NOTE

This document contains recommendations and reports to the State Regents regarding items on the April 1, 2004 regular meeting agenda. For additional information, please call 405-225-9116 or to get this document electronically go to www.okhighered.org State System.

Materials and recommendations contained in this agenda are tentative and unofficial prior to State Regents’ approval or acceptance on April 1, 2004.
AGENDA

Thursday, April 1, 2004--9 a.m.
State Regents’ Conference Room
Chairman Ike Glass Presiding

1. Announcement of filing of meeting notice and posting of the agenda in accordance with the Open Meeting Act.

2. Call to Order. Roll call and announcement of quorum.

3. Minutes of Previous Meetings. Approval of minutes.

FISCAL


5. Tuition and Fees.
   a. Posting of Tuition and Mandatory Fee Limits and Academic Service Fees. Page 5.


8.1. EPSCoR. Approval of appointment of individual to the EPSCoR Advisory Committee. Page 34.1.
ACADEMIC

   a. Approval of revisions to the State Regents’ policy statement on “Residence Status of Enrolled Students in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education,” updating the policy language and adding provisions for Oklahoma high school graduates, military dependents, and dependents of professional workers. Page 35.
   b. Approval of revisions to the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Undergraduate Degree Requirements and Articulation,” adding provisions for credit requirements in residence at the awarding institution. Page 45.

    a. Approval of increased enrollment limits for the Oklahoma State University College of Veterinary Medicine professional doctorate. Page 49.
    b. Posting of request from Oklahoma State University to increase undergraduate admission standards. Page 55.


12. New Programs.
    a. Southwestern Oklahoma State University. Approval of request to offer the Bachelor of Science in Park Law Enforcement. Page 69.
    b. Rogers State University. Approval of request to offer the Bachelor of Arts in Communications and Bachelor of Science in Justice Administration. Page 73.
    c. Cameron University. Approval of request to offer the Master of Science in Educational Leadership, including electronic delivery. Page 83.
    d. Tulsa Community College. Approval of request to offer the Associate in Science in Health and Human Performance, including electronic delivery. Page 87.


15. Teacher Education. Evaluation of Oklahoma Teacher Enhancement Program (OTEP) Title II grant. Page 95.

17. **Student Preparation.** Annual report on EPAS results from Oklahoma eighth and tenth graders. Page 111.

18. **Student Credit Cards.** Acceptance of the Council on Student Affairs Recommendations for Implementing the Findings Contained in the College Student Credit Card Study. Page 117.


**EXECUTIVE**


21. **Brain Gain Funding.** Acceptance of revisions to funding policy for allocating Brain Gain funds. Page 133.

22. **OneNet.**
   
a. Approval to unbundle OneNet’s rate schedule. Page 137.

   b. Approval of amendments to the OneNet tower leasing policy. Page 139.

   c. Approval of modifications to OneNet’s client connection policy. Page 143.

23. **Commendations.** Recognition of State Regents’ staff for service and recognitions on state and national projects. Page 149.

**CONSENT DOCKET**

24. **Consent Docket.** Approval/ratification of the following routine requests which are consistent with State Regents' policies and procedures or previous actions.

   a. Programs.

      (1) Approval of institutional requests for program modifications. Page 153.

      (2) Ratification of approved institutional requests for program modifications. Page 157.

      (3) Ratification of approved institutional requests for program suspensions. Page 159.

      (4) Approval of institutional requests for final approval of and review schedule extensions for existing programs. Page 161.


e. Agency Operations.
   (1) Ratification of purchases of $25,000 and above. Page 179.
   (3) Recognition of Meldean Turley. Page 185.


h. Department of Education Grant. Acceptance of congressionally-authorized grant of $49,705.00 for distance learning expansion. Page 191

i. Department of Tourism. Ratification of final agreement for the transfer of the Quartz construction funds to the Oklahoma State Regents from the Department of Tourism. Page 193.

j. Nonacademic Degrees.
   (1) Approval of honorary degrees at Oklahoma State University. Page 197.
   (2) Approval of honorary degree at Langston University. Page 201.
   (3) Approval of posthumous degree at Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Page 202.

25. Reports. Acceptance of reports listed on Attachment "A."


   a. Academic Affairs and Social Justice and Student Services Committees
   b. Budget and Audit Committee.
c. Strategic Planning and Personnel Committee.
d. Technology Committee.

29. **Regent Recognition.** Recognition of State Regent.

30. **New Business.** Consideration of "any matter not known about or which could not have been reasonably foreseen prior to the time of posting the agenda."

31. **Announcement of Next Regular Meeting at 1 p.m. on Friday, May 28, 2004, and Tuition Hearing on April 12, 2004 at 11:00a.m. at the State Regents’ Office**

32. **Adjournment.**
25. **Reports.**


   b. Annual Reports.


Note: The State Regents will adjourn for a photo session at 11:00 a.m. in the PHF Conference room. No business will be discussed.
AGENDA ITEM #4:

E&G Budget.

SUBJECT: Approval of FY05 Budget Principles and Guidelines

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve budget principles and guidelines for FY05 for dissemination to state system presidents and governing boards.

BACKGROUND:

State Regents annually approve budget principles and guidelines for institutions to use in preparing their annual budgets. In accordance with past practice, comment has been solicited from State Regents’ various advisory bodies, including the Council of Presidents.

POLICY ISSUES:

The proposed FY05 Budget Principles and Guidelines are consistent with Regents’ priorities and actions.

ANALYSIS:

The FY05 budget poses numerous challenges for the State Regents and institutions in light of continued enrollment growth and demand for services; the growing number of students qualifying for scholarship awards; the demand for funding endowed chairs; and improving graduation and retention rates. The FY05 Budget Principles and Guidelines were developed with these challenges in mind.

The guidelines for institutions acknowledge the mandatory cost increases, maintain the limits on the share of the budget to be spent on administration, and restate the consistency requirement. These guidelines are grounded in the principles of quality as the primary consideration, differentiation among institutions, efficiency, and seamless delivery of programs for optimal use of state funding.
I. STATE REGENTS’ BUDGET ALLOCATION PRINCIPLES

Challenges of Diminishing State Support. Fiscal Year 2005 will likely see continued increasing demand for services and access, as enrollment growth shows no signs of abating. At the same time, colleges and universities will not be able to count on substantial increases in state appropriations. Thus, the Regents will expect to see institutions investing in processes that will result in increased revenue from grants, contracts, gifts, donations, auxiliaries, and other earned income.

Focus of Resources. Emphasis on new approaches, efficiency and cost saving measures will be the system focus for the next fiscal year. Because of the conditions described above, institutions should investigate radically different approaches to offering learning experiences, designing courses, organizing academic programs and providing administrative services on their campuses. Different approaches and processes may provide both fewer expenses and more responsive programs for constituents. State Regents urge institutions to collaborate and to share resources where it is economical to do so, and pledge to continue initiatives to ensure efficient operation of the system as a whole.

E&G Budgets. Education and general budgets support institutions’ missions of teaching, research, and public service. To accomplish the goals of the Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (APRA) system, it is the State Regents’ intent to protect the operating budgets of the colleges and universities, particularly in light of increased mandatory costs and the need for competitive faculty salaries. Hence, basic operating budgets will have a higher funding priority than special programs.

Scholarships. Funding needs for the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program and the Academic Scholars Program continue to increase, as more students qualify for these awards. Addressing the impending deficits will be a priority.

Brain Gain 2010. The State Regents will maintain the focus on improving graduation and retention rates and continuing the performance funding allocation model.

Endowed Chairs. State Regents will seek funding to reduce the queue of unmatched accounts.

II. INSTITUTIONS’ BUDGET ALLOCATION PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES

Principles. Establishment of priorities in programs and services and allocation of resources to these priorities are necessary for the higher education system to effectively serve Oklahoma. As State Regents, governing boards, and presidents undertake to focus resources for optimal use of state funding, the FY05 budgets should reflect the following principles:

Quality – Resources should be focused on 1) increasing the retention and graduation rates and 2) enhancing the quality of priority programs and courses in the institution’s academic plan, including libraries and other resources for obtaining and using information.
**Differentiation** – Resources should be focused on enhancing the institution’s clearly differentiated central academic mission and eliminating unnecessary programmatic duplication, rather than spreading dollars thinly across all existing programs and services.

**Efficiency** – Resources should be allocated internally within each institution to ensure operations that are as efficient as possible. Collaboration and sharing of resources within and among institutions should be encouraged.

**Seamless Delivery** – Resources should be allocated to ensure that students and programs are able to move among institutions easily and smoothly. Bureaucratic and unnecessary academic hurdles should be minimized for students who wish to participate in more than one institution. Programs, too, should be shared among institutions with a minimum of administrative and academic overhead.

**Guidelines.** Within the context of the above principles, FY05 institutional budgets should evidence these specific guidelines:

**Mandatory Cost Increases** – The first priority on the campuses will be funding mandatory cost increases. Estimates for mandatory costs are approximately $26 million. These costs include health and dental insurance, risk management premiums, and operating costs of new space ready for occupancy.

**Administrative Cost Budget Caps** – For FY05, the following caps are approved for expenditures budgeted under the functional category of *Institutional Support*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Cap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU, OSU</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Center, Law, Vet Medicine, OSU-COM</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions with enrollments of 3,500 FTE</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions with enrollments below 3,500 FTE</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the caps are unchanged from the previous year, institutions are strongly encouraged to contain administrative costs at their current percentage of E&G budget.

**Use of Tuition Revenue** - Institutions should expend revenue from any increases in tuition on programs that directly benefit students, such as faculty compensation, computer equipment, library acquisitions, and enhanced counseling services.

**Use of Revenue from Dedicated Fees** – Institutions that charge students special fees for library materials and services, classroom and laboratory materials, or technology must ensure that the revenues are spent for the approved purpose of the fee. Likewise, traditional E&G support for the above and similar purposes should not be diminished as a result of student fee revenue.

**Consistency** – By law, institutional budgets must be prepared in accordance with financial accounting and reporting standards of the National Association of College and University Business Officers. Institutions will continue to submit budgets for State Regents’ approval by function and object. Institutions will transmit summary budgets to OSF by object under three activities: Educational and General, Part I (Fund 290), Educational and General, Part 2 (Fund 430), and Agency Special (700 Fund Series).
AGENDA ITEM #5-a:

Tuition and Fees.

SUBJECT: Posting of tuition and mandatory fee limits for resident and nonresident undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs for Fiscal Year 2005 and posting of institutional requests for changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2005.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents 1) approve the posting of tuition and mandatory fee limits for resident and nonresident undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs for Fiscal Year 2005, 2) approve the posting of institutional requests for changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2005, as reported on the attached schedule, and 3) approve an exception to the November 1 deadline for requesting changes in fees to accommodate all institutional requests.

BACKGROUND:

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions for the Coordination of Higher Education Tuition and Fees

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma establishes the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as the coordinating board of control for all public institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. Among others, specific powers enumerated include the power to prescribe and coordinate student fees and tuition within limits prescribed by the Legislature. The State Regents are authorized to 1) establish resident tuition and mandatory fees at levels less than the average rate charged at public institutions in the Big Twelve Conference for comprehensive universities and less than the average rate charged at peer institutions for regional and two-year institutions, 2) establish academic services fees, not to exceed the cost of the actual services provided, and 3) make a reasonable effort to increase need-based financial aid available to students proportionate to any increase in tuition, as well as annually report on tuition and fees.

1) Tuition and Mandatory Fee Limits

The attached schedule lists “Not to Exceed Limits” for tuition and mandatory fees for Fiscal Year 2005, as provided by law, for undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. Institutions and governing boards will submit in June their requested increases or changes for Fiscal Year 2005, after the higher education appropriation is known. It is expected that most institutions will request new rates that are well under the maximum rates.
2) Academic Services Fees

The attached schedule lists institutional requests for changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2005. Special fees for instruction and academic services are assessed students as a condition of enrollment and as a condition of academic recognition for completion of prescribed courses. Academic services fees are required for all students receiving certain courses of instruction or academic services as designated by the institution. Institutions have provided justifications for the requested increases in academic services fees, the total revenue to be collected from the fees, and the use of increased revenues.

3) Exception to November 1 Deadline

State Regents’ policy lists November 1 of each year as the deadline for submission of requests for changes in fees to be charged the following academic year. This year an exception to policy is requested for all institutions.

A public hearing will be held on April 12, 2004 at the State Regents’ office for the purpose of receiving views and comments on the requested changes to academic services fees and the resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fee limits. Institutional requests are posted here for discussion purposes. The State Regents will act on proposals at their regular meeting scheduled to be held on June 30, 2004. State Regents’ staff will review institutions’ published tuition and fee schedules for compliance with State Regents’ action.

POLICY ISSUES:

This item is consistent with the Policy and Procedures Relating to Tuition and Student Fees.

ANALYSIS:

Tuition and Mandatory Fee Limits

70 O. S. 2001, Section 3218.8, as amended by Sections 2 and 8 of House Bill No. 1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature, specifies the limits for resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees by tier, i.e. comprehensive universities, regional universities, two-year colleges and for professional programs. An analysis of tuition and fees charged at public institutions in the Big Twelve Conference, like-type public institutions in surrounding and other states, public two-year colleges receiving no local tax funding in surrounding and other states, and for professional programs was conducted for each respective tier and for professional programs. The attached “FY05 Peer Limits for Tuition and Mandatory Fees” schedules reflect the results of the analysis and are being posted to comply with policy and statute.

It is interesting to note that last year peer institutions in each tier also increased their tuition and mandatory fees resulting in Oklahoma’s respective percentage of peer average remaining fairly constant. Comprehensive universities rates as a percentage of peers increased seven percentage points to 83.4 percent; regional institutions increased five percentage points to 77.5 percent; and two-year institutions remained at 68 percent of their peer average for resident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees. The State Regents will annually monitor and
publish the tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions, the comparable amounts at each institution in Oklahoma, and the maximum possible increase for the next academic year.

**Academic Services Fees**

Of the twenty-five public institutions in The State System, fifteen requested changes in academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2005, and ten had no requests for changes in these fees. One institution has requested a change in Systemwide Fees, five institutions have requested changes in various Special Instruction Fees, two institutions have requested changes in Testing and Clinical Services Fees, two institutions have requested changes in various Facility and Equipment Utilization Fees, seven institutions have requested changes in Classroom and Laboratory Supplies Fees, and eleven institutions have requested changes in various Other Special Fees. The complete listing of these requested changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2005 is attached.

This information is being posted for State Regents’ review and public comment.
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

FY05 Peer Limits for Tuition and Mandatory Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>FY05 Peer Limit for Resident Tuition and Mandatory Fees</th>
<th>FY05 Per Credit Hour Rate</th>
<th>FY05 Peer Limit for Nonresident Tuition and Mandatory Fees</th>
<th>FY05 Per Credit Hour Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (30 Credit Hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Universities (Includes OSU-OKC; OSU-Okmulgee; OSU, Tulsa; and OU Health Sciences Center)</td>
<td>$4,534.00</td>
<td>$151.13</td>
<td>$13,555.00</td>
<td>$451.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities</td>
<td>$3,527.00</td>
<td>$117.57</td>
<td>$8,991.00</td>
<td>$299.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year Colleges</td>
<td>$2,697.00</td>
<td>$89.90</td>
<td>$7,001.00</td>
<td>$233.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (24 Credit Hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Universities (Includes OSU, Tulsa and OU Health Sciences Center)</td>
<td>$4,826.00</td>
<td>$201.08</td>
<td>$12,487.00</td>
<td>$520.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities</td>
<td>$3,553.00</td>
<td>$148.04</td>
<td>$8,439.00</td>
<td>$351.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 1748, enacted during the 2003 Legislative Session, provides that the limits for undergraduate resident tuition and mandatory fees shall be less than the average of resident tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions for each tier. Undergraduate nonresident tuition and mandatory fees shall be less than 105 percent of the average of nonresident tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions for each tier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Peer Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU and OSU</td>
<td>Big 12 Public Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities</td>
<td>Like-type public institutions in surrounding and other states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Public two-year colleges that receive no local tax funding in surrounding and other states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Regents will approve tuition and fees at their meeting on June 30, 2004 for each institution within the limits posted above.
AGENDA ITEM #5-b:

Tuition and Fees.

SUBJECT: Approval of FY05 Tuition and Fee Guidelines

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve tuition and fee guidelines for FY05 for dissemination to state system presidents and governing boards.

BACKGROUND:

State Regents annually approve budget principles and guidelines for institutions to use in preparing their annual budgets. Last year, for the first time, State Regents approved a similar document related to the preparation of each institution’s tuition and fee request in light of the tuition structure changes made by the implementation of House Bill No. 1748, which conferred additional responsibility on institutional leadership and governing boards. The FY05 Tuition and Fee Guidelines, essentially unchanged from those approved for FY04, serve to define those responsibilities and to outline Regents’ expectations concerning the process.

POLICY ISSUES:

The proposed FY05 Tuition and Fee Guidelines are consistent with Regents’ responsibilities and the State Regents’ tuition policy.

ANALYSIS:

The guidelines address five issues related to tuition and fees: 1) the responsibilities of various parties in the establishment of tuition and fees; 2) the State Regents’ publication of peer information for planning purposes; 3) State Regents’ communication of pertinent information to students; 4) documentation required of institutions; and 5) use of revenue from dedicated fees.
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

TUITION AND FEE APPROVAL GUIDELINES
Fiscal Year 2005

Responsibility to Establish Tuition. The Oklahoma Constitution, statutes, and State Regents’ policy confer responsibility for establishment of tuition at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education at four levels: 1) Presidents of institutions analyze the need for resources to ensure the quality and availability of higher education offerings, balanced by students’ needs and ability to pay, and propose tuition to their respective governing board; 2) Governing boards review presidents’ proposals and make a recommendation to the State Regents; 3) the State Regents review governing boards’ recommendations and approve tuition and mandatory fees and report to the Legislature their actions; and 4) the Legislature reviews State Regents’ actions within prescribed statutory limits.

Publication of Information for Planning Purposes. Pursuant to passage of statutory provisions by the 2003 Legislature, tuition at public higher education institutions in Oklahoma will be compared to tuition at peer (i.e., like-type) institutions in other states. State Regents will annually, at a minimum, monitor and publish tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions. Published in a timely fashion, the information will show the level of mandatory tuition and fees at each institution in Oklahoma and the maximum possible increase for the next academic year.

Communication between State Regents and Students. State Regents will assist in preparation and dissemination of guidelines for students and student groups to inform themselves about the process and issues and to provide input both at the campus level and to the State Regents. State Regents will hold a public hearing on proposed changes in tuition and fees at least 20 days prior to the date the change becomes effective. For changes effective for the fall semester 2004, the hearing will take place on Monday, April 12, 2004 in Oklahoma City. State Regents will maintain and publish a record of student testimony.

Guidelines to Institutions and Governing Boards. Each institutional request for tuition and mandatory fees should be accompanied by documentation on the following items:

1) Communication of tuition request to student government organizations, other student groups, and students at large;

2) Efforts to increase need-based financial aid proportionately to tuition;

3) Analysis of the expected effect of tuition increases on enrollment; and

4) Dedication to cost-effectiveness in operations.

Use of Revenue from Dedicated Fees. Institutions that charge students special fees for library materials and services, classroom and laboratory materials, or technology must ensure that the revenues are spent for the approved purpose of the fee. Likewise, to the extent possible, traditional E&G support for the above and similar purposes should not be diminished as a result of student fee revenue. According to existing State Regents’ policy, institutions
submit requests related to academic services fees to the State Regents by November 1 of the year prior to the effective date of the fee request.
AGENDA ITEM #5-c:

Tuition and Fees.

SUBJECT: Posting of Changes to the State Regents’ Policy on Tuition and Fees

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents review and post modifications to the Policy on Tuition and Fees.

BACKGROUND:

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma provides for the establishment of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as the coordinating board of control for all public institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education within the limits prescribed by the Legislature. Specific powers enumerated include the power to prescribe and coordinate student fees and tuition, among others.

POLICY ISSUES:

State Regents’ Policy on Tuition and Fees is Part II, Chapter 4, Section 4, pages 45-54 of the Policies and Procedures Manual.

ANALYSIS:

The State Regents’ Policy on Tuition and Fees was last updated June 30, 2003, to incorporate changes relative to House Bill No. 1748 of the 2003 Legislative session, which modified the statutory limits and emphasized the role of institutional governing boards in the establishment of tuition. Subsequent review indicated the need for clarification regarding the eligibility of concurrently enrolled high school students and for amendment to the credit hour limit requirement on resident tuition waiver scholarships and a new section on military personnel.

In addition, institutions have indicated a desire for a change to a February 1 deadline for submitting requests for changes in academic services fees. The deadline is currently November 1 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year in which the change will be effective.

These revisions have been incorporated in the State Regents’ Policy on Tuition and Fees and are now being posted for review. Recommended modifications will be finalized and the policy will be presented for approval at the State Regents’ meeting on May 28, 2004.
Section 4
Student Tuition and Fees

POLICY AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO
STUDENT TUITION AND FEES

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS FOR THE COORDINATION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND FEES

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma provides for the establishment of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education (herein after referred to as The State System) and for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (herein after referred to as the State Regents) as a "coordinating board of control" for all institutions in The State System. Among those specific powers enumerated in the Constitution which are vested in the State Regents is the following:

"It [the State Regents] shall have the power to recommend to the Legislature proposed fees for all of such institutions and any such fees shall be effective only within the limits prescribed by the Legislature."

70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.2, as amended by Section 1 of House Bill No. 1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature, further recognizes the authority of the State Regents to prescribe and coordinate student fees and tuition at institutions in The State System. By January 1 of each year, the State Regents shall submit a report to the Governor, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority floor leaders and education committee chairs of both houses of the Oklahoma Legislature, of action taken in regard to and the schedule of tuition and fees approved for the current academic year. The annual report shall include data on the impact of any tuition and fee increases on the ability of students to meet the costs of attendance, enrollment patterns, availability of financial aid, and any other data considered relevant by the State Regents.

70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.8, as amended by Sections 2 and 8 of House Bill No.1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature, authorizes the State Regents to establish undergraduate resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees, which students shall pay as a condition of enrollment, except as otherwise provided by law. At the comprehensive universities the combined average of the resident tuition and mandatory fees, as determined by the State Regents, shall remain less than the combined average of the resident tuition and fees at state-supported institutions of higher education that are members of the Big Twelve Conference. The combined average of undergraduate nonresident tuition and mandatory fees, as determined by the State Regents, shall remain less than one hundred and five percent (105%) of the combined average of the nonresident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees at the state-supported institutions of higher education that are members of the Big Twelve Conference. At the regional universities and two-year colleges, the combined average of the resident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees, as determined by the State Regents, shall remain less than the combined average of the resident undergraduate tuition and
mandatory fees at like-type state-supported institutions of higher education in states determined by the State Regents that include, but are not limited to, those adjacent to Oklahoma. The combined average of the nonresident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees, as determined by the State Regents, shall remain less than one hundred and five percent (105%) of the combined average of the nonresident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees at like-type state-supported institutions of higher education in states determined by the State Regents that include, but are not limited to, those adjacent to Oklahoma. In its deliberation on the establishment of resident tuition rates for undergraduate and graduate education, the State Regents shall balance the affordability of public higher education with the provision of available, diverse, and high-quality learning opportunities giving consideration to the level of state appropriations, the state economy, the per capita income and cost of living, the college-going and college-retention rates, and the availability of financial aid in Oklahoma. For any increase in the tuition rates, the State Regents shall demonstrate a reasonable effort to effect a proportionate increase in the availability of need-based student financial aid which shall include, but shall not be limited to, awards for the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program, Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grants, federal need-based financial aid and tuition waivers, and private donations.

70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.9, as amended by Section 3 of House Bill No. 1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature, authorizes the State Regents to establish resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees for graduate and professional courses and programs which shall remain less than the combined average of tuition and fees for like-type graduate and professional courses and programs of comparable quality and standing at state-supported institutions of higher education as determined by the State Regents. Professional courses and programs include, but are not limited to, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, and dentistry.

70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.10, as amended by Section 4 of House Bill No. 1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature, authorizes governing boards of institutions within The State System to establish academic services fees at their respective institutions, with the approval of the State Regents, which may be required in addition to resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees. Such fees shall not exceed the actual costs of the academic services provided by the institution and may include, but shall not be limited to, special instruction, testing, and provision of laboratory supplies and materials. It is the intent of the Legislature that the State Regents maintain information on established mandatory fees authorized in Sections 3218.8, 3218.9 of this title and on the academic services fees authorized in this section. The information shall include, but shall not be limited to, the basis for the amount of the fee, the amount of total revenue to be collected from the fee, and the use of the revenue collected.

70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.12, as amended by Section 5 of House Bill No. 1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature, authorizes the State Regents to contract for, charge, collect, receive, and use any and all fees, tuition, charges, grants, and allowances available through the United States Veterans Administration, or any other federal agency for the education and training of veterans, establish a system of student tuition and fee waiver scholarships for use at each institution of The State System, establish an educational assistance program utilizing state institutional matching funds when federal student loan programs require it, and establish a program for payment of tuition and fees by consumer credit card.
70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.14 authorizes the State Regents to review and consider requests submitted by institutions, constituent agencies, and/or their governing boards for tuition and fees, within the limits established by law, to be charged as a condition of enrollment at each institution or constituent agency. If appropriate, the State Regents may approve the recommendations.

A new section of law, Section 6 of House Bill No. 1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature to be codified in the Oklahoma Statutes as 70 O.S. 2001 Supp. 2003, Section 3218.15, requires the State Regents to maintain for public inspection all reports submitted by institutions to the United States Department of Education regarding tuition and fees of institutions that receive federal funds. In addition, this section requires each institution in The State System that receives federal funds to submit the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Report annually to the Department of Education reflecting the average annual tuition and fees charged to its students.

70 O.S. 2001, Section 4004.6 authorizes the State Regents to set fees for use of buildings and facilities financed by institutional governing boards through revenue bonds, within limits established by law, on behalf of any higher education institution in The State System. The fees will be used for the repayment of principal and interest toward the retirement of the revenue bonds as authorized by appropriate provisions in the resolution(s) authorizing the bonds.

I. DEFINITIONS

A. Tuition. Payment required of an individual for enrollment to receive instruction at an institution of The State System. Tuition is payment in addition to fees that may be required, as defined in I.B. of this section.

1. Resident Tuition. Payment required of an individual who is either a resident of the state of Oklahoma or qualified for resident tuition under the provisions of Senate Bill 596 of the 2003 Session, its codification, or amendments thereto, for enrollment to receive instruction at an institution of The State System. Resident tuition is payment in addition to fees as defined in I.B. of this section. The definition of a resident student can be found in State Regents’ Policy II-2-177, Section III.1.

2. Nonresident Tuition. Payment required of an individual who is neither a resident of the state of Oklahoma nor qualified for resident tuition under the provisions of Senate Bill No. 596 of the 2003 Session, its codification, or amendments thereto, for enrollment to receive instruction at an institution of The State System. Nonresident tuition is payment in addition to fees as defined in I.B. of this section.

B. Fees. Those fees assessed students in addition to resident and nonresident tuition as a condition of enrollment.

1. Mandatory Fees. Fees required of all students for enrollment to receive instruction at an institution of The State System. Such fees shall be used to support the mission of the institution and shall support service facilities, such
as student unions, health care infirmaries, recreational facilities, for any lawful purpose to enhance quality of student life including, but not limited to, facility debt service, student scholarships, student awards, travel, entertainment, guest speakers, and student organizations, or for any academic purpose or service as designated by the institution including, but not limited to, assessment fees and library resources fees. The State Regents shall maintain information on established mandatory fees, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, the basis for the amount of the fee, the amount of total revenue to be collected from the fee, and the use of the revenue collected.

2. **Academic Services Fees.** Fees assessed certain students as a condition of enrollment and as a condition of academic recognition for completion of prescribed courses. Such fees are assessed mandatory for all students receiving certain courses of instruction or certain academic services as designated by the institution and shall not exceed the actual costs of the course of instruction or the academic services provided by the institution. These services may include, but shall not be limited to, special instruction, testing, and provision of laboratory supplies and materials.

3. **Contract Credit Course Fee.** A separate special fee, up to full cost, for delivery of credit courses and programs with business, industry and governmental entities.

II. **PROCEDURES FOR APPROVAL OF TUITION AND FEES**

A. The State Regents will, annually, at a minimum, monitor and publish limits on tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions. The information, published in a timely fashion, will show the level of tuition and mandatory fees at each institution in Oklahoma and the maximum possible increase for the next academic year.

B. Institutions will submit requests for authorization to change tuition and fees to the State Regents. Requests for changes in tuition and fees will normally be considered by the State Regents one time each year. Requests for a change in academic services fees must be received in the State Regents’ office by November-February preceding the beginning of the fiscal year, July 1, in which the change is to be effective. Each institutional request for tuition and mandatory fees should be accompanied by documentation on the following items: 1) communication of tuition and fee requests to student government organizations, other student groups, and students at large; 2) efforts to increase need-based financial aid proportionately to tuition; 3) statement of the expected effect of tuition and fee increases on enrollment; and 4) dedication to cost-effectiveness in operations.

C. Higher Education Center Procedures. Tuition and mandatory fees for students enrolled in courses and programs at the higher education programs in Idabel and Ardmore shall be less than the average tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions for the regional universities, as determined by the State Regents. Tuition and mandatory fees shall be approved by the State Regents with the advice of the participant institutions and the boards of trustees of the higher education
programs. The State Regents shall determine the proportionate distribution of revenue from the tuition and mandatory fees between the participant institutions or other institutions offering courses and the higher education programs. Participant institutions and the trustees of the higher education programs may request academic services fees to be charged to students enrolled at the higher education programs.

D. The State Regents will assist in preparation and dissemination of guidelines for students and student groups to inform themselves about the process and issues and to provide input both at the campus level and to the State Regents.

E. The State Regents will hold a public hearing on proposed changes in tuition and fees at least twenty (20) days prior to the effective date of the increase.

F. The State Regents will give public notice of any increase in tuition and fees at least thirty (30) days prior to the effective date of the increase.

G. By January 1 of each year, the State Regents will submit a report to the Governor, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority floor leaders and education committee chairs of both houses of the Oklahoma Legislature of the actions taken in regard to and the schedule of tuition and fees approved for the current academic year for The State System, with due regard for the provisions of Section 3218.14 of this title. The annual report shall include data on the impact of any tuition or fee increases on the ability of students to meet the costs of attendance, enrollment patterns, availability of financial aid, and any other data considered relevant by the State Regents.

III. GENERAL POLICIES

A. Assessment and Waiver of Tuition and Fees. Resident and nonresident tuition and fees may be neither assessed nor waived unless authorized by general policy or by specific authorization of the State Regents.

B. Publication of Fee Schedule. Each institution shall publish a schedule annually of all tuition and fees charged.

C. Contract Credit Course Fee. A special Contract Credit Course Fee is established in 70 O.S. 2001, Section 3219.3. This section authorizes the State Regents "...to establish special fees for delivery of courses and programs to governmental entities, including, but not limited to, the military, profit and nonprofit associations, corporations, and other private entities in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of delivery of such courses and programs." This fee allows universities and colleges to negotiate a separate special fee, up to full cost, for delivery of credit courses with business, industry, and governmental entities. If the institution negotiates a special fee, the assessment and collection of additional fees from students (resident or nonresident tuition, mandatory fees, and academic services fees) shall be waived. This policy provision authorizes any institution to assess charges up to the cost of delivery of the course.
D. Disposition of Revenue Received from Tuition and Fees.

1. **Tuition and Academic Services Fees.** Revenue derived from resident and nonresident tuition and academic services fees shall be deposited to the institution’s Fund 290 revolving fund or may be deposited to the institution’s 295 Fund or clearing account and then transferred to the institution’s Fund 290 revolving fund.

2. **Mandatory Fees.** Revenue derived from mandatory fees shall be deposited to the institution's Fund 290 revolving fund or the Agency Special Account (Fund 700) revolving fund, as appropriate, or may be deposited to the institution’s 295 Fund or clearing account and then transferred to the institution’s Agency Special Account (Fund 700) revolving fund.

3. **Expenditure of Student Fee Revenue.** Institutions that charge students special fees for library materials and services, classroom and laboratory materials, or technology must ensure that the revenues are spent for the approved purpose of the fee. Likewise, to the extent possible, traditional E&G support for the above and similar purposes should not be diminished as a result of student fee revenue.

E. **Policy for Assessing Tuition.** Resident and nonresident tuition charges at institutions in The State System shall be based upon the academic level of the course, with the exception of tuition for certain professional programs. Institutions shall assess resident and nonresident tuition charges based upon those course numbers appearing in the official catalog or bulletin. The following definitions and procedures shall be used to determine the level of tuition charges:

1. **Undergraduate.** Courses numbered in the "1000", "2000" (lower division), "3000" and "4000" (upper division) series shall be classified as undergraduate courses for determining resident and nonresident tuition charges. In addition, those developmental courses at the "less than 1000" level that normally do not carry collegiate credit shall be classified as undergraduate courses for resident and nonresident tuition purposes.

2. **Graduate Division.** Courses offered by comprehensive and regional universities designated at the "5000" level and above shall be classified as graduate division level for resident and nonresident tuition purposes.

F. **Collection of Tuition and Fees.** Tuition and fees are due prior to the first day of class. Each institution shall establish and publish a deadline when tuition and fees are payable, after which payment may be subject to a late charge. Late payment will require payment in full as well as be subject to late payment charges in an amount determined and published by the institution.

G. **Refunds of Tuition and Fees.** The refund policy for tuition and fees collected from students at institutions shall be as follows:
1. **Withdrawals and Changes of Enrollment.** Changes in schedules and complete withdrawals from the institution during the defined add/drop period will result in full charges for courses added and full credit for courses dropped. No refunds will be made after the add/drop period for that session.

2. **Return of Title IV Funds for Students Who Cease Attendance.** Title 20 U.S.C. §1091(b), as amended by Section 485 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, Public Law 105-244, enacted October 7, 1998, requires that, if a recipient of Title IV grant or loan funds withdraws from an institution after beginning attendance, the amount of Title IV, HEA program assistance earned by the student must be determined. If the amount of assistance disbursed to the student is greater than the amount the student earned, unearned funds must be returned. If the amount of assistance disbursed to the student is less than the amount the student earned, the student is eligible to receive a late disbursement in the amount of the earned aid that the student had not received. Each institution shall develop and publish policies and procedures that are in compliance with the above referenced law. Reference: [Federal Register: November 1, 1999 (Vol. 64, Number 210)] and 34 CFR, Parts 668, 682, and 685.

3. **Tuition and Fees Applicable Only for Current Semester.** Tuition and fees are applicable only for the current semester. If a student withdraws and is entitled to a refund, the amount of the refund cannot be carried forward as a credit to a subsequent session.

4. **Refunds for Classes Offered on a Non-Standard Schedule.** Institutions may refund tuition and fees paid by a student who must withdraw from a course offered on a schedule that differs from the standard 16-week term or 15-week trimester. Each institution may develop refund procedures for courses offered on a non-standard schedule.

H. **Refund of Tuition and Fees for Students with Hardship Circumstances.** Institutions may refund tuition and fees paid by a student who must withdraw from the institution due to hardship or extraordinary circumstances. Each institution may develop institutional policy to address the definition of hardship or extraordinary circumstances and refund procedures.

I. **Refund of Tuition and Fees for Students Called to Active Military Service.** If a student is called to active military service during a term in which the student has not completed an amount of work sufficient to receive a grade, the institution may refund the tuition and fees paid by the student for the current term or the institution may waive the amount of tuition and fees paid from the amount owed for tuition and fees for a future term following the student's tour of duty.

