**OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Improving our future by degrees

Agenda

April 2, 2009

NOTE

This document contains recommendations and reports to the State Regents regarding items on the April 2, 2009 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 2, 2009.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

A G E N D A

Thursday, April 2, 2009 – 9 a.m.
Noble Foundation, Ardmore Oklahoma
Pavilion Room
Chairman Ron White, 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.

4. **Report of the Chairman.** (No Action, No Discussion).

5. **Report of the Chancellor.** (No Action, No Discussion).

ACADEMIC

6. **New Programs.**   Oklahoma State University. Approval of request to offer the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Entrepreneurship. Page 1.

7. **Program Deletions.** Approval of institutional requests for program deletions. Page 7.

8. **Policy.**

    a.   Posting of the *Intensive English Program Approval and Review* policy. Page 9.

    b.   Approval of the *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy. Page 19.

9. **Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System.** Presentation of year end report. Page 43.

10. **ACT's Oklahoma 2008 College Readiness Awards.** Announcement of awards. Page 47.

FISCAL

11. **E&G Budgets.**

    a.   Allocation of Brain Gain Conference Grant Funds. Page 49.

    b.   Allocation of Cigarette and Tobacco Tax Revenue. Page 53.

    c.   Deleted item. Page 55.

*****The Oklahoma State Regents will have a breakfast at 7:30 a.m. on April 2, 2009 in the Sam Noble Foundation Conference Center at which no action will be taken.*

AGENDA ITEM #6:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma State University. Approval of request to offer the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Entrepreneurship.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve Oklahoma State University's (OSU) request to offer the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Entrepreneurship along with the stipulation that continuation of the program will depend upon meeting the criteria established by the institution and approved by the State Regents, as described below.

- **Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Entrepreneurship.** Continuation beyond Fall 2014 will depend upon:
    Majors enrolled: a minimum of 120 students in Fall 2013; and
    Graduates: a minimum of 58 students in 2013-14.

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

OSU's Academic Plan lists the following institutional priorities and new funding initiatives:

- Improving student retention and graduation rates.
- Incorporating technology into learning to enhance educational opportunities.
- Continuing the research initiative begun in 2000-2001.
- Promoting international involvement, focusing on establishing partnerships with other countries.
- Using new/reallocated funds to propose new programs.

APRA Implementation
In August 1991, the State Regents launched the Academic Planning, Resource Allocation (APRA) initiative, which was based on the principle that institutional officials would prioritize their programs and activities, and then fund higher priority activities at levels that ensured quality. In times of flat or declining budgets or financial constraints, institutions are expected to reallocate resources from lower priority activities to higher priority activities, rather than reducing quality by funding lower priority activities at the same rate as higher priority activities.

Since 1992, OSU has taken the following program actions in response to APRA:

Degrees and/or certificate programs deleted	71
Degrees and/or certificate programs added	59

Program Review
OSU offers 218 degree and/or certificate programs as follows:

Certificates	15
Associate of Arts or Sciences Degrees	0
Associate of Applied Science Degrees	0
Baccalaureate Degrees	88
Master's Degrees	69
Doctoral Degrees	46
First Professional Degrees	0

All of these programs were reviewed in the past five years with the exception of those programs with specialty accreditation. Programs with specialty accreditation are aligned with OSU's program review schedule as appropriate. Thus, if a professional program received ten-year accreditation status, it would not be reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents' policy.

Program Development Process
OSU faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials and OSU's governing board.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval* policy.

ANALYSIS:

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in Entrepreneurship

Program purpose. The purpose of this program is to provide students with advanced educationally based competencies in entrepreneurship. It is designed to produce graduates who are noted for their entrepreneurial contributions in all walks of life.

Program rationale and background. The proposed program is designed to address the growing demand for entrepreneurship education by offering a comprehensive and integrative curriculum that will focus on developing student skills in entrepreneurial analysis and thinking through application in real-world settings. Entrepreneurs account for the majority of the job growth in Oklahoma and are the key creators of value and wealth, whether it is through creating new ventures or leading change in existing organizations. The mission of the proposed degree program will be to foster the spirit of entrepreneurship at OSU and produce graduates who are noted for their entrepreneurial contributions in all walks of life. The curriculum is built around two content cornerstones "contexts for entrepreneurship and "facilitators of entrepreneurial behavior" as well as the four underlying learning components "opportunity assessment," "planning," "resource acquisition," and "new concept implementation." The program will address entrepreneurship as a phenomenon that occurs in a range of differing professional contexts, including the creation of new start-up ventures, family businesses, growth-oriented small businesses, innovative non-profit enterprises, established corporations, public sector organizations and professional disciplines. Further it will emphasize the facilitators of entrepreneurial behavior within these contexts, such as opportunity assessment, planning, resource acquisition and new concept implementation.