J. **Tuition and Fees Relating to Course Audits.** Students permitted to audit courses shall pay the same resident and nonresident tuition, mandatory and academic services fees as required of students who enroll for credit.
IV. WAIVER OF TUITION

A. Policy Relating to Resident Tuition Waiver Scholarships. Pursuant to 70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.12, as amended by Section 5 of House Bill No. 1748 of the First Session of the Forty-Ninth Oklahoma Legislature, authorizing the State Regents to establish a system of student scholarships, the following policy of resident tuition waiver scholarships is hereby authorized for each institution in The State System. Except as provided below, it is the intent of this policy to provide assistance to Oklahoma students with demonstrated financial needs and to promote excellence of scholarship throughout all of the academic and professional fields of study. It is further intended that this program provide equitably for students at all academic levels from the freshman year through the graduate study. Institutions may authorize tuition waivers to students who are concurrently enrolled in credit bearing courses and to other special students. Also, insofar as is practicable, awards should be distributed so as to be supportive of the state's needs and demands for trained manpower in the various career and occupational areas. Finally, assistance under this program should be utilized to promote equity of treatment for those students in fields without access to funds from other student assistance programs.

1. Elements to be considered by institutions in the awarding of scholarships are financial need, scholastic aptitude and achievement, academic discipline or field of study, student activity participation, cultural diversity, and academic level. These elements shall be specifically incorporated into institutional procedures as follows:

a. At least fifty (50) percent of all scholarships awarded shall be on the basis of financial need of students. The criteria for determining financial need shall be determined by the institution.

b. Awards shall be apportioned in such a manner as to provide equity for students by academic discipline or field of study consistent with the state’s educated workforce priorities and taking into consideration other kinds of funds available for the support of students in particular programs.

c. Awards shall be apportioned at each institution generally in accordance with the distribution of student enrollment among the various academic levels (undergraduate or graduate division) and by student classification (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, master, or doctoral classification).

d. Scholarships shall be available to students regardless of the number of credit hours in which they are enrolled, as well as to high school students who are concurrently enrolled, in a minimum of six (6) semester credit hours per academic semester or three (3) semester credit hours during the summer term. Tuition waiver scholarships may also be awarded to students enrolled in on-line courses and other special students.
c. Scholarships so granted shall be gratuities and the student shall not be required to perform services in return for the award.

2. Each institution is authorized to award scholarships to residents of the state of Oklahoma from the Educational and General Budget - Part I in the form of resident tuition waivers, the total amount of which shall not exceed three and five-tenths (3.5) percent of the total E&G Budget - Part I for the current year. Nothing in this policy shall disqualify a student from receiving a tuition waiver scholarship on the basis of immigration status if the student qualifies for resident tuition under the provisions of Senate Bill No. 596 of the 2003 Session, its codification, or amendments thereto.

a. **Reduced Tuition Benefit for Eligible Employees.** Eligible employees at constituent institutions in The State System may enroll in courses at the institution where employed and be charged tuition at the rate of one-half the amount regularly charged to students. The term "benefit for eligible employees" means full-time and permanent employees of the institution who are eligible under the institution's benefit eligibility criteria. It should be assumed that an employee's enrollment in a course of study is for the benefit of both the employee and the institution. Procedures including appropriate limitation as to the number of credit hours in a given term for which the benefit will apply shall be determined by the institution. Upon the institution's determination that the employee's enrollment in a course of study is primarily for the benefit of the institution, the institution may waive or reimburse the employee for the remaining one-half of the tuition that was charged to the employee.

3. The following waivers, as noted below, shall not be included as tuition waiver scholarships awarded under the three and five-tenths (3.5) percent of E&G Budget - Part I limitation. (IV.A. 2. above)

a. **Auditing of Classes by Senior Citizens.** State System institutions are hereby authorized to waive the tuition and fees for auditing of classes for residents of the state of Oklahoma who are sixty-five (65) years of age or older. Such students may be admitted without charge to classes on a space available basis.

b. **Waiver of Tuition for Prisoners of War, Persons Missing in Action, and Their Dependents.** 70 O.S. 2001, Section 2281, provides that any former prisoner of war or person missing in action and their dependents may, if otherwise qualified, enroll and pursue study at any state-supported institution of higher education or state-supported technical institute without payment of resident tuition. The following points of policy and procedure will serve as guidance for institutions in the administration of this law:

1. A "prisoner of war" or a "person missing in action" means any person who was a resident of the state of Oklahoma at the time he or she entered service of the United States Armed Forces or whose
2. A "dependent" means any child whose parent served as a prisoner of war or was declared by the United States Armed Forces to be a person missing in action. A "dependent" child ceases to be eligible for benefits when he/she turns twenty-four (24) years old.

3. Dependents of prisoners of war, persons missing in action, or persons reclassified as killed in action are not eligible for this benefit if federal funds are provided to pay their tuition.

4. Under this policy, the benefits to which an eligible person is entitled includes tuition waivers for five (5) years or the completion of the bachelor's degree, whichever occurs first.

c. **Waiver for Dependents of Peace Officers and Fire Fighters.** Within The State System, no resident or nonresident tuition shall be charged to the dependents of Oklahoma peace officers or fire fighters who have given their lives in the line of duty. Institutions shall grant tuition waivers to eligible persons upon presentation of evidence that the deceased person was a duly appointed peace officer or fire fighter as defined in 70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.7. Such waivers shall be limited to a period of five (5) years from the date of the first waiver. A "dependent" means any child of an Oklahoma peace officer or fire fighter who has given their life in the line of duty. A "dependent" ceases to be eligible for benefits when he/she turns twenty-four (24) years old. Such waiver of resident or nonresident tuition shall also apply to the children of members of the Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System who have given their lives in the line of duty or whose disability is by means of personal and traumatic injury of a catastrophic nature and occurred in the line of duty, as defined by 47 O.S. 2001, Sections 2-300. Such a waiver shall be a service benefit of each Oklahoma peace officer and firefighter. For the purposes of this section, “firefighter” means a volunteer firefighter or a permanent, salaried, professional member of any fire department within the state of Oklahoma.

d. **Waiver for Graduate Assistants.** Graduate students with at least a one-quarter time graduate assistantship are eligible for these scholarships irrespective of Oklahoma residency status. Graduate assistants involved in teaching must be proficient in both oral and written English. The ability to communicate course material effectively in understandable English is required of all graduate teaching assistants awarded these waivers as defined in 70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.3 and 3224.

e. **Waiver for Exchange Students on a Reciprocal Basis.** Institutions are hereby authorized to grant waiver of resident tuition for students from
institutions outside the continental limits of the United States that have entered into an exchange agreement with a State System institution to provide reciprocal waivers for students from the Oklahoma institution. The number of credit hours of nonresident students received by the Oklahoma institution is expected to equal the number of credit hours sent by the Oklahoma institution to the exchange institution. Such authorization will be effective for as long as a contract exists with the reciprocal institution.

f. Waiver for Oklahoma State Regents Academic Scholars Program. Institutions shall waive resident tuition for Oklahoma residents and may elect to waive tuition for nonresident students who are recipients of the Oklahoma State Regents' Academic Scholars Program scholarship in an amount that, when added to the State Regents' cash award and any other state or federal financial aid for which the student qualifies, is sufficient to comply with the provisions of 70 O.S. 2001, Section 2403(C) and (E). Eligible recipients may be granted waivers of tuition for up to five (5) years of undergraduate and/or graduate study.

g. Waiver for Regional University Baccalaureate Scholarships. The regional universities shall waive resident tuition for recipients of a Regional University Baccalaureate Scholarship in an amount that, when added to the State Regents' cash award and any other state or federal financial aid for which the student qualifies, shall comprise a scholarship sufficient to cover the cost of tuition, fees, room, board, books and supplies required for courses.

h. Waiver for Students in Custody of the Department of Human Services (Independent Living Act). As established in 70 O.S. 2001, Section 3230, State System institutions are authorized to waive the resident tuition for any eligible Oklahoma resident who, within the past three (3) years, has been in the custody of the Department of Human Services for any nine (9) of the twenty-four (24) months after the individual’s sixteenth (16) birthday and before the individual’s eighteenth (18) birthday. To be eligible, the resident must have graduated within the previous three (3) years from a high school accredited by the State Board of Education, the Oklahoma School of Science and Mathematics or, upon approval of the State Regents, a public high school in a state bordering Oklahoma in which the student enrolled with approval of the State Board of Education as provided in 70 O.S. 2001, Section 8-103, or has completed General Educational Development (GED) requirements. The eligible student must be pursuing studies in this state leading to an associate or baccalaureate degree or studies in a postsecondary Career Tech program or course offered pursuant to a duly approved cooperative agreement between an area Career Tech school and an institution which is a member of The State System. To retain eligibility, the student shall maintain good academic standing and satisfactory academic progress and comply with the standards related to maintenance of eligibility as promulgated by the State Regents. The student shall be eligible for such
waivers up to the age of twenty-six (26) years or upon completion of the requirements for a baccalaureate degree, whichever comes first.

i. Waiver for Students Enrolled in On-Line Courses. State System institutions are hereby authorized to waive the tuition and fees for residents of the state of Oklahoma who are enrolled in on-line courses. Institutions shall waive the nonresident tuition of active-duty military personnel stationed in Oklahoma, of their spouses and of their dependent children so long as the military personnel are stationed in the state in full-time military service and under military orders. Dependents of military personnel who have not established residency according to the provisions of Part II, Chapter 2, Section 6 of the State Regents’ policy statement on “Residence Status of Enrolled Students in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education” may continue their eligibility for the waiver if the military personnel are subsequently stationed out-of-state.

4. Scholarships so granted shall be gratuities and the student shall not be required to perform services in return for the award.

5. Institutions shall report to the State Regents on an annual basis the number of students and the amount of tuition waivers granted.

B. Policy Relating to Nonresident Tuition Waiver Scholarships.

1. Any institution in The State System may award a scholarship that includes a waiver of nonresident tuition as defined in 70 O.S. 2001, Section 3226.

2. Institutions shall report to the State Regents on an annual basis the number of students and the amount of nonresident tuition waivers granted.

V. WAIVER OF FEES

A. Institutions may establish procedures for waiving of fees for students who are enrolled in courses offered on a non-standard schedule.

B. Institutions shall waive fees for courses offered under a contract with business, industry, military, and governmental entities pursuant to the State Regents’ policy on Contract Credit Course Fees (Section 4, Part III, Paragraph C).

C. Institutions in The State System are authorized to establish policies that waive mandatory fees for students enrolled in off-campus, electronic media, and correspondence courses. Generally, fees for campus services and activities not available to students due to time and distance may be waived if the institution determines the waiver is in the best interests of the student and the institution.

D. Fees may be neither assessed nor waived unless authorized by general policy or by specific authorization of the State Regents.
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

TUITION AND FEES
Effective Academic Year 2004-2005

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education will conduct a public hearing for the purpose of receiving views and comments on the subject of tuition and fees charged students as a condition for enrollment at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. The hearing will be held in the State Regents’ Conference Room on the second floor of 655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma at on Monday, April 12, 2004 at 11 a.m.

The following will be presented for comment:

- Tuition and mandatory fee limits for undergraduate and graduate programs;
- Tuition and mandatory fee limits for professional programs;
- Academic service fee proposals.

Those desiring to be heard should notify the Chancellor’s Office of the State Regents by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, April 9, 2004, at 655 Research Parkway, Suite 200, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 73104, phone (405) 225-9120.

Signed______________________________
Date______________________________ Paul Risser, Chancellor
AGENDA ITEM #6:

Allocation.

SUBJECT: Approval of allocations to Oklahoma State University and the University of Oklahoma from the Higher Education Facilities Fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the allocation of $2,877,697.35 to Oklahoma State University and $2,877,697.35 to the University of Oklahoma from revenue collected through the Higher Education Facilities Revolving Fund.

BACKGROUND:

The Oklahoma Legislature passed House Bill No. 2598 in May 2002 designating $38 million from an assessment on motor fuel, diesel fuel and blending materials used or consumed in the state for certain research purposes at OU and OSU. This revenue will be deposited into a new fund called the “Higher Education Facilities Fund.” The bill further states that these funds shall be evenly deposited to an account at the University of Oklahoma for funding construction of the weather center and to an account at Oklahoma State University for purchase of equipment and renovation of facilities for work on the application of advanced sensor technology for the detection of chemical and biological threats to homeland security.

In the October meeting, the State Regents’ approved the updated strategic plan for Oklahoma State University and the allocation of the full $19 million designated for their project. Also presented during the October meeting was a project update on the Weather Center project at the University of Oklahoma.

POLICY ISSUES:

The recommendation is consistent with Regents’ policy and approved budget principles.

ANALYSIS:

The fund currently has on deposit $5,755,394.71. This amount is sufficient for a transfer of $2,877,697.35 to each OSU and OU. With this allocation, each institution has received $12,101,449.50 to date.
OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
RESOLUTION NO. 4415

Pursuant to the authority granted under the Constitution of Oklahoma by Articles XIII-A adopted March 11, 1941, which vests in the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education the allocation of funds appropriated by the Legislature for use in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education and pursuant to 70 O.S. 1991, Sections 3210, 3903, 4401 and 4408 and pursuant to the provisions of House Bill No. 2598, of the Forty-Eighth Oklahoma Legislature,

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education hereby ALLOCATE the sums set out below for the respective special programs of the specified institutions for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2003, and ending June 30, 2004, said funds to be subsequently allotted for encumbrance and expenditure during said fiscal year, as provided by law.

Higher Education Facilities Revolving Fund Allocation
University of Oklahoma – Weather Center
Oklahoma State University – Biosensor Laboratory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: 299-03-605-000000</th>
<th>$5,577,394.70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To: 295-760</td>
<td>$2,877,697.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295-010</td>
<td>$2,877,697.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,577,394.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted by the State Regents in the meeting of April 1, 2004.

I, Paul G. Risser, do hereby certify that the above is a correct statement of the action authorized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as set forth in the minutes of the regular meeting on April 1, 2004.

Paul G. Risser, Chancellor

Duly subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of April 2004.

_____________________________________
Notary Public

My commission expires _________________________
AGENDA ITEM #7:

Policy.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma Guaranteed Student Loan Program Guarantee Fee

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents authorize the Oklahoma Guaranteed Student Loan Program to reinstate the guarantee fee as needed.

BACKGROUND:

At the meeting of June 29, 2001, State Regents approved the waiving of the one percent guarantee fee for loans guaranteed by the Oklahoma Guaranteed Student Loan Program, in response to the marketplace pressures of the student loan industry. Recently, the trend among the nation’s 36 student loan guarantors to waive guarantee fees has begun to reverse, which now lessens the marketplace pressure. Moreover, President Bush, in his budget proposal for FY2005, has called for the guarantee fee to be collected by all guarantors, compelling the OGSLP to position itself to reinstate the fee if needed.

POLICY ISSUES:

None. United States Department of Education regulations authorize guarantee agencies to charge a guarantee fee.

ANALYSIS:

Staff envisions that the President’s proposal, if approved, would become effective October 1, 2004. The systems provider used by OGSLP requires a minimum five-month notice for system programming changes. While OGSLP management would like to refrain from reinstating the fee until its fiduciary responsibilities indicate such a change is necessary, authorization from the State Regents would permit timely action in response to both market conditions and a possible mandate.
AGENDA ITEM #8:

Revenue Bond.

SUBJECT: Review of Statement of Essential Facts for University of Central Oklahoma, Wantland Stadium Project.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents certify to the Attorney General of Oklahoma that the Statements of Essential Facts for the University of Central Oklahoma, Series 2004, in the amounts of $15,000,000 is substantially accurate.

BACKGROUND:

For revenue bonds issued pursuant to Title 70, Oklahoma Statutes, Section 4001 through 4014, a Statement of Essential Facts shall be prepared by the issuing Board of Regents for the use of and information of prospective bond purchasers. Section 4014 of this statute requires that the State Regents examine the Statement of Essential Facts and, if found to be substantially accurate, certify such to the Attorney General of Oklahoma.

POLICY ISSUES: None

ANALYSIS:

The proceeds received from the sale of the Series 2004 bonds will be used (a) to renovate, to construct improvements, and to equip the stadium facility, (b) to make required deposits into the Bond Reserve Fund, and (c) for payment of costs of issuance.

The bonds to be issued as serial bonds will be payable on May 1 and November 1 for each of the years 2004 through 2019 with interest payments commencing on November 1, 2004, and semiannually each year thereafter and term bonds payable on May 1, 2024 and May 1, 2034. The bonds are special obligations of the Board of Regents for Oklahoma Colleges. The University has pledged, as security for the bonds the gross receipts of $3.00 per credit hour of the current $5.15 per credit hour Student Facility Fee, and the gross receipts of $3.00 per credit hour of the Stadium Facility Fee, and a lump sum of revenue in the specified Stadium Facility Fee fund that has been collected during the 2003-2004 academic year. The University has also pledged as security a Debt Service Reserve Fund in the form of a Debt Service Reserve Fund Surety Policy. The pledged revenues as anticipated by the University’s Board, will provide sufficient revenue to: (1.) pay principal of and interest on the Bonds; and, (2.) maintain the reserve required in the Reserve Account for securing any bonds payable.
The Statement of Essential Facts as reflected in the Preliminary Official Statement for the Wantland Stadium Project has been reviewed and found to be substantially accurate. Projected revenue, as described in the Statement, will assure that revenues will be adequate to cover debt service requirements at a minimum coverage ratio of 1.2.

A concurrent resolution authorizing issuance of the bonds has been approved by the legislature. A copy of the Preliminary Official Statement is available for review.
AGENDA ITEM #8.1:

EPSCoR.

SUBJECT: Appointment of a member to the Oklahoma EPSCoR Advisory Committee

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the appointment of an individual to the EPSCoR Committee.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents have currently eight standing advisory committees to the Chancellor, of which two are created by statute and the others established by State Regents’ action. 70 O.S. 2001, §3230.1 et seq. establishes the EPSCoR Committee as an advisory committee to the State Regents. The Student Advisory Board is the other statutory committee.

The purpose of the EPSCoR committee is to promote cooperative research efforts among public and private universities in Oklahoma; promote private sector involvement in university research and encourage technology transfer; promote human resource development in science and engineering within the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education; recommend research projects when only a limited number may be submitted by the State of Oklahoma; and appoint the EPSCoR director.

The statutes provide that the Regents shall appoint members of the EPSCoR Advisory Committee to include: 1) representatives of the state’s universities and colleges; 2) representatives of private research entities located in Oklahoma; 3) representatives of private businesses; 4) residents of Oklahoma whose contribution will enhance the goals of the Committee; and 5) a representative of the Oklahoma Center for the Advancement of Science and Technology. Additional committee members are to be appointed by the Governor, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Eight federal agencies have EPSCoR or similar programs to encourage the development of competitive sponsored research in states that have historically had little federally sponsored research. The federal agencies are the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce. Oklahoma is one of 23 states that participate in a program at one or more federal agency.

POLICY ISSUES:

None
ANALYSIS:

Chancellor Risser recommends that members be appointed to the EPSCoR Advisory Committee for terms to expire December 31, 2006. Current membership includes members of the private sector, a member of the House of Representatives, a member of the Governor’s staff, the President of the Oklahoma Center for the Advancement of Science and Technology, the Vice Presidents for Research of The University of Oklahoma Norman and Health Sciences Center campuses, Oklahoma State University and the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, the President of the University of Oklahoma – Tulsa, the Dean of the College of Agriculture for Oklahoma State University, the President of Cameron University, the Associate Provost of Southwestern Oklahoma State University and an Associate Professor from Langston University and scientists from The University of Tulsa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Term Exp (yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steven Rhines</td>
<td>Director of Legal Affairs</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Noble Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chancellor has solicited an appointment from the President Pro Tempore of the Senate.
AGENDA ITEM #9-a:

Policy - System.

SUBJECT: Approval of revisions to the State Regents’ policy statement on “Residence Status of Enrolled Students in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.”

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the following revisions to the policy statement on “Residence Status of Enrolled Students in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education,” updating the policy language and adding provisions for Oklahoma high school graduates, military dependents, and dependents of full-time workers.

BACKGROUND:

At the June 30 meeting, the State Regents approved revisions the Residency Policy related to the status of students without legal immigration status in response to SB 596, passed by the Oklahoma legislature in 2003. Also at the June 30 meeting, the State Regents posted a revision to the policy to ensure that military dependents who have established residency prior to entering the State System are eligible to maintain their residence status if their parents are subsequently stationed out-of-state. Additionally, House Concurrent Resolution 1004, also passed by the 2003 legislature, encourages the State Regents to review the residency policies for tuition and fees, scholarship, and financial aid purposes that affect military dependents.

POLICY ISSUES:

The State Regents’ policy on the “Residence Status of Enrolled Students in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education” establishes principles, definitions, criteria, and guidelines to assist institutional officials in the classification of students as residents or nonresidents for fee and tuition purposes. A full-time professional practitioner or worker is defined by policy as one who has come to Oklahoma to practice a profession on a full-time basis, conduct a business full-time, or work on a full-time basis.

ANALYSIS:

Due to recent changes required by legislation, State Regents’ staff examined the Residency Policy for outdated language, inconsistencies, and compliance with legislation. It was determined that the revision posted at the June 30 meeting did not address all of the pertinent issues and student needs. Several new revisions are proposed. The revisions include provisions for Oklahoma high school graduates, military dependents, and dependents of full-
time professional practitioners or workers whose parents or legal guardians may move out-of-state during the student’s enrollment in high school or college. These modifications are consistent with the revisions made at the June 30 meeting for students without legal immigration status in response to SB 596, and provide for a more equitable system of determining residence status for all Oklahoma high school graduates, military dependents, and dependents of full-time professional practitioners or workers. The revisions also support the State Regents’ Brain Gain initiative by providing incentive for talented students to attend college and remain in the state.

**Oklahoma High School Graduates**

Current policy requires that a student’s residence status be determined by the residence of his or her parents, legal guardian, or person with whom he/she habitually resides. The revision allows a student who resides in Oklahoma at the time of graduation from an Oklahoma high school and has been residing in the state for two years with a parent or legal guardian to be eligible for resident tuition and state scholarships and financial aid, even if his/her parents or guardian do not reside in the state at the time he/she is entering or attending college in the State System of higher education, and regardless of the student’s or parents’ immigration status.

This revision provides for those students whose parent or guardian may move out-of-state and allows the high school student to remain behind to finish high school or attend college. It is important in these cases to provide incentive for these talented students to attend college and remain in the state.

**Military Dependents**

Under current policy, military dependents are fully eligible for resident tuition and state financial aid programs at the time they enroll. However, if the student's military parents are stationed out-of-state while the dependent is in high school or after the dependent starts college, the student's residency may follow the parents and the student could be considered a nonresident. While institutions have the discretion to waive nonresident tuition for the student, the student loses eligibility for state financial aid if reclassified as a nonresident.

The proposed revision ensures that military dependents who have established residency on their own merit according to other provisions of the policy prior to entering the State System are eligible to maintain their residence status if their parents are subsequently stationed out-of-state.

**Full-Time Professional Practitioners or Workers and Dependents**

Under current policy, dependents of full-time professional practitioners or workers who come to Oklahoma to practice a profession, conduct a business, or work full-time are considered residents at the time of enrollment. The revision ensures that dependent students under this provision who have established residency on their own merit according to other provisions of the policy and whose parents may relocate during the student’s enrollment at an institution will be allowed to maintain their residence status.
Additionally, a provision has been added to ensure that Oklahoma residents who maintain residency even when temporarily assigned by employers to another location are afforded the benefits of residence status, along with their spouse and dependent children.

Other Revisions

The revisions also include:

- updating the introduction to reflect recent changes by the legislature in the way tuition is determined by institutions;
- changing outdated language regarding the definition of dependents and removing ambiguous language that does not relate to a parent or legal guardian;
- creating consistency in the use of the terms “resident” and “residence;”
- moving an important section regarding the burden of proof to the front of the policy; and
- updating the name of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the proposed policy revisions to the “Residence Status of Enrolled Students in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education,” updating the policy language and adding provisions for Oklahoma high school graduates, military dependents, and dependents of full-time professional practitioners or workers. The revisions will be effective with the fall 2004 semester.
RESIDENCE STATUS OF ENROLLED STUDENTS IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of Oklahoma creates The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education and establishes the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as the coordinating board of control for all public institutions supported by legislative appropriations. Title 70 O.S. §3218.9 authorizes the State Regents to establish and recommend to the Oklahoma Legislature the proposed fees to be charged at public institutions to Oklahoma residents and nonresidents alike, within the limits prescribed by the legislature. Regents annually prepare and submit to the Legislature a schedule of general fees to be paid by residents of Oklahoma and nonresidents alike, and a separate schedule of tuition charges to be made of nonresident students. The policy statement set forth in the paragraphs to follow establishes principles, definitions, criteria, and guidelines to assist institutional officials in the classification of students as residents or nonresidents for fee and tuition-payment purposes. Also, the policy statement should be helpful to prospective students in the determination of their own residence status prior to enrollment or for those nonresident students seeking to be reclassified as residents of Oklahoma after having been classified originally as nonresidents. Determination of residence status for purposes of attendance at an institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is based primarily on the issue of domiciliary intent.

Section I. PHILOSOPHY

Since 1890, it has been public policy in Oklahoma to provide comprehensive, low-cost public higher education for citizens, in order to make educational opportunities available for Oklahoma individuals to improve themselves, to help upgrade the knowledge and skills of the Oklahoma work force, and to enhance the quality of life in Oklahoma generally. Therefore, residents of Oklahoma are afforded subsidies covering a majority of their educational costs at all colleges and universities of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. Nonresidents of Oklahoma are also provided substantial educational subventions, although at lower levels than those provided for permanent residents of the state.

Section II. PRINCIPLES

II.1. Attendance at an educational institution, albeit a continuous and long-term experience, is interpreted as temporary residence; therefore, a student neither gains nor loses resident status solely by such attendance.

II.2. Students attending an Oklahoma college or university may perform many objective acts, some of which are required by law (i.e. payment of taxes), and all of which are customarily done by some nonresidents who do not intend to remain in Oklahoma after graduation but are situationally necessary and/or convenient (i.e. registering to vote, obtaining a driver’s license). Such acts and/or declarations alone are not sufficient evidence of intent to remain in Oklahoma beyond the college experience.
II.3. A nonresident student attending an Oklahoma college or university on more than a half-time basis is presumed to be in the state primarily for educational purposes.

II.4. An individual is not deemed to have acquired status as a resident of Oklahoma until he or she has been in the state for at least a year primarily as a permanent resident and not merely as a student. Likewise, an individual classified as a resident of Oklahoma shall not be reclassified as a nonresident until 12 months after having left Oklahoma to live in another state.

II.5. Unless he/she has established residency in another state, a student who resided in Oklahoma at the time of graduation from an Oklahoma high school and has resided in the state with a parent or legal guardian for the two years prior to graduation from high school will be eligible for resident tuition and scholarships or financial aid provided by the state, regardless of immigration status.

II.56. All married persons shall be treated as equal under this policy. Each spouse in a family shall establish his or her own residence status on a separate basis. Exceptions include: 1) when a nonresident marries an already established resident of Oklahoma, the nonresident may be considered a resident after documentation of the marriage and proof of domicile are satisfied, and 2) as provided in Sections VII and VIII.

II.6. The burden of proof of residence status or domicile shall be upon the applicant. Establishing Oklahoma residence or domicile, including providing any supporting documentation, shall be upon the applicant. Since residence or domicile is a matter of intent, each case will be judged on its own merit by the appropriate institutional official(s) consistent with this policy. No definitive or "magic" set of criteria can be established as sufficient to guarantee classification as a resident of Oklahoma.

II.7. Initial classification as a nonresident student shall not prejudice the right of a person to be reclassified thereafter for following semesters or terms of enrollment as an Oklahoma resident provided that he or she can establish proof of residence in accordance with criteria and procedures as set forth in Sections VIII and IX of this policy.

Section III. DEFINITIONS.

III.1. Resident of Oklahoma--A resident of Oklahoma is one who has lived continuously in Oklahoma for at least 12 months duration and whose domicile is in Oklahoma. A person's domicile is his or her true, fixed, permanent home or habitation. It is the place where he or she intends to remain and to which he or she expects to return. A person can have more than one residence, but only one domicile. Domicile has two components -- residence and the intention to remain. When these two occur, there is domicile.
III.2. Independent Person--An independent person is one enjoying majority privileges (or is legally emancipated from the parental domicile) and who is responsible for his or her own care, custody, and support.

III.3. Dependent Person--A dependent person is one who is under the care, custody, and support of a parent or other legally sanctioned parental surrogate legal guardian.

III.4. Full-time Student--A full-time undergraduate student is one enrolled in a minimum of 12 credit hours per semester in an academic year or a minimum of 6 credit hours in a summer session. A full-time graduate student is one enrolled in a minimum of 9 credit hours per semester in an academic year or a minimum of 4 credit hours in a summer session.

Section IV. INDEPENDENT PERSONS

If a person enjoying majority privileges and who is independent of parental domicile can provide adequate and satisfactory proof of his/her having come to Oklahoma with the intention of establishing domicile, he/she may be granted resident student classification at the next enrollment occurring after expiration of 12 months following the establishment of domicile in Oklahoma. The spouse of such person must establish proof of his or her own domiciliary status on a separate basis, except as provided in other sections of this policy.

Section V. DEPENDENT PERSONS

The legal residence of a dependent person is that of his/her father parents, or the legal residence that of his/her mother if his/her father be not living or if the parents are separated and the dependent person habitually resides with the mother; or, if both parents are dead, of the parent who has legal custody or the parent with whom the student habitually resides. If the student is under the care, custody, and support of those other than his/her parents, the legal residence is of that of his/her legally appointed guardian, or anyone else with whom he/she habitually resides in the absence of formal legal designation.

A dependent person may become emancipated (freed from his/her parental domicile) through marriage, formal court action, abandonment by parents, or positive action on his/her own part evidential of his/her alienation of parental domicile. To qualify under the latter category, a dependent person must have completely separated himself/herself from the parental domicile and have proved that such separation is complete and permanent. Mere absence from the parental domicile is not proof of its complete abandonment. If an applicant can provide adequate and satisfactory proof of complete emancipation and his/her having come to Oklahoma with the intention of establishing domicile, he/she may be granted resident student classification at the next enrollment occurring after expiration of 12 months following establishment of domicile in Oklahoma.
Section VI. FOREIGN NATIONALS

An individual who is not a United States national may become eligible for classification as an Oklahoma resident provided that he/she holds **lawful permanent resident** status as defined by the Bureau of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), evidenced by whatever documents may be required under applicable federal law, who has resided in Oklahoma for at least 12 consecutive months, and who meets any other applicable criteria for establishment of domicile as set forth in this policy or who has come to Oklahoma for the purpose described in Section VIII of this policy.

In accordance with Senate Bill 596 of the 2003 Oklahoma legislature (70 O.S., Section 3242), an individual who is not a United States national and has not obtained **lawful permanent resident** status with the USCIS but who has graduated from a public or private high school in Oklahoma or successfully completed the General Education Development (GED) exam may be eligible for enrollment, resident tuition, and state student financial aid if he/she meets the following criteria:

1. VI.1. Resided in the state with a parent or legal guardian for at least the two years prior to graduation from high school or successful completion of the GED;

2. VI.2. Satisfied admission standards for the institution; and

3. VI.3. Either holds a valid temporary visa or has filed an affidavit with the institution stating that he/she has done one of the following with the USCIS toward legalizing their immigration status: a) filed an application; b) has a petition pending; or c) will file an application as soon as he/she is eligible to do so.

Section VII. MILITARY PERSONNEL

A student attending an institution while on full-time active duty in the armed forces is considered as having a temporary residence in the state in which he/she is attending school; therefore, a student neither gains nor loses **resident** status solely by such military service. Members of the armed services stationed in Oklahoma, their spouses and dependent children shall be admitted without the payment of nonresident tuition, and without the 12 month domiciliary requirement, so long as they continue to be stationed in the state in full-time military service and under military orders.

While the policy clearly states that nonresident tuition will be waived for military personnel, such a waiver does not constitute Oklahoma residence status. **Military personnel and their dependents** who provide proof of a legal change in their state of residence to Oklahoma (such as claiming Oklahoma for income tax purposes) may have the full benefits of residence status.

**Dependent children of military personnel** that establish residency as described in Section II of this policy shall maintain residence status if their parents are subsequently stationed out-of-state. **Dependents of military personnel** who have not established residency according to policy may maintain non-resident waiver status if their parents are subsequently stationed out-of-state.
Section VIII. FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL PRACTITIONER OR WORKER

An individual who provides evidence of having come to Oklahoma to practice a profession on a full-time basis, conduct a business full time, or work on a full-time basis shall be immediately declared an Oklahoma resident along with his/her spouse and dependent children without the 12 month domiciliary requirement so long as they continue in such full-time employment capacity or until such time that they establish residency as described in Section II of this policy.

Dependent children of the above full-time professional practitioners or workers that establish residency as described in Section II of this policy may maintain residence status if their parents subsequently leave the state.

Likewise, a full-time professional practitioner or worker who is temporarily assigned to another location but maintains his/her residency in Oklahoma (such as claiming Oklahoma for income tax purposes) shall be considered a resident for tuition and state scholarship and financial aid purposes, along with his/her spouse and dependent children.

Section IX. PROOF OF RESIDENCE

The burden of proof of establishing Oklahoma residence or domicile, including providing any supporting documentation, shall be upon the applicant. Since residence or domicile is a matter of intent, each case will be judged on its own merit by the appropriate institutional official(s) consistent with this policy. No definitive or "magic" set of criteria can be established as sufficient to guarantee classification as a resident of Oklahoma.

Section IX. RECLASSIFICATION

In addition to the aforementioned criteria, an independent person seeking to be reclassified as a resident of Oklahoma must meet the following criteria for the current and immediately preceding year.

IX.1. The person must not have been claimed as an exemption for state and federal tax purposes by his or her nonresident parents.

IX.2. The person must be self-supporting as evidenced by having provided the majority of funds for his or her own upkeep.

IX.3. The person must have maintained a continuous residence in Oklahoma for the period set forth in Section IV above.
Section XI. ADMINISTRATION OF POLICY STATEMENT

Each institution should designate the Admissions Officer or some other individual to be responsible for administration of the policy, and should make appropriate provision for a student's appeal of an adverse decision.

Section XII. TUITION WAIVERS

Nothing in this policy precludes the waiving of fees or tuition for nonresidents by any institution upon authorization by the State Regents based on criteria other than resident status provided that the residence status classification will not be affected by any such waiver alone.

The revised policy will be in effect with the 1996-2004 fall semester.
AGENDA ITEM #9-b:

Policy - System.

SUBJECT: Approval of revisions to the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Undergraduate Degree Requirements and Articulation.”

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the following revisions to the “Policy Statement on Undergraduate Degree Requirements and Articulation,” adding new provisions for credit requirements in residence at the awarding institution.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Undergraduate Degree Requirements and Articulation” requires that baccalaureate degrees be based on 120 credit hours, exclusive of physical education activity courses. Sixty hours must be from a baccalaureate degree granting institution, and 40 hours must be upper-division credit. Additionally, a minimum of 30 hours must be taken in the major area, with at least 50 percent of the major area courses at the upper-division level. The policy also includes a residency requirement of 30 credit hours at the degree-granting institution, with at least 15 of the final 30 credit hours in-residence at the awarding institution.

There is no final credit hour requirement for associate degrees, but 15 hours in residence at the awarding institution is required for the associate in arts and the associate in science degree.

ANALYSIS:

Students today are more mobile than in the past and frequently transfer among institutions to find what fits their educational needs. Many have jobs and families that require them to relocate temporarily or permanently, sometimes on short notice.