Employment opportunities. OSU states that there is a demand, both nationally and in the state of Oklahoma, for entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship represents the fastest growth areas within Colleges of Business in the Unites States over the past ten years. At present, approximately 400 students are enrolled in entrepreneurship course at OSU. Statewide demand is reflected in a recent Kauffman Foundation study that ranked Oklahoma as fourth in the nation for entrepreneurial activity. According to the Department of Commerce, "Oklahoma's entrepreneurs will provide the innovation, creativity and leadership needed to take us successfully into our next 100 years" and that creating culture for entrepreneurship in the state is a top priority. OSU is confident there will be sufficient employment opportunities for program graduates.

Student demand. The new program is expected to meet the following enrollment and graduate standards by the established deadline prior to final approval by the State Regents:

Productivity Category	Criteria	Deadline
Minimum Enrollment of majors in the program:	120	Fall 2013
Minimum Graduates from the program:	58	2013-2014

Duplication and impact on existing programs. The proposed degree program would duplicate the following existing programs:

Existing Programs
Northeastern State University Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurship (136).
University of Oklahoma Bachelor of Business Administration in Management and Human Resources (168) with an option in Entrepreneurship and Venture Management.
East Central University Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (007) with an option in Entrepreneurship.
Southwestern Oklahoma State University Bachelor of Business Administration (011) with an option in Entrepreneurship.
Rogers State University Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (113) with an option in Entrepreneurship.

Requests for copies of the program proposals were received from two institutions and were sent to them from the Chancellor's office. No institution notified the State Regents office of a protest to the proposed program. Due to the distance between institutions increasing student demand, and dedication to the effort by OSU, approval will not constitute unnecessary duplication.

Curriculum. The proposed program will consist of 120 total credit hours from the following areas:

Content Area	Credit Hours
General Education Courses	41
Core Courses	36
Option Courses	15
Guided Elective Courses	12
General Elective Courses	16
Total	**120**

Eight new courses will be added and are asterisked on the attached curriculum (Attachment A).

Faculty and staff. Existing faculty will teach the proposed program.

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

Financing. Private funds in the amount of $50.6 million have been obtained to support the program, some of which are eligible for a one-to-one state match in the endowed chair program. One existing state

faculty line in the management department will be reallocated to the newly formed department of entrepreneurship to support the proposed program. Additional state lines in the business school may be reallocated to support the program in the future, based on shifts in student demand.

Cost/Funding Summary:

Program Resource Requirements

A. Funding Sources	1st Year Of Program	2nd Year Of Program	3rd Year Of Program	4th Year Of Program	5th Year Of Program
Total Resources Available from Federal Sources	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Narrative Explanation/Justification					
Total Resources Available from Other Non-State Sources	$2.72 million	$2.72 million	$2.72 million	$2.72 million	$2.72million
Narrative Explanation/Justification: Sources – *Revenue from endowment*					
Existing State Resources	0	0	0	0	0
Narrative Explanation/Justification:					
State Resources Available through Internal Allocation and reallocation	$110,000	$220,000	$330,000	$440,000	$440,000
Narrative Explanation/Justification: *Existing state faculty line*					
Student Tuition	$60,114	$105,199	$150,285	$240,456	$360,684
Narrative Explanation/Justification: *Undergraduate tuition is currently $131.35 per credit hour for in-state and $476.50 per credit hour for out-of-state. Based on projected enrollments, student tuition will generate $1,698,190 over the first five years of the program.*					
TOTAL	**$2,890,114**	**$3,045,199**	**$3,200,285**	**$3,400,456**	**$3,520,684**