The standards for baccalaureate degrees in the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Undergraduate Degree Requirements and Articulation” are in place to provide a safeguard for ensuring the candidate’s fitness for the degree and to provide faculty with the opportunity to evaluate the candidate’s abilities. Under the current policy, however, students lacking as few as three of the final 15 credit hours are required to remain at the degree-granting institution for completion, even if the missing course will only be counted as elective credit.

Exceptions to the requirement that 15 of the final 30 hours be taken in residence are requested and granted more frequently by the Chancellor than any other policy exception. In 2003, 16
exceptions to the policy were granted, and in 2002, 13 were granted. The reasons for the exceptions varied. The most common reason was a relocation for medical, job, family, or military reasons. Some students transferred to another institution but returned to finish a degree, and some earned hours that were not related to the degree but, because of the policy, had to request an exception. Many of these students earned in residence over 100 hours at the awarding institution, but lacked 15 of the final 30 hours to complete the degree.

The revision will allow institutions to require either at least 15 of the final 30 hours in residence or at least 50 percent of the hours required in the major field in residence. Maintaining a residency requirement is important because it ensures that a completed degree is actually earned from the awarding institution. Allowing institutions to require that at least 50 percent of the hours in the major be taken in residence will address the policy issues encountered by students while maintaining degree integrity.

This revision is consistent with policies in peer states. Requiring a certain number of hours in the major in residence is almost as common as requiring a certain number of the final hours in residence. Of the 48 institutions and state systems reviewed, 17 specified the minimum number of final hours required in residence and 14 specified the minimum number of hours in the major required in residence.

The revision also supports the State Regents’ Brain Gain initiative to increase the number of Oklahomans with college degrees by providing more flexibility for students in the final credit hour requirements. It also allows students to take advantage of job opportunities while still completing a degree, and will help institutions maintain balance in meeting the needs of business and industry while safeguarding the academic integrity of the degree.

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the following revisions to the “Policy Statement on Undergraduate Degree Requirements and Articulation,” adding new provisions for credit requirements in residence at the awarding institution.
C. REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS

Following is a list of requirements, standards, and recommendations for use by institutions in the development and evaluation of bachelor's degree programs. Also, this section will be helpful to the State Regents in reviewing both new and existing baccalaureate programs to help determine their quality and viability.

1. Traditional bachelor's degrees—all degrees with the exception of professional or conservatory-type degrees—should be attainable in four years of full-time academic study. Bachelor's degrees shall be based upon at least 120 semester hours of course work excluding physical education activity courses.

2. The faculty of the awarding institution should have an opportunity to make a judgment as to the candidate's fitness for the degree. Therefore, a minimum of 30 hours of resident credit applied toward the bachelor's degree shall be taken at the awarding institution, exclusive of correspondence work.

3. Each bachelor's degree awarded by a State System institution shall be based on a minimum of 40 hours of general education excluding physical education activity courses. Normally, most general education courses will occur at the lower-division level; however, it is recommended that at least one upper-division general education course be required by the awarding institution.

4. Bachelor's degrees shall be based upon a minimum of 60 hours, excluding physical education activity courses, at a baccalaureate degree-granting institution, 40 hours of which must be upper-division course work excluding physical education activity courses. Upper-division courses should be taught at a level either sequentially above or conceptually higher than lower-division courses.

5. At least 15 of the final 30 hours applied toward the degree or at least 50 percent of the hours required by the institution in the major field must be satisfactorily completed at the awarding institution.

6. Bachelor's degrees should be based upon a minimum of 30 semester hours of credit in the area of specialization; however, the major area is defined by the institution. Of the 30 hours in the major field, 50 percent must be taken at the upper-division level.
7. Students recommended for the bachelor's degree must achieve a grade-point average of 2.0 as a minimum on all course work attempted, excluding any courses repeated or reprieved as detailed in the State Regents' Grading Policy and excluding physical education activity courses.

8. The requirements and standards set forth in this policy statement should be considered minimal, allowing for change by individual institutions upon approval by the State Regents.

9. Students must demonstrate computer proficiency, which includes the competent use of a variety of software and networking applications. This requirement may be completed through one of three options: 1) successfully complete a high school computer science course that meets the State Regents' high school curricular requirements, or 2) satisfy an institution's computer proficiency assessment, or 3) successfully complete college-level course work that the institution designates.\(^6\)

\(^6\) This is a minimal requirement. An institution may adopt higher standards. This requirement is effective for first-time entering freshmen beginning fall 1998.
Meeting of the
OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
April 1, 2004

AGENDA ITEM #10-a:

Policy - Institution.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma State University (OSU). Approval of request to increase the nonresident enrollment maximum for first-year students and allow nonresident enrollment in unfilled contract positions in the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine professional degree program.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that OSU be permitted to increase the nonresident enrollment maximum for first-year students in the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine program from 20 percent to 25 percent per year and to allow nonresident enrollment in unfilled contract positions beginning with the class of 2008.

BACKGROUND:

In 1993, the State Regents approved a request from OSU to maintain maximum nonresident student enrollment in the College of Veterinary Medicine (OSU-CVM) at 20 percent through the 1994-95 academic year, with the stated intent that the maximum would be reduced to 15 percent thereafter. In 1995, the State Regents approved OSU’s request to raise the maximum from 15 percent to 20 percent on a permanent basis.

In 1998, OSU requested revisions to the OSU-CVM policies on admission and contract fees. At the April 3, 1998 meeting, the State Regents approved the request, allowing OSU-CVM to determine enrollment limits based on physical and financial resources and more clearly articulating that nonresident students admitted through contracts with other states are exempt from the 20 percent cap on nonresident students. Additionally, revisions more clearly defined the cost-per-student fee for students admitted under state contracts.

POLICY ISSUES:

The State Regents’ policy “Criteria and Standards for Admission of First-Year-Entering Students and Transfer Students” for the OSU-CVM regulates the College’s enrollment. Current policy states that the number of students to be admitted shall be determined by the Dean of the College according to the physical and financial resources available after recommendations of the faculty and approval of the President.

The policy requires that fully qualified Oklahoma residents be given first priority for admission to the program over residents of other states, and allows for 20 percent of each freshman class to be nonresidents. A limited number of transfer students may also be
admitted during the second, third, and fourth year classes to maintain the original class size, but at no time should the enrollment of nonresidents exceed 20 percent of the total enrollment.

The State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Contract Fees for Non-Resident Students” permits the OSU-CVM to exempt students enrolled within contracts with other states from the nonresident enrollment limits. The contract fee is defined by policy as the actual direct cost of instruction for the year prior to the beginning of the contract period divided by the number of Oklahoma residents enrolled full time in the College. Although contract students are exempt from the nonresident enrollment limits, the policy states that the number cannot exceed that which would cause the OSU-CVM to increase its indirect, non-instructional fixed costs.

Neither of the above policies includes provisions for contract positions that are left unfilled by students.

**ANALYSIS:**

The following chart depicts the current enrollment limits and the limits proposed by the OSU-CVM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Limits</th>
<th>Proposed Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract (New Jersey)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This increase from 20 percent to 25 percent in nonresident enrollment limits was approved by the OSU/A&M Board of Regents at the January 30, 2004 meeting. In support of this request, the OSU-CVM administration engaged in discussions with faculty, staff, and students, as well as preliminary discussions with State Regents’ staff and dialogue with members of the Oklahoma Veterinary Medical Association, which is supportive of the increase. Research by the OSU-CVM has determined the following:

- The maximum enrollment per class should be 80 students, based on current classroom and laboratory space.
- An increase in class size of six students will not result in additional non-instructional fixed costs.
- There is an adequate pool of qualified applicants from which to select the additional students.
- Current nonresident tuition ($24,429) exceeds per student direct instructional costs. For fiscal year 2003, instructional expenses were $6,327,921 according to OSU-CVM. The per student cost of instruction for 233 resident students is $27,158 and that cost is reduced to $21,378 when 63 nonresident and contract students are included. Inclusion of 35 graduate students further reduces the cost to $19,118.

As mentioned previously, by policy, students enrolled in OSU-CVM under contracts with other states are not included in the nonresident allowable maximum. If a student leaves the program, the contract position he/she held has been left open. OSU has requested that if a
contract position is not filled by a student from the state contract, the position can be filled with another nonresident student without including that student in the nonresident maximum. This will permit OSU-CVM to maximize its class sizes and will enhance enrollment and budget management. Additionally, allowing a nonresident student to fill a contract position will not increase OSU-CVM’s indirect, non-instructional fixed cost.

It is recommended that the State Regents approve OSU’s request to increase the nonresident enrollment maximum for first-year students in the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine program from 20 percent to 25 percent per year and to allow nonresident enrollment in unfilled contract positions beginning with the class of 2008. Revisions to the “Criteria and Standards for Admission of First-Year Entering Students and Transfer Students” for the OSU-CVM are attached. There are no resulting revisions required to the “Policy Statement on Contract Fees for Non-Resident Student.”

Attachment
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Criteria and Standards for Admission of
First-Year-Entering Students and Transfer Students

Students are admitted to the College of Veterinary Medicine on the basis of records of academic performance in preparatory studies; personal interviews and references to determine personal characteristics and career motivation; and standard achievement tests. The following specific criteria and standards are hereby adopted for first-time-entering students and transfer students.

1. In the determination of eligibility for first-year admission to the College of Veterinary Medicine, fully qualified Oklahoma residents shall be given first priority over residents of other states.

2. Nonresident freshman enrollment shall be limited so that the number of nonresident students enrolling in the College of Veterinary Medicine shall not exceed 25 percent of the total College student enrollment. Nonresident students may be enrolled in an unfilled out-of-state contract position outside of the 25 percent maximum.

3. The number of students to be admitted shall be determined in accordance with physical facilities and financial resources available by the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine after recommendations of the College faculty and approval by the President of the University.

4. Students applying for first-time admission to the College of Veterinary Medicine shall present a minimum grade-point-average of 2.8 (based on a 4.0 scale) for all courses specifically required for admission to the College of Veterinary Medicine.

5. A limited number of students may be admitted by transfer each year from other accredited colleges to fill the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year classes back to their original authorized levels. However, the number of nonresident students enrolled at any given time shall not exceed twenty-five percent of the total enrollment for the college.

6. A maximum of 15% of the entering class may be admitted who meet special college admission criteria, but who do not meet the State Regents' admission criteria. These students must have credentials close to those required of students regularly admitted and must be interviewed. Special consideration should be given to the diversity of the students admitted to the program.

---

1 See State Regents' Policy Statement on Contract Fees for Non-Resident Students located in the fiscal policy section Policy and Procedures Relating to Student Fees and Tuition for a definition of out-of-state contract students.
Functions of the College of Veterinary Medicine

The functions of the College of Veterinary Medicine of Oklahoma State University shall be as follows:

1. to offer a four-year course of professional training leading to the degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine;

2. to offer a two-year upper-division technical training program leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science;

3. to offer courses in the basic sciences leading to the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees;

4. to offer graduate clinical training either with or without advanced degree objectives;

5. to offer service courses for students of the several colleges of Oklahoma State University and other appropriate institutions;

6. to offer continuing education programs for the veterinary medical and related professions;

7. to maintain and operate clinics and hospitals to serve the instructional program;

8. to maintain and operate an animal care and procurement center for the College of Veterinary Medicine and for the University;

9. to work cooperatively with the state in the maintenance and operation of a diagnostic service for the benefit of the state of Oklahoma; and

10. to conduct basic and applied veterinary medical research.

AGENDA ITEM #10-b:

Policy - Institution.

SUBJECT: Increased Admission Standards: Oklahoma State University (OSU).

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents post OSU’s request to increase admission standards incrementally as described.

BACKGROUND:

Admission of First-Time Entering Students

In 1987-88, entering freshmen at Oklahoma’s two comprehensive universities had the lowest average ACT scores, the highest freshman dropout rates, and the lowest graduation rates in the Big 8 Conference. As a result, in 1988, the State Regents adopted a multi-year phase-in of increased admission standards at the comprehensive as well as regional universities. Entering students are required to score higher on the ACT or earn better grades in high school to enroll at either of these two tiers. These higher standards encourage high school students to take more academic core courses. By 1998, the University of Oklahoma (OU) and OSU had significantly improved student performance rates in these three categories.

The standards for first-time entering freshmen adopted by the State Regents in 1988 for the comprehensive universities became effective with the fall 1992 semester. The standards required students entering OU and OSU to earn either an ACT or SAT score in the top 33.3 percent of Oklahoma students or to be in the top 33.3 percent of their high school graduating class and earn a minimum GPA on all high school coursework. In 1999, the State Regents adopted a third admission option for students. The third option allowed OU and OSU to admit students who had earned a GPA in the top 33.3 percent on the required 15-unit high school core curriculum required for admission. OSU currently maintains these performance admission standards.

OU has increased admission standards several times since the original standards were adopted in 1988:

- In 1998, the State Regents approved a request to raise the minimum ACT/SAT score and class rank, effective fall 2000.
- In 2000, the State Regents approved a request to add a minimum ACT/SAT score to the third admission option for OU.
In 2001, the State Regents approved a request to establish separate higher admission standards for nonresidents.

In 2002, the State Regents approved a request for more delineated automatic admission and space available admission for residents.

Currently, OU’s admission standards for first-time entering freshmen are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Options</th>
<th>Current OU Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: ACT/SAT</td>
<td>Residents: 24/1090; Nonresidents(^1): 26/1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: High School GPA and Class Rank</td>
<td>Residents: 3.0 and top 25%; Residents(^2): 3.0 and top 33%; Nonresidents(^1): 3.5 and top 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: High School GPA in the 15-Unit Core</td>
<td>Residents(^2) and Nonresidents(^1): 3.0 and ACT 22/SAT 1020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Nonresidents not meeting these standards, but otherwise meeting admission standards for resident students, may be placed on a waiting list and evaluated according to state policy.

\(^2\) OU residents meeting these standards will be placed on a waiting list and evaluated according to stated policy.

The following describes OSU’s current and proposed admission standards for first-time entering freshmen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: ACT/SAT</td>
<td>22/1020</td>
<td>23/1060</td>
<td>24/1090</td>
<td>24/1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: High School GPA and Class Rank</td>
<td>3.0 and top 33.3%</td>
<td>3.0 and top 33.3%</td>
<td>3.0 and top 33.3%</td>
<td>3.0 and top 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: High School GPA in the 15-Unit Core</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0 and ACT 20 or SAT 940</td>
<td>3.0 and ACT 21 or SAT 980</td>
<td>3.0 and ACT 21 or SAT 980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admission by Transfer

Current State Regents’ policy on admission by transfer requires that students meet the institution’s retention GPA standard based on at least 24 attempted semester credit hours of regularly graded work. In 2001, the State Regents approved a request from OU to raise its minimum standard GPA for transfer students. All students transferring to OU with less than 60 credit hours are required to have a GPA of 2.5. Those with over 60 hours are required to have a GPA of 2.0.

OSU has requested the following revisions to its admission standards for transfer students:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Current OSU Standard</th>
<th>Proposed for Summer 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-23 hours</td>
<td>1.7 retention/graduation GPA for residents; 2.0 retention/graduation GPA for nonresidents; Plus satisfy freshman admission requirements</td>
<td>2.25 retention/graduation GPA and satisfy freshman admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-30 hours</td>
<td>1.7 retention/graduation GPA for residents; 2.0 retention/graduation GPA for nonresidents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-59 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25 retention/graduation GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ hours</td>
<td>2.0 retention/graduation GPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ hours or associate degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 retention/graduation GPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY ISSUES:**

The State Regents' "Policy Statement on Admission To, Retention In, and Transfer Among Colleges and Universities of the State System" establishes admission requirements and principles for institutions. The policy encourages institutions to establish higher admission standards: "Institutional and individual programs' admission policies should be considered minimal. Institutions are encouraged to propose more rigorous standards for approval by the State Regents."

**ANALYSIS:**

Proposed Changes

(1) OSU has proposed three changes to the standards for summer 2005:

- raising the minimum ACT and SAT requirement to 23 and 1060, respectively, under Option 1;
- adding a minimum 20 ACT or 940 SAT composite score to Option 3; and
- raising the transfer admission standards to a 2.25 GPA for students entering with less than 60 hours.

(2) For summer 2006, the following two changes are proposed:

- raising the minimum ACT and SAT requirements to 24 and 1090, respectively, under Option 1; and
- raising the minimum ACT and SAT composite scores to 21 and 980, respectively, under Option 3.

(3) For summer 2007, OSU has proposed that students admitted under Option 2 to be in the top 25 percent of the high school graduating class.
Incremental increases are requested to give prospective students and high school counselors time to prepare for the increases and to lessen the impact of any revenue loss that may occur as a result of the possible decreased enrollments. Additionally, raising the standards incrementally will allow time for public response.

Northern Oklahoma College (NOC)-OSU Gateway Program

In order to better serve students, OSU has partnered with NOC in a program designed to expand educational opportunities for students and more efficiently provide remedial and general education courses. The NOC-OSU Gateway Program is designed to assist freshman and transfer applicants in qualifying for full admission to OSU. Students who have applied for freshman admission to OSU, but do not meet current admission requirements, are offered provisional admission through the Gateway Program. All credits earned through the program apply toward OSU baccalaureate degrees. All credits earned through the program apply toward OSU baccalaureate degrees except zero-level (remedial) course work.

Gateway students have a seamless transition to OSU—they enroll in remedial classes through OSU’s student enrollment system, have the option to live in OSU housing, and participate with OSU students in a wide range of programs, services, and activities on the OSU campus. Students in the program pay the same tuition and fees as OSU students and are eligible to apply for the full range of federal and state financial aid programs. Hours from both NOC and OSU are included in the calculation of total hours for a student. In fall 2003, the program offered 5 remedial courses with 442 OSU students. In spring 2004, there were 5 remedial courses with 235 OSU students and 9 general education courses with 57 OSU students.

Enrollment Projections

Over the past five years, OSU’s total enrollment has grown from 21,087 to 23,571, an 11 percent increase. Additionally, OSU’s first-time freshman enrollments have steadily increased in recent years—from 2,489 in 1997 to 3,486 in 2003. About 90 percent of OSU’s first-time freshmen are aged 17-19.

With the proposed admission standards applied to OSU’s 2003 freshmen class, OSU projects that its future freshman classes would be reduced by 7 percent in 2005, 12 percent in 2006, and 16 percent in 2007 as a result of the proposed increases. OSU has provided the following projections for freshman admission due to the increased standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma High School Graduates</td>
<td>38,801</td>
<td>38,936</td>
<td>38,562</td>
<td>37,828</td>
<td>37,942</td>
<td>38,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Freshman Applications</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>6,629</td>
<td>6,960 (+5%)</td>
<td>7,308 (+5%)</td>
<td>7,673 (+5%)</td>
<td>8,057 (+5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Freshmen Admitted</td>
<td>5,229</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>6,194 (-7%)</td>
<td>6,048 (-12%)</td>
<td>6,011 (-12%)</td>
<td>6,023 (-16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Freshman Class</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>3,592</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>3,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When approved and fully implemented, OSU’s admission standards will be similar to OU’s admission standards. Only the required ACT score for the third admission option will be different (OU requires a 22, OSU will require a 21) and the transfer GPA for students with less than 60 credit hours (OU requires a 2.5 and OSU will require a 2.25). At OU, the increase in admission standards has been accompanied by increases both in enrollment and student retention. In fall 1989, OU enrolled 2,421 first-time entering freshmen. In fall 2001, OU enrolled 3,748 first-time entering freshmen. In 1988, OU had a first to second year retention rate of 71.4 percent. By 2000, the retention rate had increased to 83 percent. It is likely that the same can be expected at OSU with increased admission standards.

RECOMMENDATION:

Increasing admission standards will help OSU better manage its enrollment and still preserve the quality academic experiences of freshman and transfer students. At the same time, increasing OSU’s admission standards should increase graduation rates by improving students’ potential for academic success. In turn, these efforts will support the goals of Brain Gain 2010 by increasing the number of college degree holders in Oklahoma.

Each time the State Regents raise the expectations for student performance, students respond. Additionally, the NOC-OSU Gateway Program provides an excellent avenue for admission of students who would not otherwise be qualified. The OSU Board of Regents approved the proposed revisions at the March 5, 2004 meeting. It is recommended that the State Regents post OSU’s request to increase admission and retention standards as described above.

Attachments
B. High School Performance Criteria for Admission of First-Time-Entering Students

1. Comprehensive Universities
   University of Oklahoma (OU)
   Oklahoma State University (OSU)

Any individual who: (a) is a graduate of a high school accredited by the appropriate regional association or by an appropriate accrediting agency of his/her home state or has achieved a high school equivalency certificate based on the General Education Development tests (GED); (b) has met the curricular requirements as set forth in Part I.A of this policy; (c) has participated in the American College Testing program or a similar acceptable battery of tests; and (d) meets the following criteria by year for performance on standard tests or high school performance, is eligible for admission to either of the comprehensive universities in the State System.

---

3First-time-entering student: A student with six or fewer attempted credit hours, excluding remedial (0-level courses) or pre-college work and excluding credit hours accumulated by concurrently enrolled high school students.

4If there is an enrollment limit, Oklahoma residents will be given priority.

5GED recipient’s high school class must have graduated to be eligible for admission. The president or his/her designee may allow exceptions on an individual student basis. Any exceptions, including subsequent student academic performance, will be reported to the State Regents upon request.
### Performance-Based Admission Standards: Comprehensive Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Tests</th>
<th>ACT or SAT</th>
<th>Top 33.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Performance A</td>
<td>GPA<strong>6 (All Courses) and Class rank</strong>7</td>
<td>Top 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Performance B</td>
<td>GPA**8 in State Regents’ Required H.S. Core</td>
<td>Top 33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Oklahoma (OU) is authorized to assume higher standards as follows:

- Higher test score and class rank as approved by the State Regents in October 1998.
- An ACT minimum requirement on the High School Performance B option as approved by the State Regents in December 2000.
- Higher admission standards for nonresident students as approved by the State Regents in February 2001.
- Delineated automatic admission and space available admission for residents beginning summer 2003 as approved by the State Regents in June 2002.

Both OU and OSU have been authorized by the State Regents to set separate admission standards.

The exact standardized test scores and GPA will vary over time and differ at each comprehensive institution. The GPA will be defined annually to correspond to the rank in class. The ACT score equivalent to these percentages will be determined based on the average of the preceding three years' ACT scores of graduating seniors if available. Oklahoma test data will be used. The concordance table used to set the equivalent SAT score will be updated as necessary.

**The GPA will be defined annually to correspond to the rank in class.

---

6Grade-Point Average A: The grade-point average is the average of all grades ("A" equating to 4.00 and "D" equating to 1.00) taken in the 9th through 12 grades. While the State Regents strongly support the initiation of honors courses, honors weighting will not be used in the calculation of the GPA because there is no equitable mechanism to include the honors premium.

7Class Rank - The class rank is one more than the number of students in the high school graduating class who have a grade-point average greater than the student in question.

8Grade-Point Average B: The grade-point average is the average of all grades ("A" equating to 4.00 and "D" equating to 1.00) taken in the 9th through 12th grades. Institutions shall add a standard weighting (1.0) to The College Board’s Advanced Placement courses and the International Baccalaureate Organization’s higher-level courses (an “F” remains zero). While the State Regents strongly support the initiation of honors courses, honors weighting will not be used in the calculation of the GPA because there is no equitable mechanism to include the honors premium.
E. Admission by Transfer[^13]

1. Undergraduate Students Entering by Transfer From a State System Institution

An Oklahoma State System student who wishes to transfer to another State System institution may do so under the following conditions:

a. If the student originally met both the high school curricular requirements and academic performance standards of the institution to which the student wishes to transfer, the student must have a grade point average high enough to meet the institution's retention standards to which the student wishes to transfer; or as defined in Part II of this policy.

b. If the student originally met the high school curricular requirements but not the academic performance standards of the institution to which the student wishes to transfer, the student must have a grade point average high enough to meet the institution's retention standards to which the student wishes to transfer, based on at least 24 attempted semester credit hours of regularly graded (A, B, C, D, F) college work; or

c. If the student originally met the performance but not the curricular requirements of the institution to which the student wishes to transfer, the student must have a grade point average high enough to meet that institution's retention standards to which the student wishes to transfer as defined in Part II of this policy and must also complete the curricular requirements before transferring; or

d. If the student originally met neither the curricular nor the performance requirements of the institution to which the student wishes to transfer, the student must have a grade point average high enough to meet the institution's retention standards to which the student wishes to transfer, based on at least 24 attempted semester credit hours of regularly-graded (A, B, C, D, F) college work and must also complete the curricular requirements of the institution to which the student wishes to transfer before transferring.

[^13]: Transfer Student: Any undergraduate student with greater than six attempted credit hours, excluding remedial (0-level courses) or pre-college work and excluding credit hours accumulated by concurrently enrolled high school students.
* The University of Oklahoma was authorized to assume higher standards beginning fall 2002 and Oklahoma State University was authorized beginning fall 2005 to assume higher standards (minimum GPA requirements based on number of credit hours earned) for admission by transfer.
AGENDA ITEM #11:

Student Transfer.

SUBJECT: Acceptance of Course Equivalency Information.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept the system faculty’s 2004-05 course equivalency information.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents’ report to the 1996 Legislature, Facilitating Student Transfer: A Comprehensive Action Plan, presented a multifaceted plan to improve student transfer. Its four parts include: 1) creating working faculty transfer curriculum committees; 2) proposing the development of a systemwide electronic course transfer guide; 3) emphasizing academic advising; and 4) organizing an evaluation process to monitor transfer students’ success. In December 1997, the State Regents submitted a second progress report on student transfer issues to the Legislature. Its focus was the Course Equivalency Project—the implementation phase of the Comprehensive Action Plan.

The Course Equivalency Project (CEP) operates on an annual cycle. In late spring, the Council on Instruction (COI) determines which faculty committees meet in the fall; not all committees meet every year. Presidents annually nominate faculty to the selected curriculum committees during the summer. Each fall, up to 500 faculty representing the entire State System meet by discipline to update curricula and establish new course equivalencies. Faculty reports are completed in November. Courses can also be added to course equivalency disciplines that have no faculty meeting in the fall, but the additions are subject to faculty review on respective campuses before being entered into the course transfer matrices. Academic vice presidents update the course equivalency information twice each year in August and December. In December, the COI approves the faculty’s course equivalency reports. The State Regents accept it in early spring of each year. The equivalency information is then distributed to institutions in the spring. Concurrently, the State Regents’ web site is updated to include the latest equivalency information. The information is accessible electronically at http://www.okhighered.org/student-center/transfer-stdnts/course-transfer.shtml.

Course equivalency is defined as follows: Course "A" is equivalent to course "B" if and only if course "A" satisfies all program requirements that course "B" satisfies—serving exactly the same purpose with respect to content delivery, general education, or program degree requirements. Courses contained within a single equivalency group, or common grouping of courses (e.g., English Composition I), are guaranteed to transfer among institutions that sponsor courses in that group.
The following table illustrates the growing number of course equivalencies that faculty have established since fall 1995.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chart provides the totals for the current matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established Equivalencies (2004-05)</th>
<th>Total Number of Discipline Groups</th>
<th>Total Number of Course Equivalency Groups</th>
<th>Total Number of Courses</th>
<th>Approximate Total Semester Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>19,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three new disciplines—American Indian Studies, Film and Video Studies, and Geosciences—were added for 2004-2005. These additions resulted in over 1,000 new courses. Attached is a bar graph summarizing the performance of individual disciplines for the 2004-05 edition of the CEP.

**POLICY ISSUES:**

The State Regents' “Policy Statement on Undergraduate Degree Requirements and Articulation” provides standards for the articulation of course work between and among State System institutions. The CEP provides information that facilitates institutions' compliance with policy guidelines.

**ANALYSIS:**

From fall 1995 through fall 2003, dedicated faculty serving on Faculty Transfer Curriculum Committees consistently generated course equivalencies for this project. The faculty’s course equivalency reports represent the heart of the student transfer effort. The CEP reinforces student access to the three-tiered higher education system and helps shorten the time it takes students to obtain a degree. The CEP received the Governor’s Commendation Award in 1999 for demonstrating innovation and efficiency.

Other positive features of the CEP are listed below.

- It facilitates articulation of curriculum development as faculty design new courses to meet articulation guidelines and course content descriptions.
- A tracking system implemented in 1998-99 permits registrars to recognize the course changes, deletions, and additions made to the course equivalency matrices from year to year.
A course coding identification project allows State Regents’ staff to monitor students’ use of the courses contained in the CEP. This supports the evaluation component of the State Regents’ Comprehensive Action Plan mentioned above.

The State Regents maintain a student transfer hotline (800-583-5883) to help students with transfer problems within the State System.

Faculty members in disciplines meeting this fall were asked to begin discussion on ways to facilitate the transfer of blocks of courses within programs among institutions. Other initiatives related to the CEP include discussions regarding a similar matrix for transfer of two-year programs to the regional and comprehensive universities, and the development of a student web portal to facilitate student information on admission, transfer, and academic and career planning.

The 2004-05 faculty course equivalency information (matrices, course content descriptions, and narrative report) is provided as a supplement to this item. The COI approved the 2004-05 course equivalency information on March 11, 2004. It is recommended that the State Regents accept this edition of the CEP.

Attachment
SUMMARY OF FACULTY TRANSFER CURRICULUM COMMITTEES
2004-05

Total Courses Per Discipline With Established Equivalencies

- World Languages: 322
- Theatre: 269
- Statistics: 18
- Speech: 213
- Sociology: 247
- Religion: 36
- Psychology: 162
- Political Science: 122
- Physics: 139
- Physical Science: 61
- Philosophy: 68
- Music: 1049
- Mathematics: 180
- Marketing: 172
- Management: 78
- Journalism: 201
- Information Systems: 324
- Humanities: 171
- History: 385
- Geosciences: 34
- Geography: 83
- Finance: 49
- Film and Video Studies: 113
- English: 320
- Engineering: 48
- Economics: 58
- Criminal Justice: 154
- Computer Science: 176
- Chemistry: 174
- Business Law: 0
- Business Communications: 26
- Biology: 279
- Art: 403
- Anthropology: 63
- American Indian Studies: 164
- Accounting: 62

Note: The Business Law faculty group has met, but not established equivalency groups.
AGENDA ITEM # 12-a:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU). Approval of request to offer the Bachelor of Science in Park Law Enforcement.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve SWOSU’s request to offer the Bachelor of Science in Park Law Enforcement with the stipulation that continuation of the program beyond fall 2009 will depend upon meeting the criteria established by the institution and approved by the State Regents. Specifically, the program will enroll a minimum of 40 majors in fall 2008 and graduate a minimum of 12 students in 2008-09.

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

SWOSU’s Academic Plan lists the following institutional priorities:

- reorganize academic structure for overall operating efficiency and program efficacy;
- determine priorities for emphasis and expansion of high priority programs with consideration for program viability, as related to student interest; employment demand for graduates; and relation of programs to university mission;
- utilize budget-building model 2004-2005 to allow greater number of faculty in each curriculum area to create ways and means to meet requirements of program improvements and viability within budgetary limitations;
- determine incentives to encourage faculty initiatives for collaboration with business and industry, and civic organizations; and
- increase student enrollments in graduate programs and distance education.

APRA Implementation

Since 1991-92, SWOSU has added 15 degree programs and deleted 50 degree programs.

Program Review

SWOSU offers 59 degree programs (4 associate, 5 associate in applied science, 38 baccalaureate, 11 masters, and 1 first professional), all of which were reviewed in the past five years. All programs are scheduled for review during the next five-year cycle consistent with State Regents’ policy, with the exception of those programs receiving specialty accreditation. For programs receiving specialty accreditation, SWOSU aligns its program review schedule
with the accreditation cycles, so that programs are reviewed when faculty are preparing for an accreditation visit. Thus, if a professional program received a ten-year accreditation, it would not be reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents’ policy.

**Program Development Process**

SWOSU faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials and SWOSU’s governing board.

**POLICY ISSUES:**

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval.”

**ANALYSIS:**

*Bachelor of Science in Park Law Enforcement*

**Program purpose.** The proposed program will provide students knowledge and skills in the areas of park and natural resources law enforcement.

**Program rationale/background.** SWOSU indicates that in the post 9/11 environment, the United States government considers security of public areas a paramount concern. The National Park Service is responsible for many sites in the U.S. that attract thousands of visitors each year, including sites in Oklahoma. National park law enforcement and security is a developing field and SWOSU has current offerings that would complement the proposed program, fulfilling an unmet need in southwestern Oklahoma and the surrounding region.

**Employment opportunities.** Nationally, there are 148 park ranger position openings, and 497 general park position openings at the federal level, with several state park ranger positions open in the region surrounding Oklahoma. Within a 65-mile radius of SWOSU, there are two National Park Service units, one U.S. Forest Service unit, two U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service units, one U.S. Army Corp of Engineers unit, four Oklahoma State Parks, and two Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation units. These facilities provide employment opportunities for qualified workers with expertise the proposed program provides in park management, game and fish law, park law enforcement, and other relevant areas. SWOSU anticipates employment opportunities for graduates with these agencies, as well as with the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and municipal and county parks.

**Student demand.** The proposed program is expected to enroll a minimum of 40 majors in fall 2008 and graduate a minimum of 12 students in 2008-09.

**Duplication/Impact on existing programs.** Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU) offers a Bachelor of Science in Conservation Law Enforcement, but NWOSU’s program has a stronger focus on wildlife biology and criminal investigations than the proposed program, which focuses on park management and law enforcement. Due to differences between the programs and the distance between locations, approval will not constitute unnecessary duplication.
Curriculum. The proposed degree program consists of 120 total credit hours, including 43-44 credit hours of general education, 41-42 credit hours in the degree program core, 18-23 credit hours in the minor, and 11-18 credit hours in general electives. Attachment A details the proposed curriculum. Two new courses will be added to support the program, and are asterisked.

Faculty and staff. Existing SWOSU faculty will teach the proposed degree program, with adjunct faculty from appropriate agencies teaching the two new courses.

Support services. The libraries, facilities, and equipment are adequate.

Financing. No additional funds are requested.
### SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
**BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PARK LAW ENFORCEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education Requirements</strong></td>
<td>43-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Core Requirements</strong></td>
<td>41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 2102 Foundations of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3122 Wilderness First Aid</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3133 First Responder</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3161 Lifeguarding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3441 High Angle Rescue OR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3442 Advanced Ropes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3663 Recreation Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 3702 Recreational Areas and Facilities Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 4201 Special Topics in Park Law Enforcement: The Park Ranger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 4201 Special Topics in Park Law Enforcement: Custody and Control</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 4201 Special Topics in Park Law Enforcement: Game and Fish Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 4201 Special Topics in Park Law Enforcement: Firearm Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 4201 Special Topics in Park Law Enforcement: Small Craft Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPE 4063 Legal Aspects of Physical Education, Recreation, and Athletics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 4663 Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM 4773 Natural Resource Recreation Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PRM 4997 &amp;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PRM 4996 Internship in Professional Park Law Enforcement (520 hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guided Program Electives (minor)</strong></td>
<td>18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Electives</strong></td>
<td>11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates new courses.
AGENDA ITEM # 12-b:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: Rogers State University (RSU). Approval of request to offer the Bachelor of Arts in Communications and the Bachelor of Science in Justice Administration.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve RSU’s request to offer the Bachelor of Arts in Communications and the Bachelor of Science in Justice Administration with the stipulation that continuation of the programs beyond fall 2009 will depend upon meeting the criteria established by the institution and approved by the State Regents, as detailed below.

Criteria:

- **Bachelor of Arts in Communications**
  Continuation beyond fall 2009 will depend upon:
  - Majors enrolled: a minimum of 14 students in fall 2008
  - Graduates: a minimum of 5 students in 2008-09

- **Bachelor of Science in Justice Administration**
  Continuation beyond fall 2009 will depend upon:
  - Majors enrolled: a minimum of 14 students in fall 2008
  - Graduates: a minimum of 6 students in 2008-09

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

RSU’s Academic Plan includes a condensed version of the strategic plan, which is comprised of five major strategic commitments, goals, and action plan/implementation timing.