B. Breakdown of Budget Expenses/Requirements	1st Year Of Program	2nd Year Of Program	3rd Year Of Program	4th Year Of Program	5th Year Of Program
Staff:					
Administrative/Other Professional *Cost of Entrepreneurship Center Director, 2 admin assistants and 1 Events Coordinator*	$353,700	$371,385	$389,954	$409,452	$429,925
Faculty *Cost of 4 tenure track faculty and 3 clinical faculty*	$1,370,000	$1,565,000	$1,760,000	$1,955,000	$1,955,000
Graduate Assistants *3 Graduate Assistants*	$24,510	$24,510	$24,510	$32,680	$32,680
Student Employees	$0	$11,200	$16,800	$22,400	$28,000
Narrative Explanation/Justification: Includes salaries of all listed above.					
Equipment and Instructional Materials	$4,500	$1,500	$4,500	$1,500	$1,500
Narrative Explanation/Justification: *Utilizing existing library resources and equipment, facility space for program being renovated with privately raised funds.*					
Library	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
Narrative Explanation/Justification: *Utilizing existing library resources and equipment, facility space for program being renovated with privately raised funds.*					
Contractual Services	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500
Narrative Explanation/Justification *Utilizing existing library resources and equipment, facility space for program being renovated with privately raised funds.*					
Other Support Services	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
Commodities *Printing and Postage Expenses*	$15,000	$16,500	$18,000	$19,500	$20,000
Printing *Marketing & Promotional Expenses*	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
Telecommunications	$600	$600	$600	$600	$600
Travel *Student and Faculty conference travel*	$24,000	$25,200	$26,400	$27,600	$28,800
Awards and Grants	$176,780	$196,780	$216,780	$236,780	$256,780
Narrative Explanation/Justification: *Entrepreneurship research fellows: 10 @ $10,000, Student internship program: 20 @ 180 hours @ $7 per hour*					
TOTAL	**$1,988,590**	**$2,232,175**	**$2,477,044**	**$2,725,012**	**$2,772,785**

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Degree Requirements		Credit Hours
General Education		*41*
Program Core		*36*
ACCT 2103	Financial Accounting	3
ACCT 2203	Managerial Accounting	3
ECON 2103	Introduction to Microeconomics	3
ECON 2203	Introduction to Macroeconomics	3
MSIS 2103	Business Computer Concepts and Applications	3
STAT 2023	Elementary Statistics for Business and Economics	3
FIN 3113	Finance	3
MGMT 3013	Fundamentals of Management	3
MKTG 3213	Marketing	3
LSB 3213	Legal and Regulatory Environment of Business	3
MSIS 3223	Operations Management	3
*EEE 4513	Strategic Entrepreneurial Management	3
Option Courses (Select 15 hours from the following courses)		*15*
ECON 3010	Economics of Entrepreneurship	3
*EEE 3033	Women and Minority Entrepreneurship	3
*EEE 3513	Growing Small and Family Ventures	3
*EEE 4010	Special Topics in Entrepreneurship	3
EEE 4113	Dilemmas and Debates in Entrepreneurship	3
*EEE 4263	Corporate Entrepreneurship	3
*EEE 4313	Emerging Enterprise Consulting	3
EEE 4483	Entrepreneurship and New Technologies	3
EEE 4610	Entrepreneurship	3
LSB 3010	Business Law and Entrepreneurship	3
MKTG 3323	Consumer and Market Behavior	3
MKTG 4333	Marketing Research	3
MKTG 4973	New Product Development	3
Guided Electives		*12*
EEE 3023	Introduction to Entrepreneurship	3
*EEE 3263	Entrepreneurial Marketing	3
*EEE 3663	Imagination	3
EEE 4653	Venture Capital	3
General Electives (Upper Division)		*12*
Select an additional 12 upper-division hours from fields in the Spears School of Business.		
Electives (May be selected from upper or lower division courses)		*4*
Total Hours:		*120*

*Asterisks denote new courses.

AGENDA ITEM #7:

       Program Deletions.

SUBJECT: Approval of institutional request.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

BACKGROUND:

Oklahoma State University (OSU) requests authorization to delete the Certificate in Women's Studies (244).

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents' *Academic Program Review* policy.

ANALYSIS:

OSU requests authorization to delete the Certificate in Women's Studies (244). The program was not structured to meet student needs. The college of Arts and Sciences has created a minor program in Women's Studies. No courses will be deleted, no students are enrolled in the program and there are no funds for reallocation.

AGENDA ITEM #8-a:

> **Policy.**

SUBJECT: Posting of revisions to the State Regents' *Intensive English Program Approval and Review* policy.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents post revisions to the *Intensive English Program Approval and Review* policy, as described below.**

BACKGROUND:

Approving English language centers has been part of the State Regents' *Policy Statement on Admissions of Students for Whom English is a Second Language* since 1980. Beginning with the 1995 review, out-of-state evaluators with expertise in directing English as a Second Language (ESL) programs have been hired to conduct the reviews.