- **Strategy – Commitment to Academic Innovation and Integrity**; goals: operate on basis of strong institutional effectiveness process; provide traditional and innovative learning opportunities.
- **Strategy – Commitment to Supportive Student Services**; goals: provide academically supportive student services; increase enrollments to optimal levels; increase retention and graduation rates.
- **Strategy – Commitment to Planning and Effective Use of Resources**; goals: build and institutionalize planning process; operate within established, stable organizational structure; create supportive working environment; strengthen financial stability; develop prioritized master plan.
- **Strategy – Commitment to Effective Use of Technology**; goals: provide campus incorporation of technology; continue developing library facility and library resources to meet university-level standards and practices.
- **Strategy – Commitment to Community Outreach**; goals: integrate with communities served.
APRA Implementation

Since 1991-92, RSU has deleted 63 degree and/or certificate programs while adding 17 degree and/or certificate programs.

Program Review

RSU offers 31 degree and certificate programs (6 baccalaureate, 15 associate, 8 associate in applied science, and 2 certificate programs), all of which were reviewed in the past five years with the exception of those programs receiving specialty accreditation. For programs receiving specialty accreditation, RSU aligns its program review schedule with the accreditation cycles, so that programs are reviewed when faculty are preparing for an accreditation visit. Thus, if a professional program received a ten-year accreditation, it would not be reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents’ policy.

Program Development Process

RSU faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials and RSU’s governing board.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval.”

ANALYSIS:

Background. In spring 1998, Senate Bill 1426 restructured higher education services in Tulsa and provided for a regional university in Claremore to be named Rogers State University. In fall 1998, the State Regents approved RSU’s regional university function. The new mission for RSU is to prepare students to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities. A key component of the university mission is to provide associate and baccalaureate degrees, and offer educational opportunities for traditional and non-traditional students. RSU continues to offer associate degree programs, and in fall 2000 implemented four new baccalaureate programs: Applied Technology, Business Information Technology, Social Science, and Liberal Arts. In August 2000, RSU attained baccalaureate-level accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, and in May 2001, the State Regents approved RSU’s request to offer a fifth baccalaureate degree, the Bachelor of Science in Biology, followed by approval of RSU’s request in November 2001 for the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration. This brings RSU’s baccalaureate offerings up to a total of six programs. To date, all of the baccalaureate offerings have good productivity, showing gradual growth in all programs.

Bachelor of Arts in Communications

Program purpose. The proposed program is designed to prepare students for careers in communications by fostering an understanding of communications theory, research methodology, and the use of modern communications technology. Options in Radio-Television and Corporate Communications will prepare students for careers in broadcast or print media, marketing, advertising, public relations, sales, or promotions. The program will build on the Associate in Arts in Radio/Television currently in place at RSU with the only Federal Communication Commission licensed television and radio broadcast station on a campus in northeastern Oklahoma. State Regents’ approval of this program is required before approval will be given by the North Central Association’s Higher Learning Commission. If the required approvals are received, the program will be implemented in fall 2004.
Employment opportunities. According to the U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Outlook Handbook, employment in radio and television broadcasting is expected to continually increase with the expansion of television and cable stations. Regionally, there are over 50 television stations, and over 230 radio stations in the four-state region of Oklahoma, southeast Kansas, southwest Missouri, and northwest Arkansas. In Oklahoma, there are 25 television stations and 176 radio stations with positions such as program directors, reporters, newscasters, technical directors, media sales, media buyers, advertising specialists, public information officers, and others. RSU anticipates many employment opportunities for graduates of the proposed program.

Student demand. The proposed program is expected to enroll 14 majors in fall 2008 and graduate 5 students in 2008-09.

Duplication/Impact on existing programs. University of Oklahoma, Cameron University, Northeastern State University, Southeastern Oklahoma State University, Southwestern Oklahoma State University, the University of Central Oklahoma, and the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma offer similar programs. However, given the distance between locations, approval of this program will not constitute unnecessary duplication.

Curriculum. The proposed degree program of 124 credit hours consists of 45 credit hours of general education requirements, 24 credit hours in degree program core requirements, 24 credit hours in either the radio-television or corporate communications option courses, 18-24 credit hours in the selected minor, and 7-13 credit hours of general electives. Twelve new courses are approved with this degree program. Attachment A lists the courses under the particular curricular components, and new courses are asterisked.

Faculty and staff. Six existing faculty members within the Department of Communication and Fine Arts will teach the proposed program. RSU indicates it has received funding to hire an endowed chair of communications.

Support services. Facilities, library resources, and equipment are adequate.

Financing. No additional funding is requested for this program.

Bachelor of Science in Justice Administration

Program purpose. The proposed program is designed to prepare students for careers in legal and criminal justice systems with an understanding of criminal and legal theory and research methodology. Students will acquire the skills and knowledge to function in law enforcement agencies, government regulatory agencies, correction facilities, or corporate security departments. The program will build on the Associate in Arts in Law/Justice Careers currently in place at RSU. State Regents’ approval of this program is required before approval will be given by the North Central Association’s Higher Learning Commission. If the required approvals are received, the program will be implemented in fall 2004.

Employment opportunities. According to the U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Outlook Handbook, employment in justice administration, probation officers, police and detectives, private detectives and investigators is expected to increase at a rate significantly higher than average, with increases of 21 to 35 percent expected. Regionally, there are positions in law enforcement, probation and parole officers, court services, correctional services, and human and social agencies, with anticipated positions at higher than entry level positions, including managerial roles.
**Student demand.** The proposed program is expected to enroll 14 majors in fall 2008 and graduate 6 students in 2008-09.

**Duplication/Impact on existing programs.** Cameron University, East Central University, Langston University, Northeastern State University, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Southeastern Oklahoma State University, Southwestern Oklahoma State University, and the University of Central Oklahoma offer similar programs; however, RSU indicates its proposed program differs from existing programs with its emphasis on management, administration, and public policy processes. Given the differences in the programs and the distance between locations, approval of this program will not constitute unnecessary duplication.

**Curriculum.** The proposed degree program of 124 credit hours consists of 45 credit hours of general education requirements, 51 credit hours in degree program core requirements, 18 to 25 credit hours in the area of emphasis, and 4 to 10 credit hours in general electives. One option in law enforcement will be added with the proposed program approval. Six new courses are approved with this degree program. Attachment B lists the courses under the particular curricular components, and new courses are asterisked.

**Faculty and staff.** Seven existing RSU faculty members will teach the proposed program.

**Support services.** Facilities, library resources, and equipment are adequate.

**Financing.** No additional funding is requested for this program.

Attachments
General Education Requirements: (45 credit hours)
The College Experience
   ORIE 1151 _____________ 1

Communications (9 hours)
   Composition I       ENGL 1113 _____________ 3
   Composition II      ENGL 1213 _____________ 3
   Speech Communication SPCH 1113 _____________ 3

Social and Behavioral Sciences
   History
      3
   Choose from the following:
      American History to 1877     HIST 2483
      American History since 1877   HIST 2493
      American Federal Government   POLS 1113 _____________ 3

Choose from the following:
   Introduction to Psychology   PSY 1113
   Introduction to Sociology    SOC 1113
   Principles of Economics I    ECON 2113

Science and Mathematics (11 hours)
   Physical Science
      4
   Choose from the following:
      General Physical Science    PHYS 1014
      Earth Science               GEOL 1014
      General Physics I           PHYS 1114
      Physical Geology            GEOL 1114
      Physical Geography          GEOL 1124
      Historical Geology          GEOL 1224
      General Chemistry I         CHEM 1315

  Biological Science 4
   Choose from the following:
      General Biology            BIOL 1114
      General Cellular Biology    BIOL 1144
      General Environmental Biology BIOL 1134

  Mathematics 3-5
   Choose from the following:
      Mathematics for Critical Thinking MATH 1503
      College Algebra              MATH 1513
      Trigonometry                 MATH 1613
      Pre-Calculus                 MATH 1715
      Analytical Geometry & Calculus I MATH 2264

Humanities 6
   Choose two from the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Literature</td>
<td>ENGL 2613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Appreciation</td>
<td>ART (HUM) 1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities I</td>
<td>HUM 2113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities II</td>
<td>HUM 2223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Appreciation</td>
<td>MUSC (HUM) 2573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>HUM 2893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcomputer Applications</td>
<td>CS 1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose from the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of World Languages</td>
<td>LANG 1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Spanish I</td>
<td>SPAN 1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans of North America</td>
<td>NAMS 1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Ethics</td>
<td>PHIL 1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Civilization I</td>
<td>HIST 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Civilization II</td>
<td>HIST 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Geography</td>
<td>GEOG 2243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee I</td>
<td>NAMS 2503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Religions</td>
<td>HUM 3633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>POLS 3053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education Electives</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Core Requirements: (24 credit hours)**

**Common Core** 

COMM 1003 Introduction to Mass Communication  
COMM 1103 Broadcast Equipment and Operation  
COMM 3023 Writing for the Media  
COMM 3413 Media Law  
*COMM 3833 Communications Theory  
SBS 3013 Research Methods I: Research Designs  
COMM 4163 Global Communication  
*COMM 4913 Senior Capstone

**Program Option Requirements (24 credit hours)**

1) Radio-Television Option 

Required Courses (12 hrs):  
COMM 2003 Video Production  
COMM 2013 Audio Production  
COMM 2703 Radio-Television Announcing  
COMM 3173 News Reporting

Radio-Television Electives (12):  
COMM 1713 Voice and Articulation  
COMM 3613 Mass Media Communication  
*COMM 3750 Advanced Broadcast Practicum  
*COMM 3853 Sports Broadcasting
*COMM 4203 Media Management
*COMM 4253 Broadcast Internship
*COMM 4323 Women and Minorities In Media
*COMM 4453 Radio and Television Programming

2) Corporate Communications Option ______________________________ 24 Credit Hours

Required Core Courses (12 hours): _________________________________ 12
COMM 2723 Small Group Communication
*COMM 3113 Public Relation Strategies
*COMM 4223 Communication in Organizations
HUM 4003 Multi-Media Communications

Corporate Communications Electives (12 hours): ______________________ 12
COMM 3253 Argumentation and Persuasion
*COMM 3803 Corporate Television
BADM 3913 Communication Skills for Managers and Professionals
*COMM 4283 Corporate Communication Internship
MGMT 3013 Principles of Management
MKTG 3113 Principles of Marketing
BADM 3323 Legal Environment of Business
POLS 4043 Media and Politics
SBS 3023 Research Methods II: Analysis and Application

Minor Hours ________________________________________________ 18-24 Credit Hours

Electives ________________________________________________ 7-13 Credit Hours

Total number of credit hours required for degree: __________________________ 124
* - indicates new courses.
ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION

General Education Requirements: (45 credit hours)
The College Experience

Communications (9 hours)
Composition I
Composition II
Speech Communication

Social and Behavioral Sciences
History

Choose from the following:
American History to 1877
American History since 1877
American Federal Government

Social Science

Choose from the following:
Introduction to Psychology
Introduction to Sociology
Principles of Macroeconomics

Science and Mathematics (11 hours)
Physical Science

Choose from the following:
General Physical Science
Earth Science
General Physics I
Physical Geology
Physical Geography
Historical Geology
General Chemistry I

Biological Science

Choose from the following:
General Biology
General Cellular Biology
General Environmental Biology

Mathematics

Choose from the following:
Mathematics for Critical Thinking
College Algebra
Trigonometry
Analytical Geometry & Calculus I

Humanities

Choose two from the following:
Introduction to Philosophy
Introduction to Literature
Art Appreciation  ART (HUM) 1113
Humanities I  HUM 2113
Humanities II  HUM 2223
Music Appreciation  MUSC (HUM) 2573
Cinema  HUM 2893

Technology
Microcomputer Applications  CS 1113  3

Global Studies
Choose from the following:
- Foundations of World Languages  LANG 1113
- Beginning Spanish I  SPAN 1113
- Native Americans of North America  NAMS 1143
- Values and Ethics  PHIL 1313
- World Civilization I  HIST 2013
- World Civilization II  HIST 2023
- Human Geography  GEOG 2243
- Cherokee I  NAMS 2503
- Comparative Religions  HUM 2633
- International Relations  POLS 3053  3

General Education Electives  3

Total Number of Program Hours Required (51 credit hours)

Program Core Requirements (39 credit hours):
- CJ 1113  Introduction to Criminal Justice
- CJ 2013  Criminal Law I
- CJ 1213  Introduction to Corrections
- CJ 2343  Community Relations
- CJ 3013  Criminal Procedures
- SOC 3043  Social Ethics
- SOC 3073  Criminology
- SBS 3013  Research Methods I
- SBS 3023  Research Methods II
- POLS 3023  Introduction to Public Administration
- *POLS 3113  American Court System
- *JA 4113  Criminal Justice Administration
- *JA 4513  Crime & Public Policy (Capstone)

Guided Electives (Choose 12 credit hours from the following):
- *POLS 3063  Constitutional Law
- POLS 4043  The Media and Politics
- *JA 3123  Current Issues in Justice Administration
- SOC 3023  Juvenile Delinquency
- TECH 3013  Leadership and Decision Making Skills
- PHIL 3213  Philosophy of Law
- CJ 3024  Communications for Justice Professionals

Students are required to earn a “C” or better in all major courses.
Selected emphasis course of study ______________________________ 18-25 credit hours

Free Electives: ______________________________ 4-10 credit hours

Total number of credit hours required for degree: ______________________________ 124
* - indicates new courses.

Law Enforcement Emphasis

Law Enforcement Emphasis (25 hours):
HLSC 1813 First Aid
CJ 2023 Criminal Law II
CJ 2123 Criminalistics
CJ 2523 Interrogation Seminar
CJ 2533 Patrol Techniques Seminar
CJ 2553 Traffic Administration & Investigation
CJ 2543 Investigation Techniques Seminar
CJ 3024 Communications for Justice Professionals
AGENDA ITEM # 12-c:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: Cameron University (CU). Approval of request to offer the Master of Science in Educational Leadership, including electronic delivery.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve CU’s request to offer the Master of Science in Educational Leadership, via traditional and electronic delivery, with the stipulation that continuation of the program and the electronic offering beyond fall 2008 will depend upon meeting the criteria established by the institution and approved by the State Regents. Specifically, the program will enroll a minimum of 45 majors in fall 2007 and will graduate a minimum of 24 students in 2007-08.

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

CU’s Academic Plan lists the following institutional priorities:
- focus institutional resources to lead southwest Oklahoma in achieving Brain Gain 2010 goals;
- key elements of effort - delivery of highest quality collegiate programs and student-centered service;
- maximize student learning;
- excellent teaching;
- economic development of southwest Oklahoma;
- expand student services; and
- continue to improve and enhance technology.

APRA Implementation

Since 1991-92, CU has added 9 degree programs and deleted 2 degree programs.

Program Review

CU offers 43 degree programs (2 associate, 9 associate in applied science, 28 baccalaureate and 4 masters), all of which were reviewed in the past five years with the exception of those programs receiving specialty accreditation. For programs receiving specialty accreditation, CU aligns its program review schedule with the accreditation cycles, so that programs are reviewed when faculty are preparing for an accreditation visit. Thus, if a professional program received a ten-year accreditation, it would not be reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents’ policy.

Program Development Process

CU faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials and CU’s governing board.
POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval” and “Policies and Procedures Pertaining to the Delivery of Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs.” The Electronic Media Policy calls for a two-step approval process. Evidence of specified quality criteria must be provided at the time of the initial request, with provisional approval granted if the criteria are addressed satisfactorily. Following provisional approval, the institution must conduct a “best practice” review that provides quantitative and qualitative analysis of the electronic media offerings through a rigorous review of exemplary programs from other institutions. Final approval will depend on the results of this review.

Consistent with revisions to the Electronic Media Policy approved at the State Regents’ May 30, 2003 meeting, once an institution has successfully completed a best practice review process and received final approval of an electronic delivery program, separate reviews will not be required to offer additional existing programs via electronic media.

ANALYSIS:

Master of Science in Educational Leadership

Program purpose. The proposed program will prepare students with leadership skills to meet the challenges faced by school administrators, specifically addressing leadership, assessment and supervision of personnel and programs, as well as financial and resource management in school settings.

Program rationale/background. There are 65 school districts in CU’s service area of Caddo, Comanche, Cotton, Grady, Greer, Harmon, Jackson, Jefferson, Kiowa, Stephens, and Tillman counties, employing 3,671 teachers and 335 administrators. The closest school administration graduate degree programs are over 80 miles away from Lawton and relatively inaccessible to the southwestern Oklahoma nontraditional student population. CU is responding to local interest and has the resources to implement this program for its service area to meet current needs.

Employment opportunities. This program prepares students for careers in school administration. The American Association of School Administrators reports that 33 percent of school administrators have less than five years experience. Some cite a higher rate of young administrators in Oklahoma at approximately 40 percent of administrators with less than five years of experience. Due to an increasingly mobile society, as well as the stress level of the job, opportunities for employment in school administration continue to grow. Graduates of the proposed program would be expected to fill school administration needs in southwestern Oklahoma, specifically in CU’s service area.

Student demand. The proposed program is expected to enroll a minimum of 45 majors in fall 2007 and graduate a minimum of 24 students in 2007-08.

Duplication/Impact on existing programs. The University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, East Central University, Northeastern State University, Southeastern Oklahoma State University, and Southwestern Oklahoma State University all offer school administration graduate programs. However, due to the local demand and the distance between locations, approval will not constitute unnecessary duplication.

Curriculum. The proposed degree program consists of 33-36 total credit hours from the following areas (Attachment A): English usage proficiency (0-3 credit hours); educational leadership (18 credit hours); educational management (9 credit hours); and internship (6 credit hours). Nine new courses will be added and are indicated by asterisks.
Faculty and staff. Existing full-time CU faculty in the Department of Education and the School of Business will teach the courses in this program. A Graduate Coordinator that will hold the McCasland Endowed Chair position will be appointed following a national search.

Support services. The library, facilities, and equipment are adequate.

Financing. No new funds are requested. Funding from the McCasland Endowment will be used to support the program.

Electronic delivery. The proposed program will be delivered using electronic media. Specifically, program offerings will be made available via interactive video (ITV) using OneNet to select locations within southwest Oklahoma. CU plans indicate initial offerings in Duncan and Altus.

In December 2003, CU submitted a “best practices” review in support of final authorization to offer the Associate in Science in Interdisciplinary Studies and Associate in Applied Science in Applied Technology via electronic media. CU’s best practice review was accepted by the State Regents at the February 13, 2004 meeting. Accordingly, consistent with the revised Electronic Media Policy, CU is authorized to offer additional existing programs via electronic media without repeating the best practice review process. However, because the Master of Science in Educational Leadership is a new degree program, continuation of the program including electronic delivery beyond fall 2008 will be contingent upon the program meeting the productivity criteria established by CU and approved by the State Regents, as outlined above.

Attachment
CAMERON UNIVERSITY  
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Usage Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 5003 Usage and Composition for Graduate Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Students may demonstrate proficiency on a standard English Usage and Composition test to waive this requirement.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Leadership</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 5103 Introduction to Graduate Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDUC 5203 Fundamentals of Public School Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDUC 5213 School Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDUC 5223 Assessment of Personnel and Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDUC 5233 Supervision of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDUC 5243 Community and School Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Management</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*BUS 5253 Legal &amp; Ethical Aspects of School Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*BUS 5263 Public School Finance &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*BUS 5273 Resource Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internship</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDUC 5281-6 Internship in School Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>33-36 Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates new courses for this program.
AGENDA ITEM # 12-d:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: Tulsa Community College (TCC). Approval of request to offer the Associate in Science in Health and Human Performance, including electronic delivery.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve TCC’s request to offer the Associate in Science in Health and Human Performance with the stipulation that continuation of the program beyond fall 2008 will depend upon meeting the criteria established by the institution and approved by the State Regents. Specifically, the program will enroll a minimum of 30 majors in fall 2007 and will graduate a minimum of 8 students in 2007-08. Continuation of electronic delivery authorization beyond fall 2005 will depend upon the successful completion of a “best practices” review prior to August 1, 2005.

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

TCC’s Academic Plan lists the following institutional priorities:

• increase graduation rate by 10 percent;
• attain four percent increase in full-time equivalent students;
• become national leader in seamless articulation with other institutions; and
• improve student support for online and other types of distance learning.

APRA Implementation

Since 1991-92, TCC has added 53 degree and/or certificate programs and deleted 59 degree and/or certificate programs.

Program Review

TCC offers 101 degree and certificate programs (24 associate, 45 associate in applied science, and 32 certificates), all of which were reviewed in the past five years with the exception of those programs receiving specialty accreditation. For programs receiving specialty accreditation, TCC aligns its program review schedule with the accreditation cycles, so that programs are reviewed when faculty are preparing for an accreditation visit. Thus, if a professional program received a ten-year accreditation, it would not be reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents’ policy.

Program Development Process

TCC faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials and TCC’s governing board.
POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval” and “Policies and Procedures Pertaining to the Delivery of Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs.” The Electronic Media Policy calls for a two-step approval process. Evidence of specified quality criteria must be provided at the time of the initial request, with provisional approval granted if the criteria are addressed satisfactorily. Following provisional approval, the institution must conduct a “best practice” review that provides quantitative and qualitative analysis of the electronic media offerings through a rigorous review of exemplary programs from other institutions. Final approval will depend on the results of this review.

Consistent with revisions to the Electronic Media Policy approved at the State Regents’ May 30, 2003 meeting, once an institution has successfully completed a best practice review process and received final approval of an electronic delivery program, separate reviews will not be required to offer additional existing programs via electronic media.

ANALYSIS:

Associate in Science in Health and Human Performance

Program purpose. The proposed program will provide students with knowledge in current health promotion theories, practices, and skills and prepare students to successfully complete the national certification exam through the American Council on Exercise. The program will also prepare students for a seamless transfer into the baccalaureate program offered at Oklahoma State University (OSU) in the same field.

Program rationale/background. OSU has seen a significant growth in enrollments in the health and human performance degree program from 2001 to 2003. In an effort to more efficiently serve students, OSU and TCC will form an articulation agreement for this program once approved to expand the offerings for the first two years of the program in the Tulsa area with a seamless transfer process to OSU for the final two years of the program. Also, in the Tulsa area, TCC recognized a need to assist the health industry in attracting and retaining qualified employees, as well as providing a career track in the health industry. The proposed program will serve to meet these needs in the Tulsa community.

Employment opportunities. This program prepares students for health promotion careers in a variety of settings including corporate, hospital-based, community, government, and independently-owned enterprises. Graduates of the proposed program would be qualified for employment in home health care, outreach health programs, crisis centers, health education, fitness centers, and in occupations such as personal trainers and fitness equipment sales, as well as other areas. Students may also seamlessly transfer to OSU’s baccalaureate program to further expand employment opportunities upon completion.

Student demand. The proposed program is expected to enroll 30 majors in fall 2007 and graduate 8 students in 2007-08.

Duplication/Impact on existing programs. Redlands Community College has an athletic trainer program at the associate level that is similar to this program; however, due to the differences in the programs and the distance between locations, approval will not constitute unnecessary duplication.

Curriculum. The proposed degree program consists of 60-63 total credit hours from the following areas (Attachment A): general education (37-40 credit hours) and program core (23 credit hours) with one OSU Transfer option. No new courses will be added.
Faculty and staff. Existing full-time and adjunct TCC faculty will teach the courses in this program.

Support services. The library, facilities, and equipment are adequate.

Financing. No new funds are required.

Electronic delivery authorization. TCC’s request addresses satisfactorily the criteria listed in the Electronic Media Policy. These criteria include faculty qualifications and training, student services, adequacy of resources, and funding. As outlined in the Electronic Media Policy, TCC will undergo a rigorous “best practice” review during the first two years of the program’s online offering. Continuation of the electronic delivery beyond fall 2005 will depend on the results of the review.

Attachment
**TULSA COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
**ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE IN HEALTH AND HUMAN PROMOTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education Requirements</strong></td>
<td>37-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Electives – 0-3 credit hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 1203 Computer Concepts and Applications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialized Course Requirements</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences Total Hours</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 1113 Introduction to Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 1113 Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science Core Total Hours</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 1383 Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 2212 First Aid</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 2263 Principles of Health Education and Human Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 2623 Fitness Assessment and Programming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 2653 Applied Anatomy and Kinesiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 1113 Personal, School, and Community Health OR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 2603 Total Wellness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Required for Degree</strong></td>
<td>60-63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For OSU Transfer Option:

| **General Education**                                      | 37           |
| **Specialized Course Requirements**                        | 23           |
| Exercise Science Core Total Hours                          | 17           |
| BIO 1383 Nutrition                                        | 3            |
| PE 2212 First Aid                                         | 2            |
| PE 2603 Total Wellness                                    | 3            |
| PE 2263 Principles of Health Education and Human Promotion| 3            |
| PE 2623 Fitness Assessment and Programming                | 3            |
| PE 2653 Applied Anatomy and Kinesiology                   | 3            |
| **Total Required for Degree with OSU Transfer Option**     | 60           |
AGENDA ITEM # 13:

Program Deletion.

SUBJECT: Approval of institutional request.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the institutional request for a program deletion, as listed below.

BACKGROUND:

University of Oklahoma (OU) requests authorization to delete the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art History (014).

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval” and “Policy Statement on Program Review.”

ANALYSIS:

OU requests deletion of the Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) in Art History (014). OU indicates the program is no longer necessary as students in the studio arts program can receive a minor in art history and students enrolled in the art history program can take studio courses as elective credit. Also, this program does not meet the National Association for Schools of Art and Design guidelines. Ten students remain in the program and will be advised into either a Bachelor of Arts in Art History or a BFA in Art with a minor in Art History. No funds will be available for reallocation.
AGENDA ITEM # 14:

Electronic Media.

SUBJECT: University of Oklahoma (OU). Acceptance of “best practices” review and approval of request for continuing authorization to offer degree programs via electronic delivery.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept the “best practices” review and grant continuing approval to OU to offer the Bachelor of Liberal Studies and Master of Liberal Studies via electronic media.

BACKGROUND:

At the September 13, 2002 meeting, the State Regents granted provisional approval to OU to offer the Bachelor of Liberal Studies and Master of Liberal Studies via electronic media. Continuing approval of the electronic offerings was contingent upon OU completing a “best practices” review prior to January 1, 2004. The report was received February 12, 2004.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policies and Procedures Pertaining to the Delivery of Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs,” which requires institutions to complete a “best practices” review for programs delivered via electronic media in order to receive final approval. Consistent with revisions approved at the State Regents’ May 30, 2003 meeting, once an institution has successfully completed a best practice review and received final approval of an electronic delivery program, additional existing programs may be considered for electronic delivery without completing the “best practices” process.

ANALYSIS:

The best practice review for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies and Master of Liberal Studies included a comprehensive study of qualitative and quantitative benchmark data from a number of best practice institutions from across the nation, including Excelsior College, the University of Texas, the University of Maryland University College, the University of Nebraska, and the University of Colorado at Denver. The analysis was organized around the Western Commission on Higher Education’s (WICHE) Best Practices for Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs and the benchmarks established by the Institute for Higher Education Policy. The review also included background and history of the two programs, recognition of the faculty and staff associated with them, an extensive literature review of
distance education policies and practices, and findings and recommendations based on the study results.

The first online courses offered in fall 1999 were based on the independent study curriculum, and were provided as an Internet-Guided Independent Study Option. With State Regents’ approval in 2002, the two programs were developed as fully online programs, with initial offerings in fall 2003 entitled the 100% Online Option.

The review findings and recommendations included the following:

- Course content is a strength of the programs, and courses are consistent and uniform. Subject matter experts, faculty, and instructional design staff are closely involved in course development.
- Methods of interaction between students and faculty are well-organized and integrated with registration systems and course management software.
- Faculty orientation and training could be improved.
- Student orientation and support could also be improved.

An implementation plan was developed based on the findings. While the review’s overall findings have been very positive and the programs are sound, the institution is committed to continuous improvements.

Based on staff analysis of the “best practices” review report, these programs meet the criteria for continuing approval as outlined in the State Regents’ Electronic Media Policy. Continued authorization of the electronic offerings is recommended.
AGENDA ITEM #15:

Teacher Education.

SUBJECT: Program evaluation: Oklahoma Teacher Enhancement Program (OTEP) Title II Grant

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is presented for State Regents’ information.

BACKGROUND:

Authorized in October 1998 under the Higher Education Act, the United State Department of Education’s (USDE) Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant program is designed to improve student achievement by implementing comprehensive approaches to improving teacher quality. The State Grant program promotes innovative reforms that meet the mandates of “No Child Left Behind,” which holds institutions of higher education with teacher preparation programs accountable for preparing teachers who are highly competent in the academic content area and who have strong teaching skills that impact student learning. In August 2000, the USDE awarded a higher education Title II grant in the amount of $787,073 for the State Regents’ OTEP proposal; funds were made available in January 2001. First year funding was $107,274. Added to this amount was a supplemental fund award of $181,405. Second year funds were awarded in the amount of $374,275. In the third and final year, grant funds awarded were $371,461. Total funds awarded to the State Regents’ OTEP by the USDE are $1,034,415.

By way of reminder, the purpose of OTEP is to create and implement evaluation methods to assess the impact of teacher preparation programs on K-12 student learning. Specifically, OTEP grant funds have been used to create a systematic method of monitoring classroom experiences of participating Resident Year teachers (RYT). The project has included the following initiatives.

- Implementation of the Educational Testing Services’ “Pathwise Induction Program,” an assessment system to evaluate the pedagogical impact of RYT on K-12 student progress. The Resident Year Committee (RYC), which includes a school administrator, a higher education faculty member, and a mentor teacher, used Pathwise to assess the effectiveness of RYT.

- Implementation of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), an in-class assessment system, to be used by RYT to evaluate student learning on a unit-by-unit basis.
• Evaluation of the higher education teacher preparation program by RYT program graduates through a portfolio process.

OTEP has received national recognition from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

POLICY ISSUES:

The activities of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant are consistent with the State Regents’ teacher education reform efforts.

ANALYSIS:

The Oklahoma Teacher Enhancement Program: Effectiveness of the Training Model evaluation report was prepared by Kathleen McKean, Ph.D. of the Oklahoma Technical Assistance Center. The full report is available upon request as a supplement to this agenda item. The key findings of the report are described below.

KEY FINDINGS

The research hypothesis upon which the OTEP program was based was supported. Two assessment instruments, the Teacher Work Sample and Pathwise, contributed unique information and appeared to measure different aspects of teaching that impact student learning. Both instruments demonstrated relationship to student learning, as measured by the unit pre-post scores.

Effect on student achievement

An analysis was conducted to determine whether student achievement was related to teacher quality as measured by the instruments used as a part of OTEP, the Pathwise assessment, and the Teacher Work Sample. Statistical analyses using the 2001-02 data suggested that students whose teachers scored higher on Pathwise and TWS demonstrated greater gains in classroom achievement. A replication study, using 2002-03 data, resulted in statistically significant findings.

This Title II grant project met its goals and objectives despite a number of obstacles. The project met its goal of developing a set of instruments to provide a comprehensive evaluation of beginning teachers. Pathwise and the Oklahoma TWS contributed different information about teacher effectiveness. An analysis of principal components demonstrated that the instruments complemented each other and were not redundant. In addition, both instruments have a demonstrated relationship to student learning, as measured by the unit pre-post scores. Participants’ mean scores on these instruments showed them to be proficient teachers by the end of their induction experience.

Synthesis of Pathwise and Teacher Work Sample Data

Table 1 summarizes basic descriptive information from the Pathwise and TWS instruments. The mean rating on the Pathwise observation forms was at the top of the Basic range on the fall assessment and in the Proficient range on the spring assessment. The Teacher Work
Samples, all conducted during the spring semesters, were at the top of the Proficient range in 2001-02 and at the bottom of the Distinguished range in 2002-03.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathwise Form B, Fall</strong></td>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>46.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathwise Form B, Spring</strong></td>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>48.70</td>
<td>48.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Work Sample</strong></td>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>70.89</td>
<td>75.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A factor analysis was conducted to determine: (1) whether the instruments measured separate constructs; and (2) the degree to which scores on the instruments were related to student achievement gains, as hypothesized in the grant proposal. The results, although based on a relatively small sample size, revealed three unambiguous factors that could clearly be defined as: (1) a Teacher Work Sample factor; (2) a Pathwise factor; and (3) a student gain factor.
AGENDA ITEM #16:

Eastern Oklahoma State College.

SUBJECT: Compliance Review

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept the Compliance Plan from Eastern Oklahoma State College (EOSC) regarding the agreement with Move on Toward Education and Training (MOTET).

BACKGROUND:

Responding to concerns from several sources about an agreement between Eastern Oklahoma State College (EOSC) and a Florida enterprise, Move on Toward Education and Training (MOTET), a Compliance Review was authorized by Chancellor Risser. The concerns triggering the Compliance Review involved the awarding of academic credit and issuance of transcripts for courses taught outside of the state by faculty not employed by EOSC. The State Regents accepted the Compliance Review and recommendations at the February 13, 2004 meeting. In summary, it was determined that inappropriate academic transcripts were issued by EOSC, the activities involving MOTET violated multiple State Regents’ policies, and that EOSC faculty had no involvement in the enterprise and therefore academic credit could not be awarded for the offerings.

The Compliance Review recommendations required EOSC to submit a Compliance Plan on or before March 1, 2004, and that the plan contain the following: 1) the process for student notification that transcripts received cannot be used for academic credit and a means for the State Regents’ office to verify notification; 2) the process for student refunds of fees collected by EOSC; and 3) a plan for revising institutional policies and procedures to ensure agreements and contracts, continuing education offerings, marketing efforts, and transcripting practices comply with policies and standards of the State Regents, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (HLC/NCA), and the EOSC Board of Regents (EOSC-BOR). The report also recommended that if EOSC’s compliance plan is determined to be inadequate, the institution’s allocation for the 2004-05 fiscal year could be reduced proportionate to any financial or other advantage obtained by the institution. The Compliance Review called also for the Chancellor to notify all institutions listed on transcript requests that EOSC transcripts related to MOTET only are not academic transcripts. Additionally, the Chancellor was asked to send a copy of the Compliance Review to the appropriate officials within the Florida State Department of Education, school districts where MOTET operated, to each member of the EOSC Board of Regents, and to the HLC/NCA.
POLICY ISSUES:

The EOSC/MOTET agreement violated the following State Regents’ policies: Policy on Functions of Public Institutions, Policies and Procedures Pertaining to the Delivery of Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs, Standards Regarding Academic Calendars of Institutions and Undergraduate Academic Workload Standards in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, and Policy and Procedures Relating to Student Tuition and Fees.

ANALYSIS:

As required by the report, the Chancellor completed the process of notification as described above during the week of February 16, 2004. On February 17, 2004, the EOSC-BOR accepted the resignation of President William J. Campion. On February 25, 2004, Dr. Richard Bernard, formerly academic vice president at the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma and Eastern Oklahoma State College was appointed Interim President by the EOSC-BOR. On Friday, February 27, 2004, President Bernard met with the Chancellor and State Regents’ staff to discuss issues surrounding the Compliance Review.

As required by the Compliance Review recommendations, EOSC submitted the Compliance Plan approved by the EOSC Board at their meeting on March 11, 2004. A summary of the EOSC’s Compliance Plan is provided below:

- The report details EOSC’s acknowledgement of inappropriately offering credit for MOTET courses offered in Florida, the attempt to portray those courses as non-credit continuing education courses, and its failure to maintain appropriate control over MOTET courses;
- EOSC will notify students through letters from the president that it is unable to grant either academic credit or non-credit continuing education certificates for the MOTET courses and will forward copies of these letters to OSHRE by June 11, 2004;
- EOSC will offer refunds to students who paid $75 per credit hour. Former students who paid the fees must submit written requests and sign a release of all claims against EOSC, State Regents, and the State of Oklahoma in order to receive the refund. EOSC will report all individual refund requests on June 11, 2004;
- EOSC provided information about revised EOSC-BOR policies related to procurement and contracts and provided an outline of proposed policies subject to EOSC-BOR review and amendment. The outline proposed changes in transcripting and contracting practices to align with accepted practices and standards, State Regents policies, and HLC/NCA criteria; committee review of current and proposed contractual agreements and procedures with a report on the review due June 11, 2004; State Regents’ notification of third-party contracts until June 1, 2007; notification of HLC/NCA on all matters relating to MOTET, marketing practices (current and future), and penalties to employees found in violation of the new policies.

State Regents’ staff will continue to monitor and provide assistance to EOSC during the student notification and refund phase. The State Regents will be informed as the process unfolds and will guide any further action necessary on this matter. It is recommended that the State Regents accept the Compliance Plan from EOSC.

Attachment
Compliance Plan  
Submitted by Eastern Oklahoma State College  
In Response to the Compliance Review of the  
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education,  
Dated February 13, 2004  

March 11, 2004  

Directive  

On February 13, 2004, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (“OSRHE”) issued a written Compliance Review to Eastern Oklahoma State College (“EOSC”). In the Compliance Review, OSRHE required EOSC to submit a written compliance plan, on or before March 1, 2004, that contains a detailed account of its process in rectifying certain issues related to a contract between EOSC and an organization named, Move on Toward Education and Training (“MOTET”).

The specific issues to be addressed were:

1. Notifications of students that transcripts issued through the MOTET contract are not academic credit transcripts and a means for the State Regents’ office to verify such notification.
2. How student refunds will be processed for fees collected by EOSC.
3. Revised institutional policies and procedures to ensure that future agreements or contracts, continuing education offerings, marketing efforts, and transcripting practices comply with policies and standards of the State Regents, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (“HLC/NCA”) and the EOSC Board of Regents.

This compliance plan addresses all three issues.

Commitment  

Eastern Oklahoma State College accepts responsibility and regrets the violations of OSRHE policy, as follows:

a. EOSC inappropriately attempted to offer credit for MOTET courses, which met in Florida, without specific OSRHE approval.
b. When questioned, EOSC improperly portrayed these courses as non-credit, continuing education classes.
c. EOSC failed to maintain appropriate institutional control over the MOTET courses.

EOSC pledges to take all steps reasonably necessary to bring this matter to a close and that in the future, it will abide by all OSRHE policies and the guidelines of the HLC/NCA. To that end, EOSC is prepared to take the actions outlined below.

Issue No. 1: Notification of the MOTET students  

Using the letters in Exhibits A and B, EOSC will notify all MOTET students that it is unable to grant either academic credit or non-credit continuing education certificates for the MOTET
courses because EOSC is not authorized to offer either academic credit or continuing education certificates for the MOTET courses under either the policy guidelines of the OSRHE or the standards and guidelines of the HLC/NCA.

EOSC will maintain copies of all these letters, and forward them to OSRHE by June 11, 2004.

**Issue No. 2: Refund Policy**

Using the letter attached as Exhibit A, EOSC will notify all MOTET students, who paid tuition, any portion of which came to EOSC, that EOSC regrets its part in the MOTET program and for this reason is offering refunds of all money, which it received. EOSC will allow students, who enrolled in these courses and paid tuition, any portion of which went to EOSC, to claim refunds of $75.00 per course hour, by submitting written requests for the refund. EOSC will make the refunds conditional on two requirements: (1) that the students request the refund within 60 days of the postmark on the notification letter; and, (2) that the student release all claims against Eastern Oklahoma State College, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, and the State of Oklahoma.

As noted above, EOSC will maintain copies of all letters sent to MOTET students, and forward them to OSRHE by June 11, 2004. Further, EOSC will make a full accounting to OSRHE no later than June 11, 2004, of all individual refund requests received by EOSC and EOSC’s responses. Underlying supporting documentation for all refund requests and responses will be available to OSRHE staff on request.

**Issue No. 3: Policy Revisions**

**EOSC Board Policies, Adopted February 4, 2004.**

As explained in Appendix E of the OSRHE Compliance Report of February 13, 2004, the EOSC Board, in anticipation of the report, established the following policies:

1. “All procurement purchase contracts shall be made and entered into in accordance with the EOSC Procurement Policy previously approved by the Board of Regents and circulated to all division/department heads on September 9, 2003.” [A copy of that policy appeared in Compliance Review, Appendix E, as Exhibit C.]

2. “All other contracts of whatever nature or kind must be presented to the Board of Regents of EOSC for approval at a lawfully called board meeting. All contracts other than contracts of a routine nature shall be reviewed by EOSC legal counsel prior to consideration by the Board of Regents; all such contracts must be executed by the Chairperson and Secretary of the Board.”

**New EOSC Board Policies, Adopted March 11, 2004.**

[What follows are proposed new policies, subject to EOSC Board review, amendment, and approval on March 11, 2004.]

1. **Transcripting.** EOSC will retain all official academic records of the college, including all academic transcripts and continuing education records, in a single file in its Registrar’s Office. Those records will be available to all authorized parties, subject only to the privacy provisions of state and federal law. The institution will issue only one type of transcript: An official EOSC transcript (and unofficial copies of these transcripts).
Students who complete non-credit bearing programs will receive certificates of completion, designed in such a way as to avoid similarity with academic transcripts. Under no circumstances will EOSC grant academic credit or non-credit continuing education certificates for work in programs not controlled by the institution or not monitored for quality.

With this in mind, EOSC affirms that it will conduct all transcripting activities in accordance with the “Professional Practices and Ethical Standards” code of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRO), available at www.aacrao.org/about/ethics.htm, and in particular with its provisions requiring officials to:

- Assert ourselves when policies or practices are proposed that seem to be contrary to the philosophy and goals of our professions and our institutions,
- Develop and implement effective management systems that will ensure integrity, confidentiality, security of institutional records, and provide an accurate interpretation of such information, and
- Practice honesty and integrity in our professions and in our lives.

To insure that this occurs, EOSC will require the Vice President for Academic Affairs (“VPAA”) to conduct a Self-Audit of its Registrar’s Office using the guidelines set forth in The AACRAO 2003 Academic Record and Transcript Guide, “Appendix B,” and make changes, as necessary. In doing this, the VPAA will also ensure that EOSC is in compliance with the academic integrity provision of the HLC/NCA’s Handbook of Accreditation, 3rd ed. (2003), The Criteria for Accreditation: Criterion One: Core Component 1e: “The Organization Upholds and Protects its Integrity,” p. 3.3.4. EOSC will report the results of this audit to the OSRHE by June 11, 2004.

2. Contractual Agreements. EOSC affirms that it will monitor its current and proposed educational contractual agreements, in line with the HLC/NCA’s Handbook of Accreditation, 3rd ed. (2003), and in particular with The Criteria for Accreditation: Criterion One: Core Component 1e: “The Organization Upholds and Protects its Integrity,” p. 3.3.4; Criterion Five: Core Component 5c: “The Organization Demonstrates its Responsibilities to those Constituencies that Depend on it for Service,” pp. 3.2.17-18; and the Cross-Cutting Theme, focusing on “The Connected Organization … Collaborates,” pp. 3.3.4.

To insure that compliance occurs, EOSC will establish a Contract Compliance Committee appointed by EOSC’s President comprised of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, three faculty members (including a Division Head and the Director of the forthcoming HLC/NCA Self-Study), and another senior administrative official to review all current contracts in order to bring them into compliance with these standards. The committee will use the “Good Practices in Contractual Arrangements Involving Courses and Programs,” of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (adopted August 7, 1998). EOSC will report the findings of this review to the OSRHE by June 11, 2004.

This same committee, using the same standards, will review all proposed, future third-party contracts, involving academic credit or continuing education offerings, for the purpose of verifying that the proposed programs will meet EOSC, OSRHE, and
LHC/NCA standards for academic rigor and control. The committee’s findings will be made, in writing, to the President of EOSC. The committee’s written findings will accompany requests to the EOSC Board for contract approvals.

3. Notification Requirements (OSRHE). Until June 1, 2007, all proposed new EOSC third-party educational contracts will be submitted to OSRHE staff for review. If such contracts involve the creation of new academic programs or include delivery modes or other elements outside those currently authorized, these proposals will, like other new program proposals, be subject to regular OSRHE review and approval. If such programs meet current OSRHE standards, they will also be subject to staff review in order to allow the opportunity for written advice to the Board of Regents of EOSC on the suitability of the programs.

4. Notification Requirements (HLC/NCA). EOSC will report all matters relating to MOTET, as outlined above, to HLC/NCA. EOSC will be forthcoming in admitting its error and in explaining its corrective actions.

5. Marketing. In all marketing efforts involving current and future partnerships, EOSC will accurately portray the opportunities offered, explaining whether they carry academic credit or non-credit continuing education certificates, and clearly identifying all parties involved and their particular roles.

6. Penalties. Any EOSC employee found in violation of these policies will be subject to disciplinary action.

Conclusion

The EOSC Board of Regents respectfully submits this compliance plan and requests its approval by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

__________________________     _________________________
Mrs. Georgia Tate      Dr. Richard M. Bernard
Chairperson of the Board     President
Eastern Oklahoma State College     Eastern Oklahoma State College
Dear Mr./Ms. _______

Our records show that you took one or more courses, offered under the auspices of Move on toward Education and Training (“MOTET”). MOTET is a company located in Miami, Florida.

In the past, Eastern Oklahoma State College (“EOSC”) was associated with MOTET, but unlike MOTET, EOSC operates under the authority of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (“OSRHE”) and the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (HLC/NCA). It is now clear to us that the EOSC courses offered through this association violated OSRHE policy and the standards of the HLC/NCA. For these reasons, EOSC can offer neither academic credit nor continuing education certificates for the MOTET courses.

EOSC is concerned students may have taken the courses, believing that they would earn either academic credit or continuing education certificates from EOSC. Because neither academic credit nor continuing education certificates are available, EOSC is offering refunds of that portion of these students’ tuition, which MOTET collected and sent to EOSC ($75.00 per course hour).

If you are one of these students, you may obtain from EOSC a $75.00 per course hour refund if and only if you send to EOSC a request for such a refund. All refund requests must be in writing and must be postmarked by ____ [insert a date 60 days past the date of this letter]. EOSC will not honor requests mailed after that date.

This refund offer is conditioned on your releasing EOSC, OSRHE and the State of Oklahoma from any further claims arising from the MOTET courses. To do this, you must sign the enclosed release and return it to EOSC along with your refund request in order to obtain a refund.

Send requests for refunds and the signed release to:

MOTET Refund Program
Business Office
Eastern Oklahoma State College
Wilburton, OK 74578.

If you have questions about these matters, you may contact:

Dr. Bradley R. Rice  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Eastern Oklahoma State College  
Wilburton, OK 74578  
(918) 465-2361, ext. 321  
brice@eosc.edu.

Eastern Oklahoma State Colleges apologizes for any inconveniences arising from this matter and wishes you well in your educational efforts.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard M. Bernard  
President

Encl. Waiver statement
**RELEASE**

This release (the "Release") is made and signed the date shown below (the "Effective Date"), from the person whose name appears below to Eastern Oklahoma State College ("EOSC"), the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the State of Oklahoma and their agents, employees, board members, attorneys, insurers, representatives, successors and assigns (collectively referred to herein as "Releasees").

In consideration of the payment to me described herein by EOSC and intending to be legally bound, I hereby agree with Releasees as follows:

1) **Payment.** I acknowledge that, subject to my complying with all refund requirements established by EOSC, I will receive payment from EOSC in a dollar amount calculated as follows: the total number of documented course hours I took from Move on Toward Education and Training ("MOTET") under that certain contract between EOSC and MOTET will be multiplied times $75 per course hour (the "Payment"). I ACCEPT THE PAYMENT AS FULL AND COMPLETE CONSIDERATION OF ANY AND ALL AMOUNTS DUE TO ME FROM THE RELEASEES AND AS CONSIDERATION FOR MY OTHER PROMISES AND AGREEMENTS HEREIN.

2) **RELEASE.** IN CONSIDERATION OF THE PAYMENT, I HEREBY RELEASE THE RELEASEES OF ANY AND ALL CLAIMS, LIABILITIES OR ACTIONS, KNOWN OR UNKNOWN, WHICH I PRESENTLY HAVE OR WHICH I EVER HAD AGAINST THE RELEASEES AS OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE.

3) **Legal Representation.** I understand that I have the right to consult with a lawyer concerning this Release. I realize that by signing this Release, I could possibly be giving up and waiving important legal rights.
4) **Venue and Jurisdiction.** This Release shall be interpreted, construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Oklahoma and before the courts of the State of Oklahoma in the City of Wilburton, Oklahoma.

5) **Miscellaneous.** This Release and its terms and provisions are binding upon me and my heirs, legal representatives, successors and assigns.

**I HAVE READ THIS RELEASE AND I UNDERSTAND ALL OF ITS TERMS.**

**I ENTER INTO AND SIGN THIS RELEASE KNOWINGLY AND VOLUNTARILY, WITH FULL KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT IT MEANS.**

________________________________________
Print Name

________________________________________
Signature

________________________________________
Date
Dear Mr./Ms. ________

Our records show that you took one or more courses, offered under the auspices of Move on toward Education and Training (“MOTET”). MOTET is a company located in Miami, Florida.

In the past, Eastern Oklahoma State College (“EOSC”) was associated with MOTET, but unlike MOTET, EOSC operates under the authority of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (“OSRHE”) and the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (HLC/NCA). It is now clear to us that the EOSC courses offered through this association violated OSRHE policy and the standards of the HLC/NCA. For these reasons, EOSC can offer neither academic credit nor continuing education certificates for the MOTET courses.

Eastern Oklahoma State Colleges apologizes for any inconveniences arising from this matter and wishes you well in your educational efforts. If you have further questions about these matters, you may contact:

Dr. Bradley R. Rice  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Eastern Oklahoma State College  
Wilburton, OK 74578  
(918) 465-2361, ext. 209  
brice@eosc.edu

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard M. Bernard  
President
AGENDA ITEM #17:

Student Preparation.

SUBJECT:  EPAS -- Annual Report of Student Progress on the EXPLORE and PLAN Assessment for Academic Year 2003-2004

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is presented for State Regents information only.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents have sponsored the Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS) as a student preparation initiative since 1993. Annually, EPAS participation has increased to the point that, in the 2003-2004 academic year, 84,207 students took the EPAS assessments. Within that total, 44,072 students took the eighth grade EXPLORE assessment and 40,135 students took the 10th grade PLAN assessment. When EPAS began, four school districts participated in the pilot in 1993. Now, EPAS includes 499 participating school districts, including 42 private schools and one Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Each district voluntarily participates in EPAS, over and above the state’s required testing for K-12 education. The EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT assessment are linearly scaled, and developmentally progressive allowing for longitudinal monitoring of student progress toward college readiness over time.

POLICY ISSUES:

EPAS was originally created as a social justice initiative to strengthen student academic preparation following State Regents’ policy action to raise of admissions standards in the 1990s. More recently, State Regents’ EPAS involvement was deepened by Regents’ action to reallocate social justice resources to support an office of student preparation in 2000 as the primary State Regents’ social justice focus for providing access to college through academic preparation. In tandem with financial aid support from OHLAP and outreach support provided through the federal GEAR UP program, EPAS continues to be a valuable tool for Oklahoma middle and high school students.

ANALYSIS:

Before presenting the EPAS data for 2003-2004, it is important to note how the student data and State Regents’ interpretation of that data have undergone a change over time as more students have begun taking the assessments. Early in the EPAS program, with smaller numbers of students taking the assessments because of lower district participation, it was not unusual to see larger jumps (or drops) in scores year-to-year. The size of the sample and the
variance generated by the larger pool of students means that, as EPAS has reached saturation point in implementation, the gains or drops from year to year will not be as dramatic. Therefore, significant gains (or losses) in EPAS scores year to year are not likely to occur due to the large number of students taking the test. Increases in scores will only occur with improved academic preparation for a sufficient number of students statewide that statistically significant gains would occur.

**Eighth Grade EXPLORE Assessment Results**
The following table displays the EXPLORE results over the past three testing years against the national norms. Data presented in bold represent scores that fall below the national norms for eighth graders in the respective content areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oklahoma EPAS</th>
<th>The EXPLORE Assessment (Scale 1-25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Reasoning</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPLORE and Achievement Gaps**
This table analyzes the scores of ethnic groups compared to the national norms for the past year (2003-2004). Data in bold indicate scores that fall below the national norms for these eighth graders in the respective content areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oklahoma EPAS</th>
<th>The EXPLORE Assessment (Scale 1-25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Reasoning</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other EXPLORE Data**
The EXPLORE test also has questions that allow students to self report information in several key areas, such as educational aspiration, their plans to take core courses in high school, and potential career plans. Additionally, State Regents were able to add some Oklahoma specific questions to the exam this year. The following indicate what the students say:
Sixty-five percent indicate a plan to attend a two-year or four-year college after high school.

Sixty-seven percent of students expressed a need for help in math skills

Seventy-three percent expressed a need for help in developing good study skills and habits

Two-thirds of Oklahoma eighth graders who took the EXPLORE said they need assistance in selecting high school courses, exploring postsecondary options, and exploring postsecondary financial aid.

Only 40 percent of responding eighth graders indicated that they felt their courses were challenging.

Twenty-six percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that a teacher or counselor helps them plan courses for school.

Thirty-six percent indicated a plan to take courses by concurrent enrollment

Forty-one percent indicated a plan to take Advanced Placement courses.

Twenty-seven percent indicated a plan to take one or more courses at a Career Technology center.

10th GRADE PLAN RESULTS

The PLAN assessment, administered to 10th graders, is a good estimate of what a student would score on the ACT assessment, had the student taken the ACT on the date of PLAN testing. The predictive nature of PLAN indicates that students will typically score two to four points higher on the ACT after having taken the plan and subsequently taking the ACT assessment in their junior and/or senior year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Reasoning</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oklahoma’s 10th graders continue to outscore the national norms, but aggregate scores have changed little over the past three academic years.

PLAN and Achievement Gaps
This table analyzes the scores of ethnic groups compared to the national norms for the past year (2003-2004). Data in bold indicate scores that fall below the national norms for these tenth graders in the respective content areas.
Though overall, Oklahoma students outscored the national norms for 10th graders on the PLAN assessment, the disaggregated data by race show achievement gaps when African American, Native American, and Hispanic aggregate performance is measured against national norms.

Separately, when the PLAN data are disaggregated by gender, female students outscore their male counterparts in all content areas except for mathematics.

**PLAN and its relationship to the ACT Assessment**

Participating school districts in EPAS are required to deliver both the EXPLORE and PLAN assessments and to test every student. Because these exams are linearly scaled to the ACT Assessment, some statements can be made about student progress, particularly at the point of having taken the PLAN test in the 10th grade, which could be useful for course planning in the final two years of high school.

The PLAN test score represents what students would have made on the ACT Assessment had they taken it that same day. Expected score gains between PLAN and ACT range from two to four scale score points.

A majority of students meet their expected score gains in all of the content areas; however, with such a large sample, even a small percentage of students scoring below expected gains represents a large number of students. For example, in the content area of mathematics, for the PLAN 2000-2001 tested cohort who also took the ACT in 2003, 10 percent scored below expected gains. With the matched sample cohort totaling 20,720 students, this means that more than 2,000 students did not make expected learning gains between 10th grade and the time they took the ACT.

**The Student Perspective**

Among Oklahoma students who took the PLAN test in the 10th grade in 2003-2004:

- Forty-five percent agreed or strongly agreed that their classes are challenging.
- Thirty-four percent agreed or strongly agreed that counselors or teachers help them plan their courses for graduation.

---

**Oklahoma EPAS**

The PLAN Assessment

(Scale 1-32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Reasoning</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-eight percent were taking or planning to take a course by concurrent enrollment and thirty-six percent reported taking or planning to take an Advanced Placement course.

Twenty-five percent agreed or strongly agreed that they were planning to take a course at a Career Technology center.

Perhaps even more interesting is the uncertainty that 10th graders show in their answers – 43 percent were uncertain if they would take a course by concurrent enrollment; 31 percent were uncertain that they would take an Advanced Placement course; and 38 percent expressed uncertainty as to whether or not they would take courses at their local Career Technology center.
AGENDA ITEM #18:

Student Credit Cards.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma College Student Credit Card Study

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept the Council on Student Affairs’ Plan of Action for implementing the findings contained in the College Student Credit Card Study.

BACKGROUND:

A Concurrent Resolution passed in May 1999, by the 47th Oklahoma State Legislature, called for Oklahoma’s public colleges and universities to include consumer credit education programs as a part of new student orientation. The resolution indicates that, given the extent to which credit cards are now easily available to students, the results appear to be that more and more college students are ending up with significant financial debt. The resolution also notes that full-time college students control in excess of $19 billion dollars in annual discretionary spending and as many as 150,000 young people under the age of twenty-five will file for personal bankruptcy.

The resolution was presented to the Chancellor for the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education and subsequently shared with the Council on Student Affairs. The Council was asked to: (1) ascertain the seriousness of college student credit card indebtedness, (2) examine the extent to which State System institutions have in place consumer credit card education programs, and (3) recommend strategies for State System institutions to inform students about the consequences of too much credit card debt.

At their joint February 24, 2002 meeting, the Student Advisory Board and the Faculty Advisory Committee passed a joint resolution calling on the Council on Student Affairs to: (1) study the practices and efforts of credit card solicitation on college campuses in Oklahoma, and (2) recommend for State Regents’ endorsement a system-wide higher education practice relating to student credit card solicitation that best contributes to students’ personal development.

The State Regents, at their June 27, 2002 meeting approved a Quality Initiative Grant in the amount of $3,000 to the Center for Student Affairs Research at the University of Oklahoma for the purpose of conducting a statewide student credit card study. Additionally, colleges and universities supported the study by becoming a member of the Center for Student Affairs (CSAR) consortium.
Given (1) the diversity of students attending State System institutions, (2) the recognition that college students are the only consumers that can apply for and obtain a credit card without a job or income, and (3) some college students do not take seriously- until it is too late- the enormous financial burden over-reliance on credit cards can cause, the Council on Student Affairs agreed to ask the Center for Student Affairs Research (CSAR) to assist with the examination of the severity of Oklahoma college students’ use or misuse of credit cards and recommend additional ways State System institutions might better educate students about the consequences of credit card debt.

POLICY ISSUES:

The college student credit card study addresses various legislative concerns regarding college students’ indebtedness as a result of credit card use.

ANALYSIS:

At the October 30, 2003 meeting of the State Regents, the chair of the Council on Student Affairs presented the college student credit card study findings. As a result of sharing the study’s findings, the State Regents asked the Council to develop a series of strategies (action plan) designed to implement the recommendations contained in the college student credit card study.

As a way to arrive at its action steps for implementing the college student credit card findings the Council decided to do three things: 1) complete a comprehensive analysis of steps State System institutions are already taking to educate students about the pitfalls of unwise use of credit cards, 2) solicit advice from the Student Advisory Board, and 3) as a way to gain maximum student input, student leaders who attended the Oklahoma Student Government Association (OSGA) spring 2004 Congress, were asked to weigh in on what steps they would recommend for implementing the college student credit card study findings.

The attached report details the Council on Student Affairs Plan of Action for implementing the recommendations contained in the college student credit card study.
Council on Student Affairs Plan of Action
For Implementing the Findings Contained in the
College Student Credit Card Study

An Overview

Given the national attention directed at college students’ perceived misuse/abuse of credit cards and legislative pressure-- in some states, including Oklahoma, to prevent among other things credit card marketers from taking advantage of college students by offering “give-a-ways” in exchange for completing a credit card application, the Council on Student Affairs (COSA) asked the Center for Student Affairs Research (CSAR) at the University of Oklahoma to assist with the examination of the severity of Oklahoma college students’ use or misuse of credit cards. Specifically, the Center was asked to: 1) gather benchmark information about credit card use among college students in Oklahoma, 2) examine students attitudes toward credit card use, their debt handling habits, their understanding of the implication of credit card debt, their sources of learning about financial responsibilities and debt management, and the effects of credit card use on important aspects of their collegiate experiences, and 3) identify correlates of credit card debt handling in order to assist colleges and universities with intervention strategies.

It is also important to note that the college student credit card examination represented the nation’s first statewide multi-institutional study of the topic.

The Center completed its work, and at the October 30, 2003 meeting of the State Regents, the chair of the Council on Student Affairs presented the college student credit card study findings. By way of review, the study found that:

- Each college student in the study owned an average of two major credit cards (MasterCard, Visa, American Express, and Discover) and had an average debt of $2,607 dollars. When compared with national data, Nellie Mae reported that students on average owned 4.3 cards and College Credit Counseling found that students on average owned three credit cards.

- About half (49%) of the students in the study owned at least one major credit card before they began college. By the end of their sophomore year in college, 92% had owned at least one credit card. Nationally, 25% of all college students received their cards before college and 90% owned at least one credit card by the end of their sophomore year (TERI, 1998).

- Two of the most significant factors influencing students’ decisions to get their first and subsequent credit cards were pre-approved solicitations from credit card issuers and general mail solicitations from banks and other financial institutions. Incentives for signing up (such as offers of gifts or discounts on...
airline tickets) and solicitations from off-campus and on-campus marketers also influenced their decisions to get credit cards.

- In terms of requirements necessary to get credit cards, most students noted a rather lax policy from credit card issuers. According to the students, most issuers did not ask for information about their academic major, their status as students, or their date of graduation. Many issuers also did not ask about their expected salary upon graduation nor their independent income at the time of application. Most issuers, according to the students, were also not concerned about their ability to repay their debt.

- In terms of credit card handling, most students were handling their debt repayment well (meaning they either paid in full or more than the minimum). However, 24% of the students were not doing as well--i.e. they either paid just the required minimum or were behind on their payments each month.

- There was significant evidence that students who had debt repayment problems were more likely to be older, married, and female. They also were more likely to have a lower grade point average and a lower personal income. In addition, they had more credit cards and a higher debt level.

- In general, students reported a high level of understanding of credit card use and its implications. However, there were disparities in knowledge level between those students with debt handling problems and those without. In all cases, students with debt handling problem had substantially less knowledge about credit card use than those students who reported “moderate” or “extensive” knowledge. Two of the most significant disparities were in their knowledge of the pros and cons of credit card debts compared to other forms of debt and knowledge about the ways of managing credit card debt.

- One of the concerns about credit card debt was whether it impacted the collegiate experiences of students. There was evidence of this occurrence in the study. Among the collegiate experiences most affected were concentration on academic work, participation in extracurricular activities, decision to reduce course load and get a job in order to pay off debt, decision to remain in class, and sense of priority about academic work.

- Most students (69% to 77%) did not report satisfaction with existing programs that were aimed at helping them to understand financial responsibilities, debt management, and credit card use. The least useful were campus workshops and new student seminars.

- Most students in this study held themselves responsible for their own credit card debt. Most did not attribute their debt to credit card companies, in spite of
their lax credit requirements. They also did not attribute their debt to their institutions for having to raise tuition nor to the federal government for the inadequate student financial aid.

As a result of presenting the study findings, the State Regents asked the Council to develop action plans for implementing the recommendations as a way to further assist Oklahoma colleges and universities to better educate students about the misuse or over reliance on credit cards.

STEPS TAKEN BY THE COUNCIL TO ARRIVE AT THE ACTION STRATEGIES

As a way to arrive at its action steps for implementing the college student credit card findings the Council decided to do three things: 1) complete a comprehensive analysis of steps State System institutions are already taking to educate students about the pitfalls of unwise use of credit cards, 2) solicit advice from the Student Advisory Board, and 3) as a way to gain maximum student input, student leaders who attended the Oklahoma Student Government Association (OSGA), spring 2004 Congress, were asked to weigh in on what steps they would recommend for implementing the college student credit card study findings.

1.) WHAT STATE SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS ARE CURRENTLY DOING

A comprehensive analysis completed by the Council on Student Affairs revealed that most if not all colleges and universities already have in place ways to educate students about the pitfalls of unwise use of credit cards. Additionally, several institutions are either “revamping” their student credit card education efforts based on the results of the credit card study findings, or are putting in place more innovative strategies to reach more students who are characterized as high risk.

While the following commentary is not designed to be an exhaustive summary of steps currently being taken by higher education institutions to educate students about credit card misuse, the paragraphs that follow do highlight and demonstrate meaningful efforts on the part of Oklahoma’s colleges and universities to accomplish that goal. For example:

- One State System institution will, beginning with the 2004 fall semester, include sessions on “Credit Survival” in new student orientation. Additionally, a family component, about the same subject, will be added, and an on-line orientation process will focus on credit card debt.

- Another institution is creating a board game designed as an innovative way to teach debt management. The game will teach students about financial strategies and risks associated with financing the costs of going to college and other major purchases.
• Other colleges and universities indicate that their Student Development Office’s offer workshops on credit card debt and money management—open to all students. Other use their Career Services Division as well as their College of Education to offer seminars entitled: “Handling Your First Budget” and offering a course on Personal Finance.

• Another State System institution provides financial management seminars developed by the office of Financial Aid. Students and their parents/guardians are strongly encouraged to attend these freshman orientation programs, “Pay Me Now or Pay Me Later: College Costs and College Debts” and “The Do’s and Don’t of Credit Cards.” This institution also uses consumer credit counselors and banking officials to lecture in these seminars.

• One State System institution has a requirement cornerstone course for all students. The course has a core component in the curriculum that teaches students about consumer credit and decision-making.

2.) STUDENT ADVISORY BOARD

In a joint debt management resolution passed on January 25, 2004, the Student Advisory Board and the Faculty Advisory Council to the State Regents recommended that the following steps be taken by State System institutions:

1) That the State Regents encourage individual campus policy limiting the activity of credit card marketers on college campuses;

2) That the State Regents support a greater emphasis on debt management education within freshman orientation programs; and,

3) That the Council on Student Affairs explores the creation of an introductory personal finance class open to all students.

3.) OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

At their spring conference, student government leaders from across the state were surveyed and asked their opinions on how State System institutions might assist students avoid credit card debt. Highlights of their comments are presented below.
Highlights

- More than half of students (57%) suggested that colleges and universities should not be responsible for educating students about credit card use. However, 42% of the students indicated that they should.
- Eighty six percent (86%) of the students suggested that credit card debt education materials should be placed in college bookstores, the student unions, and in other places or events patronized by students.
- If colleges and universities were to provide debt management seminars/workshops, most students (51%) suggested that such seminars should be made available for all students.
- When asked if colleges and universities should prohibit credit card vendors from soliciting on campus, fifty-one (51%) reported that they should, while forty-eight (48%) reported that they should not.
- Forty-three percent (43%) of the students suggested that college/universities should prohibit credit card vendors from offering “give-a-ways” to students as a way to encourage them to complete a credit card application. Thirty eight percent (38%) suggested that they should not.
- When asked if colleges/universities should require every student to attend mandatory credit card use seminars/workshops or simply make them available to those students who wish to attend, eighty three percent (83%) suggested that colleges/universities should simply make such seminars available to those students who wish to attend.

PLAN OF ACTION FOR IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE COLLEGE STUDENT CREDIT CARD STUDY

Given what has been learned from a) the college student credit card study, b) a comprehensive analysis of steps already underway by State System institutions to educate students related to debt management, c) advice from both the Student Advisory Board and the Oklahoma Student Government Association, the Council on Student Affairs proposes the following plan of action for implementing the recommendations contained in the college student credit card study:

- RECOMMENDATION IN STUDY: Since a majority of college students own at least one major credit card by the end of their sophomore year, colleges and universities must continue to be vigilant and innovative in educating their students about the meaning of credit card use and its implications.
- PLAN OF ACTION: The Council on Student Affairs endorses the importance of State System institutions efforts to incorporate consumer credit education opportunities. Those efforts will continue and expanded as appropriate.
• RECOMMENDATION IN STUDY: Younger college students (22 years old or less) and undergraduate students have a relatively lower credit card debt level, but are likely to accumulate more debts later, there exist opportunities for college and universities to work with these students in alleviating or eliminating their existing and future problems with credit card debt.

• PLAN OF ACTION: In addition to consumer credit education opportunities already provided students enrolled in State System institutions, colleges and universities will work toward identifying other appropriate and creative ways to educate students such as including debt education information in bookstores, student unions, residence halls and in other places/events frequented by students. Additionally, frequent reminders about credit card management will be included in student newspapers, or on campus radio stations, and in student handbooks or other appropriate institutional organs.

• RECOMMENDATION IN STUDY: Since age, marital status, gender, grade-point-average, personal income, number of credit cards owned, and debt level are related to debt repayment problems, colleges and universities can develop a student profile consisting of these characteristics and design creative educational and intervention strategies targeted at helping these students overcome their problems.

• PLAN OF ACTION: State System institutions will use the research contained in the college credit card study to design intervention strategies for the most at risk students.

• RECOMMENDATION IN STUDY: The college student credit card study noted that credit card debt has impacted important collegiate experiences of students, colleges and universities should find creative ways to assist students with their debt problems so that they can be more successful as college students.

• PLAN OF ACTION: In addition to offering students creative and innovative learning experiences related to credit card use, the Council on Student Affairs will also study “best practices” in college student credit card education intervention strategies occurring across the country for possible implementation in Oklahoma.

• RECOMMENDATION IN STUDY: Should credit card companies and marketers be allowed to solicit student business in college campuses, college and universities should require these companies to fund educational programs designed to educate students about proper credit card use, personal financial responsibility, and consequences of too much credit card debt.

• PLAN OF ACTION: While not all State System institutions allow credit card solicitation on campus, the Council on Student Affairs will encourage those who do to seek financial support from the credit card company (ies) as a way
to financially support the cost associated with educating student about credit card debt management.

Lastly, while neither the state nor the higher education community can do much to address “off-campus” credit card solicitation by the credit card industry, the Council does propose that members of the Council work with the appropriate legislative members and the banking industry to encourage changes in state regulatory guidelines. Those changes in state regulatory guidelines would include requiring banks and credit card vendors doing business in Oklahoma to lower credit caps or require credit card spending limits based on current income as opposed to future earnings. The Council on Student Affairs also recommends, as an action step, that the content of the college student credit card study and the action steps developed for implementing the finds in the study be shared with appropriate legislative leaders.
AGENDA ITEM #19:

Annual Student Financial Aid Report for 2002-03.

SUBJECT: Annual Student Financial Aid Survey

RECOMMENDATION:

The report is an information item presented for the State Regents’ acceptance.

BACKGROUND:

For the 29th consecutive year, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education have compiled an Annual Financial Aid Report (OCR B3) for state system institutions. Information concerning grants, scholarships, loans, and employment is collected in aggregate form directly from the institutions.

POLICY ISSUES:

This report is used to track the amounts and types of financial aid distributed in Oklahoma public higher education institutions. The information is also compiled according to race and gender. The data helps to provide trend information on the long-term changes in the financial aid environment of students attending Oklahoma public colleges and universities.

ANALYSIS: (see following pages)
**Trends**: Over the past decade, the following trends are apparent:

- The amount of student loan debt continues to grow at a greater rate than grant aid such as federal Pell Grants and Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grants.

- For the lowest income students, the maximum federal Pell Grant generally covers a smaller portion of their college costs than it did in 1992-93.
2002-03 Data: More than 124,000 students attending state system institutions received nearly $700 million dollars in student aid. Following are some characteristics about the student aid awarded in 2002-03.

- In just one year, the total amount of financial aid distributed to state system students increased by $93 million or 15%. The increase in loans was 24%.

( amounts in $ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants/waivers</td>
<td>207.0</td>
<td>230.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>285.8</td>
<td>354.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(8)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601.4</td>
<td>694.1</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- More than half (54.6%) of all students attending state system institutions received some form of financial aid.

- Student loans totaling over $350 million accounted for more than half (51%) of all the student aid funds awarded. Grants, such as the federal Pell Grant and Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant (OTAG) made up one-third (33.2%). The remaining portion was split between scholarships (8.7%) and student employment aid such as federal work-study (7.1%).

- Gender and ethnicity: Female and minority students account for a slightly greater proportion of student aid recipients than their proportion of total student enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Aid Recipients</th>
<th>% of Headcount Enr.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>(4.0)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Af. Amer.</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>(4.5)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Among the institution tiers, students attending the comprehensive universities account for about half (49%) of all student aid received though they comprise only one-third (34%) of the total students receiving aid. Students at the four-year regional universities receive 32% of the student aid while two-year college students receive 19%.

- The percentage of all students taking out student loans has increased from 18% in 1992-93 to 26% in 2002-03.

- Over the past decade, the total amount of student aid awarded by state system institutions has grown from $326 million in 1992-93 to $694 million in 2002-03, an increase of $368 million or 113%.

See the following page for a summary of financial aid awarded in 2002-03.
Overview of Financial Aid for State System Institutions
2002-03

In 2002-2003, over 124,000 students attending state system institutions received approximately $700 million in the form of grants, scholarships, loans and student employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
<th>% Of Total</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Pell Grants</td>
<td>130,285,449</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>57,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal SEOG</td>
<td>5,131,672</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>9,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Grants (federal)</td>
<td>3,616,014</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants (OTAG)</td>
<td>19,902,240</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>22,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sources</td>
<td>925,954</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Grants</td>
<td>1,231,544</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Tuition Waivers</td>
<td>29,873,006</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>33,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Tuition Waivers</td>
<td>26,347,767</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>9,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants</td>
<td>12,950,086</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Grants</strong></td>
<td>$230,263,732</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>85,935 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Loans**              |              |            |               |
| Federal Perkins Loan   | 10,195,827   | 1.5%       | 4,524         |
| Other Federal Loans    | 332,408,928  | 48.0%      | 93,671        |
| Institutional Loans    | 2,192,077    | 0.3%       | 689           |
| Private Sources        | 7,155,217    | 1.0%       | 1,027         |
| Other Loans            | 2,309,411    | 0.3%       | 643           |
| **Subtotal Loans**     | $354,261,460 | 51.0%      | 58,322 *      |

| **Scholarships**       |              |            |               |
| State-Funded Scholarships | 15,936,925 | 2.3%       | 7,778         |
| Other Scholarships     | 44,208,533   | 6.4%       | 36,255        |
| **Subtotal Scholarships** | $60,145,458 | 8.7%       | 29,356 *      |

| **Student Employment** |              |            |               |
| Federal Work Study     | 7,684,295    | 1.1%       | 5,280         |
| Institutional Student Employment | 41,743,898 | 6.0%       | 13,195        |
| **Subtotal Employment** | $49,428,193 | 7.1%       | 15,263 *      |

| **Total Financial Assistance** | $694,098,843 | 100%      | 124,564 *    |

*The number of students in each category may include duplicated students that receive more than one type of financial aid. The subtotals are unduplicated for that category of aid. The total number of 124,564 is unduplicated for all sources of aid.

Source: OCR B3 Survey
Does not include Federal Hope and Lifetime Learning tax credits.
AGENDA ITEM #20:

Public Higher Education Needs Assessment.

SUBJECT: Results of the Oklahoma Social Indicator Survey

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept this report of findings and direct staff to use this information as needed.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents’ 2003-04 Workplan calls for conducting research on existing public perception of higher education in Oklahoma. In September 2003, the State Regents approved a number of research projects to address this issue. One of these projects was participation in the Oklahoma Social Indicator Survey (OSIS), an annual telephone survey was conducted by the Bureau of Social Research at Oklahoma State University.

The 2003 OSIS was conducted in October and November of 2003. A summary of the results from 1,218 random telephone interviews of adults were provided on January 2004. Staff is conducting additional analysis. A Quality Initiative Grant of $15,912 paid for conducting the survey, analyzing the results and a copy of all data.

POLICY ISSUES:

The State Regents’ workplan call for the Regents to 1) “conduct research on existing public perception of higher education...” and 2) “create and implement a statewide marketing plan in cooperation with the Communicators Council and based upon research findings.” Public perception of higher education issues were assessed in the survey.

ANALYSIS:

A summary of the findings follow. Additional analysis of these results, in combination with other ongoing research efforts, will be developed and shared at a later date.

Level of education needed in Oklahoma
Over one-third of respondents indicated that Oklahomans needed a bachelor’s degree. Only 3.1% indicated that no postsecondary education was needed. When comparing the responses by the income of the respondents, those with an annual income greater than $50,000 were more likely to indicate the need for a bachelor’s degree (47.7%) compared to persons with an income less than $50,000 (37.3%). Persons with an annual income under $50,000 were more
likely to indicate the need for “some job related courses” (11%) compared to those with an income greater than $50,000 (5%).

Affordability
Two-thirds of Oklahomans agreed that Oklahoma public colleges and universities are affordable and these findings were consistent regardless of income category. Using cost increments comparable to the resident tuition and mandatory fees at the Oklahoma public institutions (approximately $2,000 at the two-year colleges, $3,000 at the regional universities, and $4,000 at the comprehensive universities), respondents were asked how much they would be willing to spend on an annual basis for tuition and fees. More than one-third (35%) of respondents whose annual income was more than $50,000 were willing to pay up to $6,000 a year for tuition and fees. For those earning less than $50,000, 25% would pay as much as $4,000 and 20% as much as $6,000.

Place, time and offerings
Several aspects of Oklahoma public colleges and universities were assessed. Four out of five respondents indicated that classes are offered at “convenient locations,” in “fields of study that most people need,” and “at convenient times.” These findings were consistent regardless on whether the respondent lived in an urban or rural setting.

The career fields of “computer/information technology” and “business” were identified by the respondents as the most needed undergraduate career fields.

Factors influencing college attendance
Affordability was identified by two-thirds (69.3%) of the respondents as the factor that influences the decision to attend college. Commuting distance was identified by 44.5%. However, when asked to identify reasons why people do not attend public college and universities, respondents identified “an individual’s ability to pay for college” followed closely by “not being academically prepared.”

Admissions and Financial Aid
While nearly two-thirds of respondents knew how to apply for admission to an Oklahoma public college or university and for financial aid, only 18% knew how to apply for the Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program (OHLAP).

Summary
Oklahomans perceive public colleges and universities as affordable, but they also indicated that affordability was the biggest reason why Oklahoman’s do not attend public college and universities. Four out of five respondents indicated that classes are offered at “convenient locations,” in “fields of study that most people need,” and “at convenient times.” There is little awareness of OHLAP.
AGENDA ITEM #21:

Brian Gain Funding

SUBJECT: Revision of funding policy

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept the revised funding policy for allocating Brain Gain funds in FY05.

BACKGROUND:

In March 2001, the State Regents announced plans to develop funding based on the 1999 Brain Gain 2010 initiative. In May 2001, the State Regents allocated $2 million for FY02 and expressed an intent to increase annual allocations until Brain Gain funding represents two percent of state appropriated allocations for institutional education and general (E&G) budgets.

In June 2001, the State Regents posted a plan describing criteria, definitions, and a general approach for allocating Brain Gain funds. This draft plan used retention rates, graduation rates, and number of degrees as the performance indicators. The State Regents directed staff to work with presidents to finalize the plan. In December 2001, the State Regents allocated approximately half of the FY02 funds equally among the 25 public institutions and 2 technical branches because institutions have been working to improve retention and graduation rates and need to make additional investments.

In April 2002, the Presidents’ proposed a Brain Gain funding policy using five measures: (1) number of associate and bachelor’s degrees, (2) number of students completing 20 credit hours including remediation, (3) number of students reaching 30 credit hours excluding remediation, (4) first-year retention rates excluding remediation, and (5) graduation rates excluding remediation. Based on these measures, a modified funding plan was developed and the remaining FY02 funds were distributed.

At the June 2002 meeting, the State Regents distributed $2.4 million for FY03 funds using the modified policy with the understanding of the Presidents that the process of developing a long-term Brain Gain funding plan would be ongoing.

At the May 2003 meeting, the State Regents added two institution-specific measures to the five common ones, created a two-phase allocation process as proposed by the Presidents, and allocated $2.2 million for FY04.
POLICY ISSUES:

Brain Gain funding is designed to financially support the State Regents’ 1999 Brain Gain 2010 initiative, adding a component to the traditional budget formula that rewards performance with one-time funding. Brain Gain funding is consistent with the State Regents’ policy on System Effectiveness and the Oklahoma State System Report Card adopted in October 2001.

ANALYSIS:

In consultation with the Presidents last year, institutions selected two institution-specific measures that were outcomes or performance based and related to the Brain Gain initiative. These were used in addition to the five measures that remained common to all institutions: (1) number of degrees conferred, (2) first-year retention rates, (3) graduation rates, (4) number of students earning 20 or more credit hours, and (5) number of students reaching the 30 credit hour threshold.

The modified funding policy (see attachment) calls for the elimination of the two credit hour measures. Although these two measures provide some understanding of the progress students are making toward graduation, they are subsumed under the overall retention and graduation rates. Therefore, their elimination focuses attention on the primary measures of retention and graduation. Also, more attention is given to the institution-specific measures that Presidents can use to further strategic improvements on each campus.

Attachment
BRAIN GAIN FUNDING POLICY

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) have adopted *Brain Gain 2010* as a major initiative. This initiative calls for an increase in the percentage of Oklahoma’s adult population with an associate or bachelor’s degree to above the national average by 2010. Accomplishing this ambitious objective will require implementation of multiple strategies, including retaining more Oklahoma college graduates in the state and attracting college degree holders from outside the state—both strategies that require substantial attention to economic development and job creation activities.

But achieving these objectives also requires that Oklahoma colleges and universities enroll more students and retain them to the point of graduation. This is the strategy that can be most affected by OSRHE and the individual campuses. To that end, the State Regents have decided to move to a situation over several years where they will invest up to two percent of the total annual state general fund appropriation in providing incentives and rewards to institutions that increase retention of students and production of degrees at the associate and baccalaureate levels.

The design criteria and approach to allocating resources set aside by the State Regents in furtherance of their stated objective will be developed in conjunction with the Presidents.

**Design**

The Brain Gain funding model uses a two-phase allocation approach with measures, targets, and weights. The first phase allocates funds appropriated for Brain Gain funding that are apportioned by institution based on an average undergraduate full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment. Each institution receives its own share of Brain Gain funds based on the number of weighted credits earned. If all of the targets are met, then the institution is allocated its entire portion.

The second phase gives each institution another opportunity to earn additional funds. All Brain Gain funds not committed during the first phase are distributed based on performance compared to other institutions. Each institution earns uncommitted funds based on the percentage of weighted credits earned by all institutions. For example, if the total number of weighted credits earned by all institutions is 2,000 and an institution earned 100 weighted credits, then it receives 5 percent of the uncommitted funds.

**Measures**

1. **Degrees**: number of associate and bachelor’s degree conferred.

2. **20 Credits Earned in One Year**: number of students earning at least 20 cumulative credit hours including remedial courses. The students are attributed to the institution of record during the spring semester, but the credit hours are accumulated from all transcripted credit hours from other institutions.
3. **Reaching 30 Credit Threshold:** number of students reaching 30 cumulative credit hours excluding remedial courses. The students are attributed to the institution of record during the semester when the threshold was reached, but the credit hours are accumulated from all transcripted credit hours from other institutions.

4. **Retention Rates Within the State:** all first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students in the Fall semester who returned to the same or another Oklahoma institution during the next academic year (summer, fall, spring).

5. **Graduation Rates Within the State:** all first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students in the Fall semester who graduated from the same or another Oklahoma institution within six years.

6. **Institution-specific measures:** undergraduate outcome performance measures related to the Brain Gain 2010 initiative.

**Targets**

The most recent year’s performance for each measure is compared to targets that are negotiated with the Chancellor from a framework of targets based on the tier and national benchmarks.

If an institution’s most recent performance on a measure achieves at least 50 percent of the desired gain between the average previous performance and the target, then the institution will earn that percentage of the full credit. For example, an institution’s average number of degrees is 200 with a target of 250. If the most recent performance is 225, then the institution will earn 50 percent of a credit; 220 degrees earns no credit; 240 degrees earns 80 percent of a credit; and 255 degrees earns 100 percent of a credit. The amount of credit is then weighted depending on the specific measure.

**Weights**

Funds for each measure are weighted with emphasis given to degrees conferred, retention rate and graduation rate. The weights total to 100.

---

AGENDA ITEM #22-a:

OneNet

SUBJECT: Rate Unbundling and Additional Service Offerings

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the unbundling of OneNet’s rate schedule and the addition of service offerings that will enable the network to more effectively accommodate constituents’ telecommunications needs.

BACKGROUND:

Since its inception, OneNet has utilized a fee schedule that was designed to accommodate various connectivity and bandwidth needs of its constituents. Being both affordable and equalized, the rates were intended to provide OneNet with the necessary revenues to support circuit costs and modest technology refresh. To simplify the pricing structure, ancillary services such as Internet access, Web hosting and email were ultimately rolled in to the pricing model.

Though technologies and applications continued to develop and expand, OneNet’s fee schedule remained static until the State Fiscal Year 2003. At that time the network increased its rates to accommodate increases in infrastructure as well as commodity Internet. The new rate structure continued to be inclusive of all services offered under the original rate schedule, but additional circuit offerings were not integrated in the new model.

Though OneNet’s blended rates have traditionally provided equalized access to telecommunications services throughout the state, they do not take into account distinct connectivity and bandwidth needs that agencies have with regard to connecting their remote sites. Further, many constituents do not require the enhanced offerings such as Internet access, Web and email hosting be included within their telecommunications needs. There are distinct instances where constituents need to link their respective sites with circuits that are not accommodated in OneNet’s pricing model or circuit offerings. The result is that the agencies are migrating away from OneNet to secure lower cost circuits from other commercial providers – ultimately eroding OneNet’s customer base and related revenue stream.

POLICY ISSUES:

Under current policy, the State Regents must ratify all modifications to the OneNet rate schedule.
ANALYSIS:

In recent months, OneNet has seen a migration away from the network to other providers who can provide more flexible connectivity and bandwidth offerings. The net effect is a potential reduction in OneNet revenues as well as expanding fragmentation of state networking capabilities – eventually resulting in isolated network segments that are both inefficient and duplicative of OneNet’s efforts. Through unbundling of its rate schedule and expansion of service offerings, OneNet can easily accommodate additional circuit offerings and services that will meet the needs of the constituent agencies while providing the requisite revenues to cover all operating costs. Ultimately, the addition of other circuit offerings through OneNet will provide a mechanism for the state to achieve reduced pricing that the individual agencies could not otherwise achieve on their own.
AGENDA ITEM #22-b:

OneNet

SUBJECT: Modification of rules specific to lease rates for OneNet towers and facilities.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents adopt the attached amendments to Rules for the Use of Towers, Facilities, and Communications Services and continue the rule amendment process pursuant to the Oklahoma Administrative Procedures Act

BACKGROUND:

This agenda item was originally presented to the State Regents at their April 4, 2002. Following the required APA public comment period, the item is now presented for final action on the adoption of the program rule amendment.

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education have consistently made available the use of the towers and facilities of OneNet, the State of Oklahoma’s official telecommunications and information network, to institutions of higher education, federal, state, and local government agencies and to private business. The towers and facilities are made available primarily for educational purposes in accordance with 70 O.S.§2166 and 2167 and only to the extent that the proposed use does not interfere with the normal maintenance, expansion plans or operation of OneNet.

Requests to utilize the towers and facilities are reviewed on a case-by-case basis by OneNet engineering staff to determine if each is consistent with state and federal laws and regulations. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education make the towers and facilities available on a monthly basis and charge entities standard rates for usage.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is necessary to implement fully the lease rates with respect to OneNet towers and facilities with the purpose of aligning rates with current industry standards. Further, the action is intended to update the applicable administrative rule language, OAC 610:15-1, to replace the operational designation of the “Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN)” with “OneNet”.

ANALYSIS:

Approval by the State Regents would allow the rule amendment process to continue as defined by the Administrative Procedures Act.
SUBCHAPTER 1. USE OF TOWERS, FACILITIES, AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

610:15-1-1. Purpose
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education will make available the use of the towers and facilities of the Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN) OneNet, the State of Oklahoma's official telecommunications and information network, to institutions of higher education, federal, state, and local government agencies and to private business. The towers and facilities will be made available primarily for educational purposes in accordance with 70 O.S., §§ 2166 and 2167 and only to the extent that the proposed use does not interfere with the normal maintenance and operation of the Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN) OneNet. Requests to utilize the towers and facilities will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis consistent with state and federal laws and regulations.

610:15-1-2. Towers and facilities use
(a) All proposed installations shall be in accordance with good engineering practices and shall be subject to the approval of the Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN) OneNet engineering staff. Requests for installation of microwave antennas on the ETN OneNet towers shall be approved only after a tower wind load study is performed by an approved and qualified registered professional engineer. Costs of the study are to be paid for by the proposed user. Any structural modifications required to the tower resulting from the proposed antenna installation will be at the expense of the proposer. Generally, 2-way radio antenna installations will not require a tower analysis to be performed; however, it shall be at the discretion of the ETN engineering staff as to whether or not an analysis is required.
(b) The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education will make the ETN OneNet towers and facilities available on a monthly basis at the following rates:
   (1) Two-way radio antenna $.50 per foot of tower height and antenna (subject to increase if transmission lines are greater than .500" in diameter)
   (2) Microwave antennas $120 per antenna and $1.00 per foot of tower height
   (3) Building space $50 per sq. foot
   (4) A.C. electrical power (2-way radio) $10 per month
   (5) D.C. electrical power $.25 per amp/volt $12/Amp
   (6) Land $4 per sq. foot

610:15-1-3. Communications services use
(a) The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education will make available the use of voice, data and video communications circuits via the fiber optics and microwave network of the Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN) OneNet to institutions of higher education, federal, state, and local government agencies and private business as long as the proposed use is of excess system capacity and it does not interfere with the regular activities of the Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN) OneNet. The voice, data and video circuits will be made available primarily for educational purposes in accordance with 70 O.S., §§ 2166 and 2167 and only to the extent that the proposed use does not interfere with the normal maintenance and operation of the Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN) OneNet. Requests to utilize the voice, data and video circuits will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis consistent with state and federal laws and regulations. (In consideration for use of the telecommunications network of the Educational Telecommunications Network (ETN) OneNet, the State Regents will develop a schedule of rates based on a case-by-case basis upon the discounted fair commercial value of the service to be provided.)
(b) The State Regents reserve the right to change the rates or cancel service with a 90-day advance notice to the user.
AGENDA ITEM #22-c:

OneNet

SUBJECT: Revision of OneNet’s Client Connection Policies.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the modifications to OneNet’s Client Connection Policies.

BACKGROUND:

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education have a long history of public/private partnerships with regard to distance learning and professional development. The original microwave-based “Talk Back T.V.” system was deployed in the early 1970s with strong support of the oil industry throughout Oklahoma. Conoco, Phillips and Halliburton all saw the need to import higher education offerings to their respective workplaces and even contributed $500,000, or 1/3rd, toward the cost of deployment. Today, the demand throughout private industry still exists.

When the network migrated to a fiber-based, Internet infrastructure, some of the companies made the transition. Halliburton continues to partner with Oklahoma State University to import Masters-level engineering programs into their workplace – further lessening the barriers associated with securing advanced from our state institutions. It has become apparent, however, that OneNet’s current client connection policies make it difficult for business and industry to access the educational opportunities on the network in that they must have some level of “sponsorship” from a higher education institution or Career Technology Center. Moreover, an exclusive relationship such as this often limits the industry’s ability to develop relationships with multiple institutions.

In an effort to streamline the process and support many of the recommendations of the Governor’s EDGE action plan, OneNet is recommending modifications to its Client Connection Policies. These modifications will enable business and industry with educational needs to participate in the network directly without the “sponsorship” of a OneNet educational institution. However, each company or organization will have to demonstrate – either through education or professional development program needs to be provided by Oklahoma’s educational institutions or distinct research needs that only OneNet can provide – a clear rationale for connectivity. This will assure that the network is not directly competing with private telephone companies and Internet Service Providers operating in the state. It is not the intent of the network to just provide Internet access, but rather to link business and industry with the educational and research resources available on the network in order to support the state’s economic development efforts.
POLICY ISSUES:

The revisions proposed do not implicate other State Regents’ policies.

ANALYSIS:

The revised Client Connection Policy contains the following modifications:

- Provides a clear understanding of the network’s intent to support the state’s economic development efforts through targeted linkages between educational institutions/resources and private enterprise.

- Provides a means to provide network access to private business enterprises or entities engaged in research or in the development of technology, to which a higher education institution within the state system has acquired an equity interest, pursuant to Article X§14(B) and §15(F) of the Oklahoma Constitution.

- Enables Research Parks, which may be defined as property-based ventures having existing or planned buildings designed primarily for private and public research and development facilities, high technology and science based companies, and support services, to have access to network resources.

- Establishes a Client Connection Policy Committee that reviews requests of entities not falling into one of the above categories, but evidencing a mission consistent with that of OneNet. The Client Connection Policy Committee will be composed of 2 members who represent the Oklahoma State Regents and OneNet (appointed by the COO of OneNet), 1 member representing the Oklahoma Department of Commerce (appointed by the Secretary of Commerce), 1 member representing the Telephone Industry (appointed by the President of the Oklahoma Telephone Association) and 1 member representing a not-for-profit Research entity (appointed by the Chancellor).

A copy of the OneNet AUP is attached.
Client Connection Policy

This policy represents a guide to the eligibility of an organization for direct connection to OneNet. The following types of organizations and institutions are eligible to utilize OneNet services:

- K-12 Schools
- Career and Technology Education Centers
- Colleges and Universities
- Courts
- Libraries
- State Agencies
- Federal Agencies*
- Hospitals and Clinics engaged in “telemedicine”***
- Political Subdivisions, including City and County Governments
- Corporations exempt from Federal taxation under Sec. 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code
- Federally recognized Tribal governments located within the State of Oklahoma. ***
- Private business enterprises or entities engaged in research or in the development of technology, to which a higher education institution within the state system has acquired an equity interest, pursuant to Article X§14(B) and §15(F) of the Oklahoma Constitution.
- Research Parks, which may be defined as a property-based ventures having existing or planned buildings designed primarily for private and public research and development facilities, high technology and science based companies, and support services. Such parks should qualify for exemption from federal taxation and must also have the feature of a contractual and/or formal ownership or operational relationship with one or more universities or other institutions of higher education, and science research. A further characteristic should be the promotion of research and development by educational entities in partnership with industry.
- Entities not falling into one of the above categories, but evidencing a mission consistent with that of OneNet, may upon demonstration of a critical need for high-speed bandwidth, be approved by the Client Connection Policy Committee on an exception basis, for a direct
connection to OneNet. The Client Connection Policy Committee is composed of 2 members who represent the Oklahoma State Regents and OneNet (appointed by the COO of OneNet), 1 member representing the Oklahoma Department of Commerce (appointed by the Secretary of Commerce), 1 member representing the Telephone Industry (appointed by the President of the Oklahoma Telephone Association) and 1 member representing a not-for-profit Research entity (appointed by the Chancellor).

As described in the OneNet Acceptable Use Policy, use of OneNet must be consistent with its mission and goals, which include facilitating and disseminating knowledge, providing public service, aiding technology transfer to Oklahoma businesses and industry for educational purposes, promoting economic development, conducting the affairs of government and building broader infrastructure in support of education and research.

Use of OneNet must also be consistent with the eligible Client’s established mission. Clients may not enable for-profit persons or entities to use OneNet for the pecuniary advantage of the for-profit entity.**** OneNet does not “police” the content that a user transmits, but places the responsibility on the authorized user to determine whether its use or the use of any sponsored entity is consistent with its mission.

OneNet IP Clients may connect a) any building on that Client’s primary premises which is under the control of the Client, b) any other premises which is owned or controlled solely by, or that is part of the Clients corporation (as an extended campus or annex) and which is connected to the Clients primary premises by a private WAN (wide area network), c) any data server on any Client premises which the Client has provisioned so as to be accessible to other OneNet Clients and or internet Clients. OneNet Clients certified by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce as business incubators may connect any tenant of the incubator facility.

Dial-up services are provided to meet the needs of qualified agencies and institutions and for agencies that do not require a dedicated circuit. OneNet dial-up access is not offered to individuals for personal use, individuals desiring such services should contact a commercial Internet Service Provider (ISP).

* “Federal Agency” means each board, commission, department, or agency of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the United States and corporations of the federal government as identified from time to time in The United States Government Manual, the official handbook of the federal government, published on an annual basis by the office of the Federal Register as a special edition of the Federal Register.

** "Hospitals" are defined as an institution, place, building or agency, in Oklahoma, public or private, whether organized for profit or not, devoted primarily to the maintenance and operations of facilities for the diagnosis, treatment or care of patients admitted for overnight stay or longer in order to obtain medical care, surgical care and obstetrical care. “Clinics” are defined as a polyclinic facility located in Oklahoma, public or private, whether organized for profit or not, where physicians work cooperatively for medical diagnosis and treatment of outpatients. “Telemedicine” is defined as use of a telecommunications system for diagnostic, clinical, consultative, data, and educational services for the delivery of health care services or related health care activities by licensed health care professionals, licensed medical professionals, and staff who function under the direction of a physician, a licensed health care professional, or hospital.
“Federally recognized tribal government” means Native American entities recognized and eligible to receive services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs.

With regard to the general prohibition against Clients permitting or enabling “for-profit persons or entities” to use OneNet for the pecuniary advantage of the for-profit entity, such prohibition is inapplicable in the instances of Research Parks, as described above, as well as in instances of higher educational institutions with an equity interest in a private entity or enterprise, as authorized by Article 10, §14(B) and/or §15(F) of the Oklahoma Constitution.
AGENDA ITEM #23:

Commendations

SUBJECT: Staff Recognitions

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept this report and commend staff and State Regents for state and national recognitions.

State Regents and staff have received the following state and national recognitions:

- **Alberto Seco**, Network Technician in OneNet, was in Sayre for hardware replacement when commercial power was interrupted late in the day. Alberto responded to a page that the hub router was down, he contacted the power company, stayed on site, and kept Public Service of Oklahoma, hub location personnel, and OneNet informed. His quick and conscientious response plus willingness to work long hours prevented dispatching generators and other equipment or tying up other technicians.

- **Chancellor Paul Risser** addressed numerous audiences in February including the Pages at the State Capitol, McAlester Rotary, TRIO Day at the Capitol, Nigh Institute Leadership Academy, OU-Tulsa Leadership Retreat, Academic Efficiencies Workshop. In March, the Chancellor addressed UCO Math and Science Department, the Oklahoma Manufacturing Alliance, Higher Education Day at the Capitol, Oklahoma’s Mesonet, Norman Noon Rotary Club, Tinker Business and Industry Park, WOSC campus tour.

- **Dr. Debra Stuart** represented the Chancellor at the Design Lab meeting for the Southern Regional Education Board’s Campaign on Adult Learning funded by the Lumina Foundation.

- **Mary Mowdy, Rick Edington, Donna Spain-Bryant, Gary Garoffolo and Dolores Mize** are to be commended for their work in both the Cash for College and College Goal Sunday projects. Cash for College, the third annual live call-in show about financial aid was produced in conjunction with OETA and was viewed by over 65,000 Oklahomans on January 27th. College Goal Sunday, held February 8th, was an opportunity for students and families, with emphasis on first-generation families, to visit one of 30 sites throughout the state to receive assistance in completing financial aid forms, learn more about the admissions process as well as other programs offered by the school to facilitate an easy transition into the higher education experience. These large
scale and successful projects were accomplished by partnering with the Oklahoma Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators and effective combined promotional campaigns.

- **Kyle Dahlem** presented at a panel session at the Department of Education (USDE) ESEA Title II, Part A State Coordinators Workshop in Washington, D.C., on March 1: "Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Challenge-State Panel on 'High-Quality Professional Development'." She also presented at the USDE Secretary's No Child Left Behind Leadership Summit: Empowering Accountability and Assessment Using Technology on March 11 in St. Louis. Her subject was "Data Driven Decision Making: A Guide for Teacher Preparation."

- **Kyle Dahlem and Tracy Fredman** made two presentations on March 9 and 10 at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual conference in Chicago on: "Evidence of Program and Teacher Quality," and "Establishing a PK-16 Assessment System Useful to All Educational Stakeholders" At this same conference, Kyle made a joint presentation with the University of Central Oklahoma faculty. “Expanding the World Within: Supporting the Development of Diverse Perspectives”.

- **Tracy Fredman** served on a featured panel entitled "Improving Teacher Quality through Partnerships: Learning from Case Studies" at the annual Association of Teacher Educators conference in Dallas on February 17th.

- **Shelley Howell**, Coordinator for Academic Affairs, presented “OSRHE Academic Policy Update” to the Oklahoma Academic Advising Association (OACADA) Spring Meeting on March 3 on the campus of Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City.

- **Phil Moss and Bryce Fair** presented updates on OSRHE policy and programs to the Oklahoma Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (OACRAO) on February 20 in Oklahoma City.

- **Chelli Gentry and Michael Yeager**, Academic Affairs Research Analysts, made a presentation on assessment, remediation, and related issues to the Oklahoma Association of College Testing Personnel (OACTP) in Weatherford on March 26th.

- **Donna Spain-Bryant**, GEAR UP public relations coordinator, recently presented three roundtable sessions at the National Council for Marketing and Public Relation's 2004 Conference in Baltimore, Maryland. The presentation, It's Never Too Early, centered on the highly successful Oklahoma GEAR UP public engagement activities. The attendees were walked through the process of creating, implementing and evaluating a comprehensive campaign that encourages young people as early as the 5th grade to start preparing for college. In addition, participants were encouraged to work closely with GEAR UP programs on their campuses and urged to request funds for public engagement in all their future grant proposals.
- **Rebecca Stokes**, Assistant Director of Communications, has been commended by the Oklahoma Department of Libraries for her past service and excellent leadership on the Advisory Council to the Oklahoma Publications Clearinghouse and has been reappointed through 2005.

It is recommended that the State Regents accept this report and commend staff for state and national efforts noted above.
AGENDA ITEM #24-a (1):

Programs.

SUBJECT: Approval of institutional requests.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve modifications to existing programs, as described below.

BACKGROUND:

University of Oklahoma (OU)
11 degree program requirement changes
2 degree program name changes
2 option additions
3 option name changes

Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU)
3 degree program requirement changes

Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU)
12 option additions
1 degree program name change
1 degree program course requirement change

POLICY ISSUES:

These actions are consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval.”

ANALYSIS:

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Electrical Engineering (061)
Degree program name change, option name change, requirement changes:
- change degree program name to “Electrical and Computer Engineering;”
- change option name to “electrical and computer engineering;”
- require at least 9 hours in major area of concentration and 9 hours ECE technical electives;
- at least half the courses (excluding dissertation hours) must be ECE, CS, or TCOM courses and require at least 30 credit hours in dissertation research;
• changes more appropriately define degree designation and allowances for current scope of specializations;
• changes will better define individual plans of study;
• no new courses will be added; and
• no new funds required.

OU – Master of Electrical Engineering (060)
Degree program name change, option name change, option addition, and requirement changes:
• change degree program name to “Electrical and Computer Engineering;”
• add option in “industrial internship;”
• change option name to “electrical and computer engineering;”
• the new option will encourage non-thesis students to interact with industry and faculty and provide them with practical experience and technical writing skills;
• course changes will allow computer science courses to be counted toward the major coursework requirements;
• options will require at least 12 hours 5000-level or higher course work in ECE and 3 hours minimum in math or physics technical electives approved by respective Master’s committee;
• changes define degree designation, allow for current scope of specializations, and better define individual plans of study;
• non-thesis option requirements will increase from 32- to 33-hour programs;
• one new course will be added; and
• no new funds required.

OU – Master of Music Education (176)
Option name change and requirement changes with option additions:
• change option name from “vocal/general” to “general;”
• add option in “piano pedagogy;”
• changes will clarify options and areas of concentration for students, faculty advisors, and employers;
• no new courses will be added; and
• no new funds required.

OU – Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education (046);
Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education (062);
Bachelor of Science in Foreign Language Education (083);
Bachelor of Science in Language Arts Education (143);
Bachelor of Science in Mathematics Education (156);
Bachelor of Science in Science Education (203);
Bachelor of Science in Social Studies Education (208); and
Bachelor of Science in Special Education (218)
Degree program requirement change:
• increase minimum GPA admission requirement from 2.50 to 2.75;
• change will position students for successful completion of the program and will meet admission requirements for the internship portion of the program;
• no new courses will be added; and
no new funds required.

NWOSU – Bachelor of Science in Nursing (047)
Degree program requirement changes:
- change Nursing Concepts of Family Care 3138 course to two separate four-credit hour courses (Nursing Concepts of Family Care-Obstetrics 3154 and Nursing Concepts of Family Care-Pediatrics 3144);
- changes will simplify student understanding and differentiation of the courses’ content and also clarify grading issues between the distinct subject areas;
- change Nursing Concepts of Mental Health 3216 course to two separate courses (Nursing Concepts of Mental Health I 3222 and Nursing Concepts of Mental Health II 3225);
- changes will allow students more clinical/care plan writing experience prior to clinical experiences and will allow better flow of content from basic to complex;
- change Community Centered Nursing 4205 course to Community Centered Nursing 4204 (reducing one credit hour requirement);
- requested changes are in response to recommendations by the Oklahoma Board of Nursing to enhance clinical experiences;
- no new courses will be added; and
- no new funds required.

NWOSU – Bachelor of Science in Mass Communication (052)
Degree program requirement changes:
- increase required credit hours for degree majors from 48 to 53, and for major/minor students, increase required credit hours from 67 to 72;
- add MCOM 2013 Web Programming as a required course;
- add MCOM 4461 Mass Communication Senior Seminar as a required course;
- changes will better prepare students for workforce and increase overall quality of program and assessment procedures; and
- additional funds required will come from student tuition.

NWOSU – Bachelor of Science in General Studies (016)
Degree program requirement changes:
- restructure curriculum providing a choice of four areas of concentration from five possible areas: arts and humanities, natural sciences, business, behavioral sciences, or applied behavioral science; and
- no new courses or faculty will be added; and
- no new funds required.

SWOSU – Bachelor of Science in Recreation Leadership (049)
Degree program name change, option additions, and requirement changes:
- change degree program name to “Parks and Recreation Management;”
- add six options in “aquatics,” “fitness,” “outdoor education,” “park law enforcement,” “sports and recreation activity,” and “sports and athletic management;”
• HPER 353 Methods and Materials in Elementary will be deleted as a required course and will be restructured to be consistent with options added; and
• changes will provide more specialization areas to meet student demand;
• nine new courses will be added and the Internship in Professional Recreation course will increase from 3 to 13 credit hours; and
• additional funds required will come from student tuition.

SWOSU – Master of Education in Education (064)
Option additions:
• add options in “health sciences and microbiology,” “parks and recreation management,” and “sports management;”
• option additions will expand graduate offerings under the Master of Education program into fields of study unavailable in southwestern Oklahoma;
• six new courses will be added; and
• no new funds required.

SWOSU – Master of Music Education (099)
Option additions:
• add options in “choral emphasis,” “instrumental emphasis,” and “piano pedagogy emphasis;”
• the new options will provide students an opportunity to continue studies at the graduate level, prepare students to become more effective music teachers, and prepare students for advanced studies at the doctoral level;
• no new courses will be added; and
• no new funds required.
AGENDA ITEM #24-a (2):

Programs.

SUBJECT: Ratification of approved institutional request.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the approved modifications to existing programs, as described below.

BACKGROUND:

University of Oklahoma (OU)

6 course requirement changes

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval.”

ANALYSIS:

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Aerospace Engineering (007)
Doctor of Philosophy in Mechanical Engineering (160)

Course requirement changes:

- decrease required coursework from 48 credit hours to at least 42 credit hours by reducing the mathematics/science required coursework from 12 credit hours to 6 credit hours;
- changes provide flexibility in choice of courses;
- changes are consistent with peer institutions;
- no courses will be deleted or added; and
- no new funds required.

OU – Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering (006)
Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering (159)

Course requirement changes:

- decrease the mathematics requirement from 6 credit hours to at least 3 credit hours;
- increase approved courses from other fields from 6 credit hours to 9 credit hours;
- changes provide flexibility in choice of courses;
- changes are consistent with peer institutions;
• no courses will be deleted or added; and
• no new funds required.

OU – Master of Liberal Studies in Liberal Studies (232)
Course requirement change:
• permit students to complete 6 hours of advanced, focused courses and complete a Comprehensive Examination in lieu of LSTD 5940 (Research Project), LSTD 5950 (Internship), or LSTD 5980 (Thesis);
• change will enable students to complete their degree in an efficient and timely manner and addresses nontraditional student needs for flexible requirements;
• no courses will be deleted or added; and
• no new funds required.

OU – Master of Education in School Counseling (258)
Course requirement change:
• eliminate 3-hour elective requirement;
• offer choice of EIPT 5163 or EIPT 5173 in lieu of EIPT 5113;
• add a 2-semester internship requirement;
• change provides more individually appropriate developmental coursework and meets NCATE and CACREP accreditation standards;
• no courses will be deleted or added; and
• no new funds required.
AGENDA ITEM #24-a (3):

Programs.

SUBJECT: Ratification of approved institutional requests to suspend degree programs.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify approved institutional requests to suspend existing academic programs, as detailed below.

BACKGROUND:

Murray State College (MSC) requests authorization to suspend the Associate in Applied Science in Engineering Technology (052).

Northern Oklahoma College (NOC) requests authorization to suspend the Associate in Science in Arts and Sciences (027) Interdisciplinary Education Option (electronic delivery).

Tulsa Community College (TCC) requests authorization to suspend the Associate in Applied Science in Desktop Publishing (216) and the Certificate in Desktop Publishing (217).

Western Oklahoma State College (WOSC) requests authorization to suspend the Associate in Applied Science in Medical Lab Technician (046).

POLICY ISSUES:

Suspending programs is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Review,” which was revised at the January 29, 1999 meeting to include a “suspend” category for academic programs. Students may not be recruited or admitted into suspended programs. Additionally, suspended programs may not be listed in institutional catalogs and will be reinstated or deleted within three years.

ANALYSIS:

Murray State College

MSC requests suspension of the Associate in Applied Science in Engineering Technology (052). MSC reports high operational costs and a steady decline in student interest. The program suspension will allow time to review and reorganize current cooperative agreements for current options within the degree program and assess the program’s viability. Five students remain in the program and will graduate in May 2004. It is understood that in accordance with the Program Review Policy, no students will be recruited or admitted to the program, and the program will not be listed in the college catalog. It is further understood MSC will reinstate or delete the suspended program by March 12, 2007.
Northern Oklahoma College
NOC requests suspension of the Associate in Science in Arts and Sciences (027) Interdisciplinary Education Option (electronic delivery). The program is low performing and NOC administration indicates the demand for the program is low. The institution requests suspension of the program while the demand for electronic programs in this area is reassessed. No students remain in the program. No courses will be deleted. It is understood that in accordance with the Program Review Policy, no students will be recruited or admitted to this program, and the program will not be listed in the college catalog. It is further understood that NOC will reinstate or delete the suspended program by March 23, 2007.

Tulsa Community College
TCC requests suspension of the Associate in Applied Science (AAS) in Desktop Publishing (216) and the Certificate in Desktop Publishing (217). TCC reports the department has been challenged in keeping enough enrollments in the programs to prevent cancellation. Therefore, they are opting for suspension to allow them time to evaluate and redesign the programs to attract more students. Fifteen students remain in the AAS program while three students remain in the certificate program. All students will be advised to other programs. It is understood that in accordance with the Program Review Policy, no students will be recruited or admitted to these programs, and the programs will not be listed in the college catalog. It is further understood TCC will reinstate or delete the suspended programs by March 5, 2007.

Western Oklahoma State College
WOSC requests suspension of the Associate in Applied Science in Medical Lab Technician (046). The institution requests suspension of the program while conducting a survey of southwestern Oklahoma for available medical support, jobs, and turnover rates prior to activating the program and expanding resources for faculty and equipment. There are no students in the program. It is understood that in accordance with the Program Review Policy, no students will be recruited or admitted to this program, and the program will not be listed in the college catalog. It is further understood WOSC will reinstate or delete the suspended program by February 27, 2007.

Authorization was granted by the Chancellor for the above requests. State Regents’ ratification is requested.
AGENDA ITEM #24-a (4):

Programs.

SUBJECT: Approval of institutional requests for final approval and review schedule extension for existing programs.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve institutional requests for final approval of degree programs and review schedule extension for existing degree programs, as detailed below.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents approve new programs provisionally with institutionally established and State Regents approved criteria to be met prior to final approval. Examples of final program approval criteria include: minimum number of enrollments, graduates, and/or full-time equivalent enrollments (FTEs); accreditation from a regional or national accrediting agency; post-graduation employment rates; specific academic achievement profiles; and/or minimum ranking or pass rates on standardized tests or licensure examinations.

A summary of the recommendations is provided below. The accompanying table outlines the criteria, productivity, and recommendations for each degree program.

POLICY ISSUES:

These actions are consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval.”

ANALYSIS:

As noted above, the following recommendations are included in the table (Attachment A), which lists the degree program, date of approval, criteria established by the institution and approved by the State Regents, productivity level, status of other criteria, and recommendations for the program.

Recommendation: Final Approval

Oklahoma State University (OSU)

- Bachelor of Science in Aerospace Engineering (424)

This program exceeded the productivity criteria (achieved 170 enrolled, over the 30 required and 17 graduates over the ten required). The program has been a success, remains strong, and continues to grow. The Industrial Advisory Board and employers of the program’s graduates provide strong support. Strong enrollment demonstrates student demand for the program. Final approval is recommended.
Oklahoma State University Technical Branch-Okmulgee (OSUTB-OKM)
• Associate in Applied Science in Orthotics and Prosthetics (089)
This program exceeded the enrollment criterion (achieved 50 enrolled, over the 20 required) and achieved the graduate criterion (12 graduates required). OSUTB-OKM indicates the program has been featured in several national trade magazines, including O&P Business News, O&P Business World, and O&P Edge. The program is actively supported by an industry advisory committee and a strong retention program is in place to increase the graduation rate. Strong enrollment demonstrates student demand for the program. Final approval is recommended.

University of Central Oklahoma (UCO)
• Master of Science in Forensic Sciences (179)
This program exceeded the productivity criteria (achieved 59 enrolled, over the 35 required and achieved 28 graduates, over the nine required). UCO has demonstrated strong student demand for the program. Final approval is recommended.

Oklahoma City Community College (OCCC)
• Associate in Arts in Liberal Studies (128)
This program exceeded the productivity criteria (achieved 239 enrolled, over the 26 required and achieved eight graduates, over the six required). OCCC indicates this is a viable program meeting the students’ needs as evidenced by the large number of identified majors. Final approval is recommended.

Oklahoma City Community College (OCCC)
• Certificate in Computer Science: Network Technician (121)
This program exceeded the productivity criteria (achieved 34 enrolled, over the 15 required and achieved 30 graduates, over the ten required), and survey results indicated a 96 percent satisfaction rate among students (over the 90 percent satisfaction rate required). OCCC indicates this is a viable program meeting the students’ needs. Final approval is recommended.

Oklahoma City Community College (OCCC)
• Certificate in Computer Science: Microcomputer Technician (122)
This program did not meet the enrollment criterion (achieved ten enrolled rather than the 15 required) but exceeded the graduation criterion (achieved 31 graduates, over the ten required), and survey results indicate 96 percent student satisfaction with the program (over the 90 percent satisfaction rate required). OCCC indicates the low number of enrollment is misleading as evidenced by the number of graduates in the program, and is a result of most graduates in this certificate program declaring the Associate in Applied Science in Computer Science as their official major. OCCC believes this is a viable program meeting the students’ needs. Final approval is recommended.

Seminole State College (SSC)
• Associate in Arts in Child Development (228); and
• Certificate in Child Development (229)
After the associate in arts (AA) program was granted an extension in December 2002, the AA and certificate programs exceeded the enrollment criteria (AA program achieved 86 enrolled, over the 26 required and the certificate program achieved 31 over the 12 required). The AA program expects 13 graduates (over the eight required) and the certificate program surpassed the graduate criterion (22 over the six required). SSC has demonstrated strong student demand for the program and it serves a critical need in the service area, supporting a State Regents’ initiative with the Department of Human Services to prepare qualified child care providers. Final approval is recommended.
Tulsa Community College (TCC)
- Associate in Applied Science in Veterinary Technology (227)

At the September 2001 State Regents’ meeting, this program was granted an extension. This program did not meet the enrollment criterion (achieved 27 of the 40 required) but exceeded the graduate criterion (achieved 11 over the ten required graduates). The program is strong with more appropriate enrollment expectations at 30 (rather than 40), considering the program requirements, faculty resources, and facilities available. TCC reports 100 percent success rates for graduates taking national and state certification examinations. The program continues to grow and meets a need in the area. Final approval is recommended.

Tulsa Community College (TCC)
- Certificate in Health Information Technology (237)

This program met the enrollment criterion (achieved 24 over the 15 required) but did not meet the graduate criterion (achieved three of the six required); however, the program has graduated 21 students since 2001. The program is closely associated with the Associate in Applied Science in Health Information Technology (159), and has strong support in the local industry. Since enrollment and graduation rates are strong, final approval is recommended.

**Recommendation: Review Schedule Extension**

Western Oklahoma State College (WOSC)
- Associate in Applied Science in PC Hardware/Networking Specialist (059)

This program did not meet the productivity criteria (achieved 25 of the 30 required enrollments and achieved two of the seven required graduates). The advisory committee indicates strong local demand for the program. WOSC will continue to improve and update the program to attract local students. Extension of the review schedule is recommended with continuation beyond fall 2007 dependent upon meeting the following criteria:

- **Stipulations:**
  - ✓ Majors enrolled: 30 in fall 2006; and
  - ✓ Graduates: 7 in 2006-07.
## Productivity Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Headcount Enrollment</th>
<th>FTE/Other</th>
<th>Program Reviews</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU – BS Aerospace Engineering (424)</td>
<td>06/30/00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2004 2009</td>
<td>Final Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>F03</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUTB-OKM – AAS Orthotics and Prosthetics (089)</td>
<td>05/28/99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2004 2009</td>
<td>Final Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>F03</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCO – MS Forensic Sciences (179)</td>
<td>06/30/99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2004 2009</td>
<td>Final Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>F03</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC – AA Liberal Studies (128)</td>
<td>06/30/00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2004 2009</td>
<td>Final Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>F03</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>Graduates Criteria</td>
<td>Graduates Achieved</td>
<td>Headcount Enrollment Criteria</td>
<td>Headcount Enrollment Achieved</td>
<td>FTE/Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC – Certificate in Computer Science: Network Technician (121)</td>
<td>05/28/99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90 percent of graduates will indicate overall satisfaction with competencies learned in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC – Certificate in Computer Science: Microcomputer Technician (122)</td>
<td>05/28/99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90 percent of graduates will indicate overall satisfaction with competencies learned in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC – AA Child Development (228)</td>
<td>06/30/00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ext. granted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Headcount Enrollment</td>
<td>FTE/Other</td>
<td>Program Reviews</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC – Certificate in Child Development (229)</td>
<td>12/01/00</td>
<td>6/02-03</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12/00 F03</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC – AAS in Veterinary Technology (227)</td>
<td>6/30/98</td>
<td>10/00-01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40/00 F00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ext. granted 9/14/01</td>
<td>10/02-03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40/00 F03</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC – Certificate in Health Information Technology (237)</td>
<td>08/27/99</td>
<td>6/00-01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15/00 F00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Headcount Enrollment</td>
<td>FTE/Other</td>
<td>Program Reviews</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Last Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC – AAS PC Hardware/Networking Specialist (059)</td>
<td>05/26/00</td>
<td>7 02-03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 F03</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ext. granted 09/14/01</td>
<td>6 02-03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 F03</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


AGENDA ITEM #24-b:

Cooperative Agreement.

SUBJECT: Ratification of approved institutional request regarding cooperative agreements.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify Western Oklahoma State College’s (WOSC) request, as detailed below.

BACKGROUND:

In 1988, the State Regents approved the “Guidelines for Approval of Cooperative Agreements Between Technology Centers and Colleges.” The policy was designed to expand Oklahomans’ educational opportunities and to encourage colleges and technology centers to develop resource-sharing partnerships. The policy guides the creation of cooperative agreements between Oklahoma’s colleges and technology centers. Currently, 322 cooperative agreements (involving 117 associate in applied science programs) are offered through 18 colleges and 29 career technology centers (CTC) and 2 out-of-state CTCs.

At the January 24, 1997 meeting, the State Regents approved revisions to the Cooperative Agreement Policy that allow high school students meeting specified requirements to enroll in cooperative agreements.

WOSC requests authorization for a cooperative agreement with Red River Technology Center (RRTC). This cooperative agreement will allow students to receive college credit for coursework completed at the technology center toward the Associate in Applied Science in Nursing (040), as detailed below.

POLICY ISSUES:

These actions are consistent with the State Regents’ “Guidelines for Approval of Cooperative Agreements.”

ANALYSIS:

Western Oklahoma State College

WOSC requests authorization to establish a cooperative agreement with RRTC, whereby students may earn up to 18 credit hours toward the Associate in Applied Science in Nursing (040). Courses at RRTC comply with accreditation standards of the Oklahoma Board of Nursing and the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission.
It is understood that general education courses required for this degree program will not be offered as part of this agreement, and high school students will be permitted to enroll in accordance with State Regents’ policy.

Institutional and RRTC faculty and staff will serve on an oversight and evaluation committee for the cooperative agreement. The committee will meet at least annually to review course content, relevance, and instructional methods as related to the established course and program competencies.

Approval was granted by the Chancellor. State Regents’ ratification is requested.
AGENDA ITEM #24-c:

Electronic Media.

SUBJECT: Ratification of the approval of courses for the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Electronic Campus.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the approval of courses for inclusion in the SREB Electronic Campus.

BACKGROUND:

The SREB Electronic Campus was created in 1997 as an “electronic marketplace” for courses, programs and services offered electronically by accredited colleges and universities in the SREB member states. At the September 5, 1997 meeting, the State Regents approved the inclusion of three courses from Oklahoma institutions in the Electronic Campus pilot offerings for spring 1998. Over time, participation in the program has expanded, and the State Regents have periodically approved inclusion of programs and courses from Oklahoma institutions.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ “Policy and Procedures Pertaining to the Electronic Delivery of Courses and Programs.” While the comprehensive universities are functioned to offer courses and programs out of state, this policy allows for other institutions to offer courses out of state with State Regents’ approval.

ANALYSIS:

In 1996, the SREB began plans to develop the Electronic Campus (originally called the Electronic Common Market), a distance education consortium. The Electronic Campus serves as a centralized listing of approved distance education courses and programs from participating SREB states; thus, it does not grant credit or degrees. Institutions provide the education and services, and as such determine tuition and fees, set enrollment procedures, and provide related student services. The Electronic Campus has continued to expand and now lists over 7,040 courses and 250 degree programs from more than 250 colleges and universities in the south.

A proposal for new Electronic Campus offerings has been received from Oklahoma City Community College (OCCC) comprising 3 individual courses. Offerings from Oklahoma institutions listed within the Electronic Campus now total 373 courses and 12 programs.
OCCC has provided information concerning the quality of the courses to be offered and has affirmed that the submission complies fully with the Electronic Campus *Principles of Good Practice*.

Authorization was granted by the Chancellor for the above request. State Regents’ ratification is requested.

Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Course Listing</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>AOT 2473</td>
<td>Office/Acct Spreadsheet Apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 1613</td>
<td>Early Western Civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISEC 2513</td>
<td>Principles of Information Assurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #24-d:

Capital.


RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the capital allotments made during the period of January 27, 2004, through March 17, 2004.

BACKGROUND:

The Chancellor has been authorized by the State Regents to approve routine changes and allot funds for capital projects subject to ratification at the next scheduled meeting. A listing summarizing allotments for the period January 27, 2004, through March 14, 2004, is attached. This listing is provided to the Regents for ratification.

POLICY ISSUES:

State Regents’ Delegation of Authority Policy (II-1-25.1) authorizes the Chancellor to approve routine changes to capital projects and to allot funds for capital projects.

ANALYSIS:

The attached listing includes allotments made from State Funds, Section 13/New College Funds and Section 13 Offset Funds. The total amount of capital allotments made for this period is $6,476,732, $2,520,119 in Section 13/New College allotments and $3,956,613 in State Fund allotments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Resolution No</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Date Awarded</th>
<th>Section 13/New College Amounts</th>
<th>State Fund</th>
<th>Totals by Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>ISU-New College</td>
<td>HSC People Soft Equipment</td>
<td>2/20/2004</td>
<td>463,062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>463,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>HSC HIPAA Equipment Acquisitions</td>
<td>2/20/2004</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>943,062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>943,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>4421</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Research &amp; Teaching Lab</td>
<td>2/26/2004</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>2,343,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>General Campus Maintenance</td>
<td>2/26/2004</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>OSU Transit Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>2/13/2004</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Oklahoma Tech Park</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>643,098</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>2,343,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU - Oklahoma City</td>
<td>4424</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Facilities Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>2/26/2004</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4226</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Alarm System Upgrades</td>
<td>3/11/2004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>236,053</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central University</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>General Campus Maintenance, Renovation, ADA</td>
<td>1/30/2004</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4416</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>General Campus Maintenance, Renovation, ADA</td>
<td>1/30/2004</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern OK State University</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Modification to HVAC</td>
<td>2/9/2004</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4423</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Instructional Furniture &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>2/25/2004</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4423</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Library Expansion</td>
<td>2/25/2004</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>161,253</td>
<td>161,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern OK State University</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>General Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>3/9/2004</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Resolution No.</td>
<td>Source of Funds</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Date Allocated</td>
<td>Section 13/New College Amounts</td>
<td>State Fund</td>
<td>Totals by Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4422</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>OSI/CDC/Federal Programs</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2/13/2004</td>
<td>316,040</td>
<td>423,368</td>
<td>523,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4422</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Water Lab</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2/13/2004</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4422</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2/13/2004</td>
<td>100,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>423,368</td>
<td>523,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston University</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-Section 13</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3/1/2004</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3/1/2004</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Panhandle</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Instructional Equipment &amp; Materials</td>
<td>3/3/2004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Instructional Equipment &amp; Materials</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Equipment &amp; Materials</td>
<td>1/26/2004</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Science</td>
<td>4427</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Campus Administrative Software and Equipment</td>
<td>3/11/2004</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Arts of OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern OK State</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Repair &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Technology Repair</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Signage/Parking/Security</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Institutional Furniture</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Pool Building Upgrade</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Academic Equipment</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Oklahoma</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Library Acquisitions-Endid</td>
<td>1/28/2004</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Computer Software and Fees</td>
<td>1/28/2004</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Computers and Networking</td>
<td>1/28/2004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Computers and Networking - Stillwater</td>
<td>1/28/2004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Campus Dining Facility - Endid</td>
<td>1/28/2004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Instruction: Equipment &amp; Furniture</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Instruction: Equipment &amp; Furniture-Stillwater</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Purchase Vehicles</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Resolution No</td>
<td>Source of Funds</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Date Allotted</td>
<td>Section 13/New College Amounts</td>
<td>State Fund</td>
<td>Totals by Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>660-Section 13</td>
<td>Library Acquisitions</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Dorm: Furniture &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>660-Section 13</td>
<td>Dorm: Furniture &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>660-Section 13</td>
<td>Computers &amp; Networking</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>660-Section 13</td>
<td>Computers &amp; Networking - Stillwater</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>660-Section 13</td>
<td>Instruction: Equipment &amp; Furniture - Pross Tech</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>20,865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>660-Section 13</td>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>3/15/2004</td>
<td>3,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>273,959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>273,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern OK A&amp;M College</td>
<td>4419</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Equipment &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>4418</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Remodel 2nd &amp; 3rd Floor, Main Building</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>19,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4418</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>South Facility</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>93,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112,267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole State College</td>
<td>4417</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Renovations/Furnishings of Facilities</td>
<td>1/28/2004</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4417</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2/6/2004</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4417</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Equipment &amp; Equipment Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3/10/2004</td>
<td>758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>4425</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Tech. Center &amp; Computer Training Facility</td>
<td>2/27/2004</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4425</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Classroom/Program Renovation</td>
<td>2/27/2004</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,520,119</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,956,613</td>
<td>$6,476,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #24-e (1):

Agency Operations.

_Not Available Electronically._
Not Available Electronically.
Not Available Electronically.
AGENDA ITEM #24-e (2):

Agency Operations.

_Not Available Electronically._
WHEREAS, Meldean Turley was employed by the State Regents in 1987; and

WHEREAS, Meldean Turley retired on February 29, 2004 from her position as Interventions Specialist III; and

WHEREAS, Meldean Turley set a wonderful example of employee citizenship and leadership, organizational stewardship, student advocacy and education;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE State Regents express appreciation to Meldean Turley for her exemplary service and contribution to the organizational mission of the Oklahoma Guaranteed Student Loan Program and for her many years of dedicated service.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that best wishes and sincere thanks of the State Regents and the Chancellor go with Meldean as she enters retirement.

Joseph E. Cappy, Secretary

Marlin "Ike" Glass, Chairman

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct statement of action taken by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education on April 1, 2004.

Paul G. Risser, Chancellor
AGENDA ITEM #24-g:

Department of Human Services.

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Human Services

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents (1) approve the attached Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Human Services and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to administer the Teacher Education and Compensation Helps (TEACH) scholarship program, and (2) approve three FTE positions (funded through the Department of Human Services) to support this effort.

BACKGROUND:

In an effort to improve the quality of care children receive in licensed child care facilities, increase teacher educational levels, compensation, and improve retention, the Department of Human Services has entered into a contract with the State Regents, on an annual basis, since June 2000. The annual contract allows two-year colleges to, among other things, offer specialized academic and support programs and to recruit licensed child care providers as a way to encourage child care professionals to further their education in the field of early childhood/child development. A statewide initiative named, “Scholars for Excellence in Child Care”, was established to refer to those programs being offered pursuant to the contract with DHS. Each of the twelve two-year colleges as well as Oklahoma State University-OKC has a Scholars program in place.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ commitment to the enhancement of educational opportunities-Brain Gain 2010, as well as encourage coordination/cooperation between State Regents, system institutions, and other state agencies.

ANALYSIS:

The Department of Human Services (DHS) has demonstrated a genuine commitment to maintaining the child care infrastructure supported by “Reaching for the Stars” and the “Scholars for Excellence in Child Care” program. Together these initiatives have contributed to improved quality of care delivered to children across the state of Oklahoma. Specifically, the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program has successfully recruited, mentored and supported over 2,000 child care teachers/directors. An equally important component, the Teacher Education and Compensation Helps (TEACH) scholarship, currently managed by the
Center for Early Childhood Development at the University of Oklahoma’s College of Continuing Education, provides scholarships, books, release time, and bonuses to child care teachers and directors enrolled in state system two-year colleges and technology centers.

Given DHS’s desire to eliminate duplication of effort, identify cost efficiencies in light of budget constraints, and, at the same time, maintain and improve the quality of services available to child care staff through the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program, the Director of DHS asked the Chancellor to broaden the State Regents current scholarship offerings by assuming responsibility for administering and managing the TEACH scholarship program in conjunction with the Scholars program. The Director’s justification for this move included the following advantages:

- The Scholars for Excellence in Child Care initiative has improved the quality of care received by Oklahoma’s children attending licensed child care facilities.
- Scholar coordinators located in each of the two-year colleges already review scholarship applications to ensure that all needed documentation is provided. Scholar coordinators also have a working relationship with the Scholars program participants and are in the best position to evaluate needs, abilities and progress, and, as a result, can provide more individualized customer service.
- The State Regents successfully operate multiple scholarship programs and have the staff resources to evaluate each scholarship’s components. Regents’ staff experience in entering data from other scholarship programs and identifying errors and variations will be advantageous.
- Due to their formal relationship with college officials, the State Regents’ staff have been successful in influencing many aspects of the early childhood curriculum and general course offerings. This relationship can also lead to improvements in articulation agreements between institutions.
- State Regents’ staff have long established relationships with each institution’s financial aid office and can facilitate electronic payments for tuition, fees and books.
- The creation of a web-based application developed for data collection for the Scholars program will allow for exchange of information between the financial aid officers, scholar coordinators, and DHS and State Regents’ staff. Using a common reporting system will ensure consistency of data between the two programs.
- While budgets have not been finalized, it is anticipated that a considerable savings in administrative costs will result by combing the TEACH scholarship and Scholars programs.

To accomplish this goal, the attached Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) formalizes the agreement with DHS and allows the Chancellor to hire staff (funded through DHS) and perform all necessary tasks in order to ensure the TEACH scholarship program can be fully operational by July 1. A timeline is included in the MOU to assist in this effort. State Regents staff proposed a budget for two months of operation (May and June) that has been submitted and approved by DHS to allow for this transition period. The monies attributable to the transition will be available through the current FY04 Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program contract with DHS.

A contract outlining the specific details of the scholarship program along with the finalized budget for FY05 will be presented to the State Regents for approval at their May 28 meeting.

Attachment
MEMORANDUM
OF UNDERSTANDING

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into this 18 day of March by and between the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (DHS) and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (State Regents).

WHEREAS, DHS and the State Regents have a history of contractual relationships and are currently parties to a contract effective July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004. Said contract provides for DHS to fund and the State Regents to administer the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program at State System two-year colleges.

WHEREAS, the Teacher Education and Compensation Helps (TEACH) scholarship program, also funded by DHS and an integral piece of the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program, is currently administered through the Center for Early Childhood Professional Development (CECPD) under the auspices of the University of Oklahoma’s College of Continuing Education.

WHEREAS, DHS, in an effort to generate cost savings, is seeking to reduce duplication of services and enhance effectiveness of the scholarship initiative.

WHEREAS, the State Regents have expertise in effectively and efficiently administering various student scholarship programs and have demonstrated proficiency in the administration of the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program.

WHEREAS, DHS and the State Regents’ staff have had discussions regarding the practicability of the State Regents administering the TEACH scholarship program in conjunction with the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program which would reduce overall cost to DHS and provide for more continuity and cohesiveness by further linking the two programs.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the above, the parties agree that it would, in fact, be in the best interest for DHS to fund and the State Regents to administer the scholarship program beginning July 1, 2004.

IT IS AGREED THAT:

The parties will enter into a contract, not to exceed the sum of $1,138,000 for purposes of DHS funding and the State Regents administering the scholarship program in conjunction with the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program beginning July 1, 2004, effective for FY05, for approval by the State Regents at their May 28 meeting.

The parties will utilize the timetable below to provide for a smooth transition of the scholarship program and an operational date for administration by the State Regents of July 1, 2004.

- Meetings with DHS staff (February – May) to:
  - Review/design specific scholarship details (March – May)
  - Design job descriptions for staff members (March)
  - Collaborate on contract language (March – May)
- Meet with DHS staff and CECPD Director regarding transition process (February – June)
- Advertise and hire three staff (March-April)
- Locate and ready space for staff members (April)
- Implement transition plan (April – June)

Howard Hendrick, Director
Department of Human Services

Paul G. Risser, Chancellor
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
AGENDA ITEM #24-h:

Department of Education Grant.

SUBJECT: Acceptance of congressionally-authorized grant.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents authorize the Chancellor to accept a congressionally-authorized grant from the U.S. Department of Education totaling $49,705.00 to support distance learning expansion in North Central Oklahoma.

BACKGROUND:

Ponca City, Oklahoma, like many other cities throughout the country, recognizes the unique opportunities available through technology and telecommunications and their integration into the community. As the nation’s economy becomes more knowledge-based, it is paramount that cities and communities embrace technology as a means of increasing intellectual capital that will ultimately position them to compete economically and to provide an enhanced quality of life for their citizenry. This notwithstanding, limited bandwidth at the local level and lack of community expertise combined with the high costs associated with the development of a high-tech infrastructure often make technology and advanced telecommunications unattainable.

In an effort to establish a state-of-the-art telecommunications infrastructure to support distance-learning expansion in Ponca City and surrounding areas, a diverse group of public and private partners came together to apply for a grant through the U.S. Department of Education. On April 1, 2001, a congressionally-authorized grant totaling $4,564,000 was received by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to provide broadband telecommunications connectivity and access from Ponca City to state, national, and international locations. Specifically, the funding targeted the creation of the necessary telecommunications framework to support the delivery of distance learning resources for all levels of education, including continuing education and workforce training as well as economic development.

Subsequent to the grant award, a non-profit corporation, Cimarron Broadband Project, Inc., was created to serve as the lead local agency. The Cimarron Broadband Project works with the City of Ponca City, through its Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB), and both groups are involved in Economic Development promotion on behalf of the community. The EDAB, which is a municipal entity, also operates in a joint venture method with other community groups and agencies such as the Ponca City Technology Accelerator, a high tech
business incubator, to create new employment opportunities and capital investment for the community and area.

In general, the OneNet/Ponca City, OK Bandwidth Project partnership consists of entities and individuals that represent state and local government, education, economic development, telecommunications carriers and the private sector. In addition, innovative approaches have been deployed that meet the needs of all the stakeholders through the establishment of a high speed Internet hub in a rural area of the nation; one that will serve each sector at levels which are considered necessary, but currently unavailable. The outcome of the grant initiative is designed to provide the area with advanced capabilities of delivering much-needed educational services and programs to its residents while increasing the area’s viability as a competitive participant in the dynamic and rapidly changing global marketplace.

POLICY ISSUES:

The State Regents are authorized (70:3206) to “accept Federal grants and use the same in accordance with Federal requirements; and accept and disburse grants, gifts, devises, bequests and other monies and property from foundations, corporations and individuals. . .”

This action is consistent with State Regents leadership on federal initiatives and economic development goals. Further, it fulfils the State Regents’ role in coordinating federal, state, and local resources toward the goal of student success, teacher preparation, and technology immersion.

ANALYSIS:

This grant award is designed to enhance the scope of the initial Congressional grant by providing additional technology components to expand broadband telecommunications connectivity North Central Oklahoma. The primary commitment of this funding is to enhance the infrastructure to provide bandwidth and resources for distance learning and for supporting research and development opportunities within the existing project.

By continuing to expand the wide area network in the North Central region of Oklahoma, the state will have the ability to provide increased distance learning and economic development opportunities to its rural citizens – further increasing its viability in the global marketplace. To be more precise, the project’s focus is to support education and potential economic opportunities that contain unique linkages between both State and Federal programs associated with education (K-12, Higher Education and technical training).
AGENDA ITEM #24-i:

Department of Tourism.

SUBJECT: Acceptance of transfer of funds in the Quartz Mountain Revolving Fund from the Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department (Tourism) for construction remediation at the Quartz Mountain Arts and Conference Center.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the agreement to act as the fiscal agent and to accept the transfer of funds in the Quartz Mountain Revolving Fund from the Oklahoma Department of Tourism and Recreation, as described in the agreement between the Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Commission, the Oklahoma Department of Central Services, the Quartz Mountain Arts and Conference Center Board of Trustees and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

BACKGROUND:

The Quartz Mountain Revolving fund, which was originally established at the Oklahoma and Recreation Commission (Tourism) for the restricted use of construction at Quartz Mountain, was not included in the initial Quartz Mountain funding transfer, as the construction contract dispute and finalization remained the responsibility of Tourism. Subsequently, the construction contract was terminated by the Attorney General’s office and Tourism by agreement retained $614,168.09 in the fund for the sole purpose of completion and repair of the Quartz Mountain Lodge and Conference Center. Ultimately more than $614,168.09 may be required to complete and repair the Quartz Mountain Lodge due to the severity of the problems that arose from construction, but this amount is equal to the contract retainage as specified in the construction contract and was the amount the Tourism was required to hold.

POLICY ISSUES:

The recommendation is consistent with Regents’ policy and actions.

ANALYSIS:

Attached is the proposed agreement for transfer of the Quartz Mountain Revolving Funds. The total funds, $614,168.09, will be transferred to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to act as the fiscal agent on behalf of the Quartz Mountain Center Board of Trustees. The funds by agreement are restricted to Quartz Mountain Lodge and Conference Center construction remediation.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT, CONSENT TO AND ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSFER OF FUNDS IN QUARTZ MOUNTAIN REVOLVING FUND (FUND 235) CURRENTLY HELD BY THE OKLAHOMA TOURISM AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT TO THE OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ON BEHALF OF THE QUARTZ MOUNTAIN ARTS AND CONFERENCE CENTER AND NATURE PARK BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THIS ACKNOWLEDGMENT, CONSENT TO AND ACCEPTANCE OF TRANSFER (“TRANSFER”) OF FUNDS IN QUARTZ MOUNTAIN REVOLVING FUND (FUND 235), effective February ___, 2004 by and among the OKLAHOMA TOURISM AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT (“OTRD”), the OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (“OSRHE”), THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE QUARTZ MOUNTAIN ARTS AND CONFERENCE CENTER AND NATURE PARK (“QM CENTER TRUSTEES) and THE DEPARTMENT OF CENTRAL SERVICES (“DCS”).

RECITALS:

WHEREAS, OTRD has $614,168.09 in the Quartz Mountain Revolving Fund (Fund 235) which is being held for completion and repair of the Quartz Mountain Lodge and Conference Center as agreed to and memorialized in a letter between OTRD and the Office of Attorney General for the State of Oklahoma, dated January 21, 2003.

WHEREAS, that amount of $614,168.09, is without interest, and is the total sum of funds held by OTRD for the purpose of completion and repair of the Quartz Mountain Lodge and Conference Center; and,

WHEREAS OSRHE and QM Center Trustees have agreed to accept the funds and use them solely for the purpose of completion and repair of the Quartz Mountain Lodge and Conference Center.

WHEREAS, DCS, OSRHE, QM CENTER TRUSTEES and OTRD agree that any rights among the parties, as might be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction resulting from pending or future litigation regarding the construction of the Quartz Mountain Lodge, will not be affected by this agreement; and,

WHEREAS DCS will work with the OSRHE and the QM CENTER TRUSTEES to issue contracts and approve payment as appropriate from such funds transferred to OSRHE on behalf of the QM CENTER TRUSTEES for the purpose of completion and repair at QUARTZ MOUNTAIN LODGE, the parties

ACKNOWLEDGE, CONSENT TO AND ACCEPT THE TRANSFER AS FOLLOWS:

1. OTRD hereby transfers to the OSRHE the agreed upon amount of 614,168.09, without interest earnings.

2. All rights as finally determined by a court of competent jurisdiction in the Quartz Mountain Lodge/Di Carlo construction litigation are retained by the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Transfer to be executed by their duly authorized officers as of the date first above written.

OKLAHOMA TOURISM AND RECREATION COMMISSION

BY: __________________________________________________
NAME: _______________________________________________
TITLE: _______________________________________________
DATE: _______________________________________________

OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CENTRAL SERVICES

BY: __________________________________________________
NAME: _______________________________________________
AGENDA ITEM #24-j (1):

Nonacademic Degrees.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma State University

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve Oklahoma State University's request to award two Honorary Doctorates at its 2004 spring commencement.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

A request has been made from Oklahoma State University to award an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree and an Honorary Doctor of Science degree during the 2003 spring commencement.

The request is consistent with State Regents' policy which requires:

- conferral of honorary degrees only at the highest level for which an institution is authorized to award earned degrees
- conferral of honorary degrees that are distinguishable from earned degrees
- conferral of honorary degrees not to exceed the number specified in the policy
- conferral of honorary degrees upon individuals who are not faculty, administrators, or other officials associated with the institution as specified in the policy.
- conferral of honorary degrees upon individuals who have made outstanding contributions to society through intellectual, artistic, scientific, or professional accomplishments
Not Available Electronically.
Not Available Electronically.
AGENDA ITEM #24-j (2):

Nonacademic Degrees.

SUBJECT: Langston University

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve Langston University's request to award an Honorary Bachelor of Liberal Arts degree at its 2004 spring commencement.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

A request has been made from Langston University to award an Honorary Bachelor of Liberal Arts during the 2003 spring commencement.

The request is consistent with State Regents' policy which requires:

- conferral of honorary degrees only at the highest level for which an institution is authorized to award earned degrees
- conferral of honorary degrees that are distinguishable from earned degrees
- conferral of honorary degrees not to exceed the number specified in the policy
- conferral of honorary degrees upon individuals who are not faculty, administrators, or other officials associated with the institution as specified in the policy.
- conferral of honorary degrees upon individuals who have made outstanding contributions to society through intellectual, artistic, scientific, or professional accomplishments
Not Available Electronically.
AGENDA ITEM #24-j (3):

Nonacademic Degrees.

SUBJECT: Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Not Available Electronically
AGENDA ITEM #25-a:

Reports.

SUBJECT: Status Report on Program Requests.

RECOMMENDATION:

This is an information item.

BACKGROUND:

The Status Report on Program Requests tracks the status of all program requests received since July 1, 2003, as well as requests pending from the previous year.

POLICY ISSUES:

This report lists pending requests regarding degree programs as required by the State Regents’ “Policy Statement on Program Approval.”

ANALYSIS:

The following pages contain the Current Degree Program Inventory and the following schedules:

I. Letters of Intent  
II. Degree Program Requests Under Review  
III. Approved New Program Requests  
IV. Requested Degree Program Deletions  
V. Approved Degree Program Deletions  
VI. Requested Degree Program Name Changes  
VII. Approved Degree Program Name Changes  
VIII. Completed Cooperative Agreements  
IX. Suspended Programs  
X. Approved Inventory Reconciliations
## CURRENT DEGREE PROGRAM INVENTORY

**April 1, 2004**

(Table reflects actions taken at the February 13, 2004 State Regents’ meeting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
<th>Associate in Arts/Associate in Science</th>
<th>Associate in Applied Science</th>
<th>Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>First Professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUHSC</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU-LAW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU-OKC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Vet Med</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU-COM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWOSU</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSU</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOSU</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCO</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSU</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAO</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOAMC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**System Total** | **1,675** | **287** | **250** | **603** | **257** | **108** | **15** | **1,520** | **155** |
I. Letters of Intent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Certificate in Office Systems Technology</td>
<td>6/23/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Certificate in Aviation</td>
<td>6/23/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Polysomnography</td>
<td>8/27/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Sonography</td>
<td>8/27/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Bioinformatics</td>
<td>8/27/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Bioinformatics</td>
<td>8/27/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUHSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Health Studies</td>
<td>9/26/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Arts in Paraprofessional Education</td>
<td>11/20/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Paraprofessional Education</td>
<td>11/20/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Certificate in Paraprofessional Education</td>
<td>11/20/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Automotive Management</td>
<td>2/19/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Business with an Automotive Management Emphasis</td>
<td>2/19/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE</td>
<td>Certificate in Broadcast Communications</td>
<td>2/26/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU-OKC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Information Technology</td>
<td>3/9/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Arts in Film and Video Production</td>
<td>3/10/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Biotechnology</td>
<td>3/10/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE</td>
<td>Certificate in Cyber Security</td>
<td>3/10/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### II. Degree Program Requests Under Review

**July 1, 2003 to present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Communications</td>
<td>11/17/03</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Justice Administration</td>
<td>11/17/03</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>12/8/03</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Geophysics</td>
<td>12/16/03</td>
<td>undergoing review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</td>
<td>2/3/04</td>
<td>undergoing review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Park Law Enforcement</td>
<td>2/3/04</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Network Technology</td>
<td>2/3/04</td>
<td>undergoing review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Database Management</td>
<td>2/3/04</td>
<td>undergoing review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>Associate in Arts in Child Development</td>
<td>2/11/04</td>
<td>undergoing review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Master of Science in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>2/17/04</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Spanish</td>
<td>2/20/04</td>
<td>undergoing review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Approved New Program Requests

*July 1, 2003 to present*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Cyber/Information Security</td>
<td>7/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Cyber/Information Security</td>
<td>7/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>Certificate in Surgical Technologist</td>
<td>7/25/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Certificate in Management Leadership</td>
<td>8/1/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU-OKC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Health Technology</td>
<td>8/11/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUHSC</td>
<td>Certificate in Public Health</td>
<td>8/28/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies</td>
<td>5/12/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Liberal Studies</td>
<td>5/12/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU-OKC</td>
<td>Certificate in Emergency Medical Services - Municipal Fire Protection</td>
<td>10/16/03</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Nursing</td>
<td>8/27/03</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Pre Computer Science</td>
<td>5/8/03</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Geosciences</td>
<td>6/4/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCO</td>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Technology in Technology Application Studies</td>
<td>9/30/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Technology in Civil Engineering Technology</td>
<td>10/27/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Technology in Information Assurance and Forensics</td>
<td>10/27/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Technology in Instrumentation Engineering Technology</td>
<td>10/27/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Spanish</td>
<td>11/17/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in Science Education</td>
<td>12/16/04</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in Mathematics Education</td>
<td>12/16/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>Certificate in School Library Media Specialist</td>
<td>12/16/03</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Requested Degree Program Deletions

*July 1, 2003 to present*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Program (program code)</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Scheduled for Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art History (014)</td>
<td>2/3/2004</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## V. Approved Degree Program Deletions

July 1, 2003 to present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Program (program code)</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEOSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Speech Education (050)</td>
<td>7/14/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOAMC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Golf Course Management (118)</td>
<td>7/29/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Certificate in Manufacturing Technology (085)</td>
<td>8/4/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Certificate in Mid-Management (063)</td>
<td>8/4/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU-OKC</td>
<td>Certificate in Freelance Writing (078)</td>
<td>8/11/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWOSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Library and Information Science (061)</td>
<td>8/11/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOAMC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Biology (007)</td>
<td>10/23/2003</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in Educational Technology (077)</td>
<td>10/1/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWOSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Library and Information Science (061)</td>
<td>10/2/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOAMC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Physical Science (009)</td>
<td>10/2/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Microcomputer Support Technology (108)</td>
<td>10/2/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Technology (130)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Criminal Justice (139)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Computer Information Systems (141)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSU</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Swine Management (052)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in Mathematics Education (072)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in Natural Science Education (074)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in Social Science Education (080)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in Technology Education (069)</td>
<td>12/12/2003</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Requested Degree Program Name Changes  
July 1, 2003 to present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Current Program Name (program code)</th>
<th>Proposed Program Name</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Recreation Leadership (049)</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Parks and Recreation Management</td>
<td>2/3/04</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Electrical Engineering (061)</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>2/3/04</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Master of Electrical Engineering (060)</td>
<td>Master of Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>2/3/04</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Approved Degree Program Name Changes  
July 1, 2003 to present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Current Program Name (program code)</th>
<th>Proposed Program Name</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Master of Science in Counseling and Student Personnel (194)</td>
<td>Master of Science in Counseling</td>
<td>10/15/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCO</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Education in Family and Consumer Science (114)</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Education in Family and Consumer Sciences (114)</td>
<td>8/27/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOAM C</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Pre-Medicine (034)</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Natural Science</td>
<td>7/29/03</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOSU</td>
<td>Master of Education in English Education (064)</td>
<td>Master of Education in Education</td>
<td>1/12/04</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VIII. Completed Cooperative Agreements

*July 1, 2003 to present*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Re&quot;d</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Area Career</th>
<th>Degree Program (program code)</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Date Ratified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>High Plains Technology Center</td>
<td>Automotive Service Technology (004)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>High Plains Technology Center</td>
<td>Diesel and Heavy Equipment Technology (018)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>High Plains Technology Center</td>
<td>Business Systems Technology (027)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>High Plains Technology Center</td>
<td>Office Information Systems Technology (039)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>High Plains Technology Center</td>
<td>Construction Technology (011)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>High Plains Technology Center</td>
<td>Information Technology (012)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Northwest Technology Center</td>
<td>Automotive Collision Repair Technology (003)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Northwest Technology Center</td>
<td>Automotive Service Technology (004)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Northwest Technology Center</td>
<td>Business Systems Technology (027)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Northwest Technology Center</td>
<td>Office Information Systems Technology (039)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Northwest Technology Center</td>
<td>Information Technology (012)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Pioneer Technology Center</td>
<td>Automotive Service Technology (004)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Pioneer Technology Center</td>
<td>Construction Technology (011)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/03</td>
<td>OSUTB-OKM</td>
<td>Pioneer Technology Center</td>
<td>Food Service Management (046)</td>
<td>8/6/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/03</td>
<td>OSU-OKC</td>
<td>Kiamichi Technology Center</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Services - Municipal Fire Protection (088)</td>
<td>10/13/03</td>
<td>December 4, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/03</td>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>Northwest Technology Center</td>
<td>Information Technology (083)</td>
<td>1/12/04</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/03</td>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>Meridian Technology Center</td>
<td>Radiography (079)</td>
<td>1/12/04</td>
<td>February 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/04</td>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Red River Technology Center</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Nursing (040)</td>
<td>3/12/04</td>
<td>April 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IX. Suspended Programs

**July 1, 2003 to present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program (program code)</th>
<th>Date Suspended</th>
<th>Date Suspension Ratified</th>
<th>Date by which program must be reinstated or deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Business Accounting (004)</td>
<td>6/16/03</td>
<td>9/12/03</td>
<td>June 1, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Social Gerontology (055)</td>
<td>7/14/03</td>
<td>9/12/03</td>
<td>July 15, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCC</td>
<td>Certificate in Financial Services (118)</td>
<td>8/21/03</td>
<td>9/12/03</td>
<td>September 1, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU-OKC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Quality Management (075)</td>
<td>10/6/03</td>
<td>10/30/03</td>
<td>October 6, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training (134)</td>
<td>1/12/04</td>
<td>2/13/04</td>
<td>January 12, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>Certificate in Psychometrist (073)</td>
<td>1/12/04</td>
<td>2/13/04</td>
<td>January 12, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>Certificate in School Psychologist (110)</td>
<td>1/12/04</td>
<td>2/13/04</td>
<td>January 12, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Desktop Publishing (216)</td>
<td>3/5/04</td>
<td>4/1/04</td>
<td>March 5, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Certificate in Desktop Publishing (217)</td>
<td>3/5/04</td>
<td>4/1/04</td>
<td>March 5, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Medical Lab Technician (046)</td>
<td>3/2/04</td>
<td>4/1/04</td>
<td>February 27, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Engineering Technology</td>
<td>3/12/04</td>
<td>4/1/04</td>
<td>March 12, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Arts and Sciences (027) Interdisciplinary Education Option (electronic delivery)</td>
<td>3/23/04</td>
<td>4/1/04</td>
<td>March 23, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

203
### X. Approved Inventory Reconciliations

**July 1, 2003 to present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program (program code)</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Quality Control Technology, NSU transfer option [program addition]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Certificate in Medical Office Administration (183) [program deletion]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Individual, Family, and Community Service (220) [program deletion]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Science in Biology (002) [program deletion]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Electronics Engineering Technology (116) [program deletion]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Telecommunications Management (248) [program deletion]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Certificate in CIS-Digital Video (250) [program deletion]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Certificate in CIS-Web Design (251) [program deletion]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Change Certificate in Health Information Technology (237) to Certificate in Health Information Technology, Coding &amp; Reimbursement Specialist [program name change]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Change Associate in Science in Physical Science (014) to Associate in Science in Science Related Fields of Concentration [program name change]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Change Associate in Science in Engineering-Pre (007) to Associate in Science in Engineering [program name change]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Change Associate in Science in Health Professions (010) to Associate in Science in Pre-Professional Science Related Fields of Concentration [program name change]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Change Associate in Applied Science in Health Information Technology (159) to Associate in Applied Science in Health Information Technology (Medical Records) [program name change]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Change Associate in Applied Science in Child Development and Family Relations (200) to Associate in Applied Science in Child Development [program name change]</td>
<td>6/3/03</td>
<td>September 12, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Physical Therapy (047) [program deletion]</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>October 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #25-b (1):

Reports.

SUBJECT: Annual Student Assessment Report

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept this report.

BACKGROUND:

Oklahoma legislation passed in 1991 paved the way for development of a statewide assessment plan by allowing institutions to charge students up to one dollar per credit hour to support the student assessment effort. The State Regents’ Assessment Policy was adopted in October 1991.

The purpose of assessment is to maximize student success. The assessment plan requires systematic collection, interpretation, and use of information about student learning and achievement to improve instruction. The policy also addresses the need to demonstrate public accountability by providing evidence of institutional effectiveness.

The policy is a proactive, comprehensive assessment program, which addresses institutional quality and curricular cohesiveness. It is designed so that results of the assessment efforts will contribute to the institution's strategic planning, budgetary decision-making, institutional marketing, and improving the quality of student services.

Each institution must evaluate students at four levels (graduate student assessment is optional):

- **Entry-Level Assessment and Course Placement** - to determine academic preparation and course placement.

- **Mid-Level (General Education) Assessment** - to determine general education competencies in reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking.

- **Program Outcomes (Exit-Level) Assessment** - to evaluate outcomes in the student's major.

- **Assessment of Student Satisfaction** - to ascertain students' perceptions of their educational experiences including support services, academic curriculum, faculty, etc.

- **Graduate Student Assessment** - to assess student learning beyond standard admission and graduation requirements and to evaluate student satisfaction.
Institutions submit an annual assessment report to the State Regents that describes assessment efforts at each of these levels. Information on number of students assessed, results of assessment, and detailed plans for any institutional and/or instructional changes due to assessment results are to be provided in the report.

**POLICY ISSUES:**

The State Regents’ “Policy Statement on the Assessment of Students for Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability” requires annual reporting of assessment activities.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Entry-Level Assessment and Placement**

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist institutional faculty and advisors in making course placement decisions that will give students the best possible chance of academic success. Beginning fall 1994, institutions were required to use a score of 19 on the American College Test (ACT) in the subject areas of English, mathematics, science, and reading as the "first cut" for entry-level assessment. Students may also demonstrate curricular proficiency by means of an approved secondary assessment process.

Students unable to demonstrate proficiency in one or more subject areas are mandatorily enrolled in remedial courses. These courses are below college-level and do not count toward degree requirements. The student is assessed a supplementary per-credit hour fee for these courses.

Although all institutions currently use the ACT as the first entry-level assessment, testing instruments used for secondary evaluation vary. Commonly selected commercial instruments include the ACT Assessment of Skills for Successful Entry and Transfer (ASSET), the Accuplacer Computerized Placement Test (CPT), ACT Computer-Adaptive Placement Assessment (COMPASS), and the Nelson-Denny Reading Test. Institutionally developed writing and mathematics tests, as well as a predictive, statistical model, are also used.

As required by policy, institutional assessment programs not only assess the basic skills of incoming students and enroll them in appropriate courses, but also track students to measure the rates at which they succeed. In addition to measuring basic skill competencies, institutions are collecting data on student attitudes and perceptions of college life. Colleges are offering orientation courses, computer-assisted instruction, tutoring, and learning centers, which are intended to make initial college experiences both positive and successful.

**Mid-Level (General Education) Assessment**

Mid-level (general education) assessment is designed to assess the basic competencies gained by students in the college general education program. Institutions are required to assess students in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking. Mid-level (general education) assessment normally occurs after completion of 45 semester hours and prior to completion of 70 semester hours. For associate degree programs, mid-level (general education) assessment may occur halfway through the program or at the end of the program. More typically, this assessment occurs at the end of the program, after students have had sufficient time to develop basic skills.
Mid-level (general education) assessment is accomplished with a combination of locally developed and standardized testing instruments such as the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), the Riverside College Base Academic Subjects Examination (BASE), and the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). These nationally validated instruments are useful, because they provide regional or national benchmark data from other participating institutions. Several institutions have developed local instruments for mid-level (general education) assessment in some subject areas. More qualitative assessments, such as portfolio assessments and course-embedded techniques, are also being used.

Assessments at mid level and in the major academic program provide important information to institutions about the degree to which their programs facilitate student achievement of desired knowledge and competencies. Results of this process have led some institutions to redesign general education programs. Both the types of courses and the way in which courses are delivered have been examined closely.

**Program Outcomes (Exit-Level) Assessment**

Program outcomes assessment, or major field of study assessment, is designed to measure how well students are meeting institutionally stated program goals and objectives. As with other levels of assessment, selection of assessment instruments and other parameters (such as target groups, when assessment occurs, etc.) is the responsibility of the institution. Institutions are encouraged to give preference to nationally standardized instruments that supply normative data. The instrument selected should measure skills and abilities specific to the program and to higher level thinking skills. Results are used to revise curricula.

Program outcomes assessment methods used by State System institutions are diverse. Faculty members in each academic program or major field of study are responsible for developing their own methods of assessing to what degree students meet the stated program goals and objectives. Assessments include structured exit interviews, surveys of graduating seniors and employers, Educational Testing Service’s (ETS) Major Field Assessment Tests (MFAT), national graduate school admission exams (GRE, MCAT, GMAT), the ACT College Outcome Measured Program (COMP), senior projects, portfolios, recitals, national and state licensing exams, internships, capstone courses, theses, transfer GPAs, admission to professional schools, retention rates, and job placement.

**Assessment of Student Satisfaction**

Student and alumni perceptions are important in the evaluation and enhancement of academic and campus programs and services, because they provide an indication of the students' subjective view of events and services, which collectively constitute their undergraduate experiences. Student satisfaction evaluation can be accomplished several ways including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. Resulting data are used to provide feedback to improve programs and services. On many campuses, students expressed satisfaction with the availability and interest of faculty and staff, academic preparation for future occupations, classroom facilities, campus buildings and grounds, class size, libraries, cost, and other services. Common areas of dissatisfaction were food services, course availability, veteran’s services, availability of student housing, job placement assistance, financial aid services, student activity fee uses, and parking.
Changes have been instituted as a result of student feedback. Common changes include technology additions and upgrades to improve academic and administrative services, student access to computers and the Internet, expanded orientation programs, enhanced tutoring services, student activities, food services, and career counseling and placement. New facilities have been constructed and older facilities have been remodeled to meet students’ needs.

Nationally standardized surveys are used most often, but locally developed surveys are administered at some colleges and universities. Students are often surveyed at entry, during their college experience, and after they graduate. Many institutions also survey withdrawing students. The ACT Student Opinion Survey (SOS) is the most commonly used instrument. Others include the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), the ACT Alumni Survey, the ACT Withdrawing or Non-returning Student Survey, and the ACT College Outcomes Survey (COS).

**Graduate Student Assessment**

Beginning fall 1996, higher education institutions that charge graduate students the student assessment fee must perform assessment beyond the standard requirements for admission to and graduation from a graduate program. Nine of the ten universities offering graduate programs (Oklahoma State University, University of Central Oklahoma, East Central University, Northeastern State University, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Southeastern Oklahoma State University, Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Cameron University, and Langston University) reported graduate student assessment activities that include licensure, certification, and comprehensive exams; portfolios; capstone courses; practica; theses; interviews; and surveys.

**CONCLUSION**

Student assessment in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is defined as:

“A multi-dimensional evaluative process that measures the overall educational impact of the college/university experience on students and provides information for making program improvements."

As evidenced by the institutional reports, the two major objectives of student assessment -- to improve programs and to provide public accountability -- are being achieved by Oklahoma's colleges and universities. As institutional implementation of student assessment has evolved, continued enhancements and improvements have been documented.

The process of student assessment is as important as the outcomes generated. By establishing a process to assess students, institutions have learned valuable information about their students and programs. To assess the degree to which students are meeting the goals and outcomes of a program, an institution must first define the goals and desired outcomes. Institutions have used assessment tools to measure value-added gains; that is, the skill improvement that can be directly attributed to the institution. For example, institutions found, by testing new freshmen and then retesting these students after they completed the general education requirements, that the general education curriculum achieved the desired results and improvements in students’ competency levels.

Institutions have also improved the process of gathering and using assessment information. Assessment days or class times are designated to encourage more students to seriously
participate in mid-level and program outcomes testing. Strategies for increasing response rates to surveys are evaluated. Assessment information has been integrated into other institutional review processes, and results are shared widely with faculty and students. Assessment has become an important part of each institution as well as the State System.
AGENDA ITEM #25-b (2):

Reports.

SUBJECT: State Regents’ Policy Reporting Requirements Survey

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept this report.

BACKGROUND:

As a measure of accountability for both the State System institutions and the State Regents, most State Regents’ policies require data collection and reporting. Among these policies are the following:

1) Policy Statement on Grading;
2) Special Non-Degree Seeking Student Admission (Admission Policy, Part I, C.1.);
3) Academic Suspension Appeals (Admission Policy, Part II, D.2.);
4) Policy Statement on Admission of Students for Whom English is a Second Language;
5) Policy on Remediation and Removal of High School Curricular Deficiencies.

Since the data requested are not available through other sources such as the Unitized Data System (UDS), one survey was designed to minimize reporting demands on institutions for these five policies. This is the sixth year of data collection.

POLICY ISSUES:

Policy Statement on Grading
A student may request an academic reprieve from public State System institutions with academic reprieve policies consistent with State Regents’ guidelines. The explanation of grades section of the transcript will note the courses and semester(s) reprieved. Institutions granting academic reprieves must submit an annual report to the State Regents.

Special Non-Degree Seeking Student Admission
Students who wish to enroll in courses without intending to pursue a degree may be permitted to enroll in up to nine credit hours without submitting academic credentials or meeting the academic curricular or performance requirements of the institution of desired entry. The president or his/her designee may allow non-degree-seeking students to exceed this initial nine credit-hour limit on an individual student basis. Such exceptions may be made for only non-
degree-seeking students who meet the retention standards and must be appropriately documented and reported to the State Regents annually.

**Academic Suspension Appeals**
Institutions have the discretion to establish an academic suspension appeals procedure. Such procedures should allow appropriate discretion in deserving cases and require that the suspended student document any extraordinary personal circumstances that contributed to his/her academic deficiencies. Suspended students can be readmitted only one time. Such students are readmitted on probationary status and must maintain a 2.0 GPA average each semester attempted while on probation or raise their retention GPA to the designated level. Should a reinstated student be suspended a second time from the same institution, s/he cannot return to the suspending school until s/he has demonstrated the ability to succeed academically by raising his/her GPA to the retention standards at another institution.

**Policy Statement on Admission of Students for Whom English is a Second Language (ESL)**
ESL students seeking enrollment at a State System college or university must present evidence of proficiency in the English language prior to admission, either as first-time students in the system or by transfer from another non-system college or university. Exceptions may be made if the applicant demonstrates proficiency in English prior to admission. Such exceptions must be documented and reported.

**Policy on Remediation and Removal of High School Curricular Deficiencies**
The State Regents’ policy requires students to successfully remediate basic skills course requirements within the first 24 hours attempted or have all subsequent enrollments restricted to deficiency removal courses until the deficiencies are removed. The president or his/her designee may allow a deserving student who failed to remediate a basic skills deficiency in a single subject to continue to enroll in collegiate level courses in addition to remedial course work beyond the 24 hour limit providing the student has demonstrated success in collegiate courses to date. Such exceptions must be appropriately documented.

**ANALYSIS:**
A comprehensive survey was conducted to gather data regarding exceptions to the above mentioned policies. Results were tabulated and are reported by institutional tier (comprehensive, regional, and two-year). Information was gathered for the 2002-03 academic year from all State System institutions.

**Policy Statement on Grading**
Circumstances may justify a student being able to recover from academic problems in ways which do not forever jeopardize his/her academic standing. The policy recognizes there may be extraordinary situations in which a student has done poorly in an entire enrollment due to extenuating circumstances, which, in the judgment of the appropriate institutional officials, warrant excluding those grades in calculating the student’s retention and graduation GPAs. Students must meet specified criteria to be considered for an academic reprieve. Specifically, to request an academic reprieve, three years must have elapsed between the time the grades being requested reprieved were earned and the reprieve request. Prior to the request, the student must have earned a GPA of 2.0 or higher with no grade lower than a “C” in a minimum of 12 hours of course work excluding activity or performance courses. The student may not receive more than one academic reprieve during his/her academic career.
- The number of requests for academic reprieves systemwide averaged 442 per year for the past six years. In 2002-03, there were 485 requests.
- Sixty-two percent of all requests for academic reprieves were for one semester rather than two.
- In 2002-03, the majority of requests (49.9 percent) were at the regional universities; 36.1 percent were at the two-year colleges; and 14.0 percent were at the comprehensive universities.
- Systemwide in 2002-03, 84.9 percent of reprieve requests were granted. From 1997-98 to 2002-03, reprieve requests granted averaged 81.5 percent.
- Comprehensive universities granted the lowest percentage of academic reprieves in 2002-03, 76.5 percent, up from 70 percent in 2001-02. Regional universities granted 85.5 percent of requested reprieves in 2002-03, up from 80 percent in 2001-02. Two-year institutions granted 87.4 percent of requested reprieves in 2002-03, up from 79 percent in 2001-02.

The high percentage of granted reprieves appears appropriate. Students requesting reprieves must meet specific State Regents’ academic requirements. Thus, it is expected that a high percentage of requested reprieves would be granted.
Special Non-Degree Seeking Student Admission
This policy provision allows institutional flexibility to meet individual student’s goals for specific personal enrichment or job related courses with appropriate academic control.

Comparison of Non-Degree Seeking Students
Enrolled in More than 9 Credits by Tier
1997-98 to 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comprehensive</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rogers State University is included in regional university totals beginning in 2000-01. Prior to that year RSU data are included in the two-year totals.

- In 2002-03, six institutions reported a total of 471 students enrolled as non-degree seeking students with more than nine credits, down from 489 students in 2001-02. Two-year colleges reported 27.4 percent of the exceptions; comprehensive universities, 70.1 percent; and regional universities, 2.5 percent.
- Since 1997-98, the number of non-degree seeking students enrolled in more than nine hours has decreased 36 percent, from 736 to 471. The number enrolled at comprehensive universities increased 83.3 percent, from 180 to 330. At the regional universities the number dropped from 154 to 12, a decrease of 92.2 percent. At the two-year colleges the number decreased 67.9 percent, from 402 to 129.
- Explanations for exceptions included courses for personal enrichment, courses for specific certifications, and job-related courses.

It is expected that the majority of policy exceptions would be found at the two-year college tier, consistent with the community college function. Also, in certain exchange programs, non-degree-seeking foreign students are allowed to enroll in more than nine hours. Exceptions have been granted for appropriate reasons, and institutions are following the intent of the policy.
### Academic Suspension Appeals

Institutions have the discretion to establish an academic suspension appeals procedure. By State Regents’ policy, suspended students requesting appeals must document extraordinary personal circumstances that contributed to his/her academic deficiencies. Such events must be highly unusual and appeal decisions should be made only following the thoughtful deliberation of an appropriate committee that may include faculty, students, and administrators.

Note: Rogers State University is included in regional university totals beginning in 2000-01. Prior to that year RSU data are included in the two-year totals.

- From 2001-02 to 2002-03, the number of suspension appeals increased 50.6 percent from 721 to 1,086, while the number of suspensions increased 3.0 percent, from 6,581 to 6,778. The number of appeals that were granted increased 60.3 percent from 537 to 861.
- Over the past six years, suspension appeals have ranged from 564 (9 percent) in 1997-98 to 940 (17 percent) in 2000-01.
- Generally, the highest appeals percentages were found at the regional tier (21.0 percent in 2002-03). In 2002-03, the comprehensive universities reported an appeal rate of 8.6 percent, and the two-year colleges reported a rate of 14.4 percent.
- Granted appeals have increased systemwide since 1997-98 to a six-year high of 861 (79.3 percent) in 2002-03.
- Two-year colleges granted the highest percentage of appeals at 89.7 percent in 2002-03, up from 83 percent in 2001-02; regional universities granted 75.1 percent of...
appeals in 2002-03, down from 77 percent in 2001-02; and comprehensive universities granted 46.4 percent in 2002-03, up from 45 percent in 2001-02.

As previously noted, students must document extraordinary circumstances that lead to suspension. Thus, a high percentage of granted appeals is appropriate to give a second chance opportunity for deserving students documenting circumstances beyond their control which contributed to or caused academic difficulties.

**Policy Statement on Admission of Students for Whom English is a Second Language (ESL)**
The majority of exceptions to the minimum TOEFL score admission requirement was granted for ESL students who were military personnel or dependents, had alternative testing or examination, or were participating in exchange programs with foreign institutions which certified the students’ proficiency.

### Percent of ESL Exceptions by Tier

#### 1997-98 through 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UnderG Grad</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comprehensive**
- **Regional**
- **Two-Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UnderG</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>UnderG</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>UnderG</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>UnderG</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>UnderG</th>
<th>Grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rogers State University is included in regional university totals beginning in 2000-01. Prior to that year RSU data are included in the two-year totals.

- The number of undergraduate ESL exceptions increased slightly systemwide from 463 in 2001-02 to 467 in 2002-03. From 2001-02 to 2002-03, comprehensive universities reported an increase of less than 1 percent (364 to 363); regional universities decreased 21.2 percent (80 to 63); and two-year colleges increased 115.8 percent (19 to 41).
- Graduate exceptions remained the same systemwide at 38 in 2001-02 and 2002-03. From 2001-02 to 2002-03, comprehensive universities reported an increase of 41.1 percent (34 to 48), and regional universities reported no graduate exceptions for 2002-03.
- The majority of undergraduate and graduate ESL exceptions was granted at the comprehensive universities during the last six years. Comprehensive institutions granted between 65 and 79 percent of the undergraduate exceptions; comprehensive universities granted between 79 and 100 percent of graduate exceptions in each of the past six years except 1998-99, when comprehensive universities granted 29 percent and regional universities granted 71 percent.
- In 2002-03, both comprehensive universities, one regional university, and four two-year colleges granted undergraduate exceptions.
- In 2002-03, both comprehensive and no regional universities granted exceptions for graduate students.

Based on the circumstances and documentation of the students’ English proficiency, the number of ESL exceptions is warranted.

**Policy on Remediation and Removal of High School Curricular Deficiencies**
Generally, students were given exceptions if they were making satisfactory progress toward removing deficiencies, were a transfer student, or were given a second-chance opportunity.

**Time Limit Exceptions for Remediation and Removal of High School Curricular Deficiencies by Tier from 1997-98 to 2002-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-00</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remediation and Removal of High School Curricular Deficiencies - Exceptions from Time Limit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comprehensive</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Two-Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>2,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>2,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 1997-98 to 2002-03, the number of exceptions ranged from about 1,400 to about 2,100. In 2002-03, the number of exceptions was 2,020.

At the comprehensive universities, the number of exceptions granted remained fairly constant in 1997-98, 1998-99, and 1999-00 (540, 540, and 548, respectively), then decreased to 62 in 2001-02 and 32 in 2002-03.

The number of time limit exceptions granted at regional universities increased from 132 in 1997-98 to 512 in 2000-01, then decreased to 454 in 2002-03.

The number of exceptions granted at two-year institutions has been inconsistent over the last six years, but increased in the last year from 1,472 in 2001-02 to 1,534 in 2002-03.

In 2002-03, one comprehensive university, 9 of 11 regional universities, and 6 of 14 two-year colleges reported exceptions.

From 2001-02 to 2002-03, the number of students granted exceptions to remediation time limits decreased by 8.3 percent (495 to 454) at the regional universities, by 48.4 percent (62 to 32) at the comprehensive universities, and increased 4.2 percent (1,472 to 1,534) at the two-year colleges.

Among the reasons given for exceptions were satisfactory progress in other college level work, and transferred in good standing.
CONCLUSION:

Policy exceptions summarized above indicate that the State Regents’ policies addressed are effective and should remain intact.
AGENDA ITEM #25-b (3):

Reports.

SUBJECT: FY2003 Systemwide Report on Value of Supplemental Pension Obligations and Cost of Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents accept the FY2003 Systemwide Report on the Value of Supplemental Pension Obligations and the Cost of Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions and authorize its transmittal to the Governor, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

BACKGROUND:

Oklahoma statutes (70 O.S. 2001, Section 17-116.7) require that State System institutions having supplemental pension and postemployment benefit plans disclose certain information relating to these plans in their audited annual financial reports. The statute also requires that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education compile this information into a systemwide report for submission to the Governor, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. This is the twelfth systemwide report prepared pursuant to this statutory requirement. A copy of the report has been provided to each State Regent.

POLICY ISSUES: None.

ANALYSIS:

INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

The enabling statutes for governing boards of institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education elaborate powers and duties that are similar in nature and include the authority to:

1. Employ and fix compensation of such personnel as deemed necessary,...
2. Direct the disposition of all moneys appropriated by the legislature..., and
3. Establish and maintain plans for...retirement of employees…and for payment of deferred compensation for such employees.

This latter provision establishes authority to create supplemental retirement plans in addition to the retirement plan of the Oklahoma Teacher’s Retirement System (OTRS).
STATUS OF INSTITUTIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL DEFINED BENEFIT PLANS

As of June 30, 2003, 16 of the 26 system institutions (including the OUHSC) have supplemental retirement plans. Although provisions of these supplemental plans may vary among institutions, they typically involve a formula ensuring an employee upon retirement a "minimum retirement benefit" based on the employee’s current or highest compensation together with years of service. The institution's obligation under these plans usually involves paying the difference between the calculated "minimum retirement benefit" and the benefits that the employee will receive from OTRS, Social Security, or a defined contribution retirement plan, such as TIAA-CREF. The value of institutional obligations reported as of June 30, 2003, is summarized in Attachment I of the report.

The value of obligations reported is based on actuarial valuations prepared by each institution using a number of assumptions. Values are real, therefore, only to the extent that the assumptions prove valid. Actuarial assumptions used by the institutions for FY2003 were developed in accordance with State Regents' policy and were identical to those used since FY1996. Following are highlights of the information reported by institutions.

1. Institutions reporting supplemental pension obligations as of June 30, 2003, included 11 of the 13 universities and constituents and five two-year colleges.

2. The present value of future pension obligations as of June 30, 2003, for those institutions reporting amounted to $1,146,725. This amount continues to decline each year, and the current reporting format shows that seven (7) institutions have negative obligations for the future. Ten (10) institutions reported no obligations.

COST OF POSTEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS OTHER THAN PENSIONS

Costs of postemployment benefits other than pensions were reported by 12 institutions in FY 2003 and amounted to $3,679,621. These costs covered medical and/or life insurance premiums for retirees and are summarized in Attachment II of the report. Ten institutions reported FY2003 costs for medical insurance premiums for retirees amounting to $3,566,174, or 97% of the total expenses. Nine institutions reported costs for life insurance premiums for retirees amounting to $113,447. One institution, the University of Oklahoma, accounted for approximately 68% of the total systemwide postemployment benefit costs, but also reported a significant decline in expenditures from the previous year.