In Fall 1996, an English Language Institute committee was convened to work with State Regents' staff to revise the policy to include standards for the centers and an approval process. This committee consisted of representatives from proprietary and institutionally-based English language centers. The State Regents approved this policy in April 1997.

In May 2003, The Intensive English Program Approval Process section of the State Regents' *Policy Statement on Admissions of Students for Whom English is a Second Language* was separated from the admission section to create a stand alone State Regents' *Intensive English Program Approval and Review* policy. The admissions session of students for whom English is a second language is now in the *Institutional Admission and Retention policy.*

POLICY ISSUES:

The posted revisions of the State Regents' *Intensive English Program Approval and Review* policy were incorporated to strengthen the approval and review process, expand the Intensive English Program (IEP) evaluation team's recommendation options, as well as the institutions response, and devise an explicit appeals process. The original intent of the policy has not been changed.

ANALYSIS:

The purpose of this policy is to specify criteria for approval and review of IEP programs available to non-native speakers of English to ensure adequate preparation for college level academic work at an Oklahoma institution of higher education. The academic discipline and teaching methodologies for IEP students have evolved over time, along with industry standards for IEP programs. State Regents' policy

was revised to incorporate these changes and strengthen standards and the appeals process. A copy of the draft policy is attached.

Revisions to the policy were developed by the Council on Instruction (COI) Admission/Retention/Transfer Committee. Academic officers interested in Intensive English Programs were invited to participate in the policy review. Also participating in the policy review were content specialists recommended by State System vice presidents for academic affairs. The revised policy was passed by COI February 2009. The Council of Presidents reviewed and approved the policy changes in March 2009. A copy of the final draft is attached. Highlights of the revised policy are summarized below.

- **3.5.2 Definitions**
  o Added definitions for "English for Speakers of Other Languages," "NAFSA: Association of International Educators," and "American Association of Intensive English Programs." Updated the definition for "Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages."

- **3.5.3 IEP Approval Process**
  o Title for subsection 3.5.3.D was changed from Site Visit to On-Site Evaluation. Language was added to include evaluation team selection criteria, length of the on-site evaluation and the inclusion of on-site interviews.
  o Title for subsection 3.5.3.E was changed from Evaluation Team Report and Recommendation to Evaluation Report.
  o Struck policy language that limits evaluation team recommendation options of giving either an Intensive English Program (IEP) "full accreditation" or "provisional accreditation" recommendation.
  o Expanded the team recommendation language to allow programs with minor deficiencies to report on progress toward correction of the deficiencies as well as a detailed description of what will be included in the team report.
  o Added language allowing for an Institutional Response to the team report.
  o Added language to Subsection 3.5.3.F standardizing the steps that will be undertaken in the event of an appeal request by an IEP.

- **3.5.4 IEP Standards**
  o If an IEP is promoting an association with an Oklahoma institution, the IEP must provide evidence of cooperation and support with the institution.
  o Strengthened the Record Keeping requirements to include immigration documentation if applicable, personnel data and student performance in the program.

Attachment

3.5   Intensive English Program Approval and Review

3.5.1   Purpose

The State Regents' *Admission Policy* requires students who are non-native speakers of English to present evidence of proficiency in the English language prior to admission. One of the four options for admission allows students who score above a certain level on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or International English Language Testing System (IELTS) examination, but below the score required for regular admission, to be admitted following successful completion of a minimum of 12 weeks of study at an Intensive English Program (IEP) approved by the State Regents, with at least two-thirds of the 12 weeks of instruction at the advanced level. This policy specifies the criteria for approval and review of Intensive English Programs for this admission option.

3.5.2   Definitions for the purposes of this policy

The following words and terms, when used in the Chapter, shall have the following meaning, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Intensive English Program (IEP)" is a program designed to provide English instruction for non-native speakers to adequately prepare them for collegiate level instruction in a short period of time.

"English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)" is an academic discipline describing the language of, or instruction targeted to, non-native speakers of English.

"International English Language Testing System (IELTS)" is the British Council's English language assessment primarily used by those seeking international education, professional recognition, bench-marking to international standards and global mobility.

"Teaching English as a Second to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)" is an academic discipline for preparation of teachers who will teach English to non-native English speakers., including Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) and Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).

"Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)" is the Educational Testing System's Service's exam that measures the ability of non-native speakers of English to use and understand North American English as it is spoken, written, and heard in college and university settings.

"NAFSA: Association of International Educators" is a member organization promoting international education and providing professional development opportunities to the field. NAFSA serves international educators and their institutions by setting standards of good practice, providing training and professional development opportunities, providing networking opportunities, and advocating for international education.

"American Association of Intensive English Programs (AAIEP)" is a professional organization that supports ethical and professional standards for intensive English programs and promotes the well-being and educational success of English language students.

3.5.3 IEP Approval Process

To certify students who are non-native speakers of English for admission an IEP must be approved by the State Regents. The program's institution or IEP administrator must initiate the approval process with a formal request to the Chancellor for a program evaluation. IEP programs scheduled for reevaluation will be notified of subsequent reviews by the State Regents. Evaluations will be conducted according to State Regents' IEP Standards and Self-Study Guidelines (in the State Regents' *Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook* and available upon request) which emphasize the development of student language competencies that facilitate a successful transition to college academic work. The process for IEP approval is described below.

A.   Approval Funding

The IEP or the institution will pay for the evaluation including evaluation team members' honoraria, travel, lodging, and food in accordance with Oklahoma travel laws.

B.   Formal Request for Approval

Upon receipt of a formal letter of application to the Chancellor requesting a State Regents' program evaluation, the State Regents' staff will provide a copy of this policy and work with the IEP administrator to develop a time line.

C.   Institutional Self-Study

Using the State Regents' IEP Standards and Self-Study Guidelines as a reference, the program's director or institutional president will submit the IEP self-study document to the State Regents one month prior to the date of the site visit.

D.   On-Site ~~Visit~~ Evaluation

1. Team Selection.
   The Chancellor will appoint an out-of-state evaluation team of at least two (2) qualified ESOL professionals. who possess the necessary expertise for the program under review. One member of the evaluation team will be designated as team chairman and will assume responsibility for leadership in conducting the evaluation and in preparing the team's report. Team members will be required to sign a conflict of interest form provided by the State Regents' office. This form verifies that the individual team member has no direct or indirect association with the institution.

12

Every effort will be made to select qualified evaluators from an institution similar to that being reviewed. The team will review the program based on the State Regents' *Intensive English Program Approval and Review, Institutional Admission and Retention,* and *Institutional Accreditation ~~Policy~~* policies.

2. Length of the on-site evaluation.

   Typically the on-site evaluation will be scheduled for one and one-half to two days or in extenuating circumstances may be scheduled for a shorter or longer period. Staff will determine the length of the evaluation based upon the site slated for evaluation or extenuating circumstances. The dates will be determined by staff who will coordinate with the institution before confirming the dates in writing. The on-site evaluation must provide for sufficient time for adequate discussion of criteria with the appropriate constituencies. This will ensure a thorough review of the criteria by the evaluation team and allow for opportunities for meaningful independent analysis by the evaluation team.

3. On-site interviews.
   An integral and critical component of the on-site evaluation is the interview process. The team will have scheduled interviews with key administrative staff, faculty, students, and other appropriate constituencies.

E. Evaluation ~~Team~~ Report ~~and Recommendation~~

   ~~Within ten working days after the IEP site visit, the team will submit the draft evaluation report and recommendation to the Chancellor. The recommendation shall be one of the following:~~

   1. ~~approval without qualification with reexamination in five years,~~

   2. ~~provisional approval with reexamination in one, two, three, or four years, and~~

   3. ~~approval denied.~~
   ~~The IEP administrator or institutional president will have an opportunity to make factual corrections to the draft evaluation report. Objections to the final evaluation report and the recommendation must be submitted within 15 working days from receipt of the final report.~~

1. Team Report and Recommendation.

   Following the on-site evaluation, the team will prepare a report of its evaluation to the institution consistent with the scope of the evaluation detailed in the team charge. The team chairman will be responsible for preparing and submitting the complete team report to the Chancellor's

office within ten (10) working days following the evaluation. The report will provide a fair and balanced assessment of the IEP program at the time of the evaluation.   The team should identify the specific criteria met and not met.

A recommendation will be included in the evaluation team's report and shall be supported by a clear and explicit rationale based on the State Regents' criteria. The recommendation must be consistent with this policy and will be one of the following:

a.   Recommendation for Approval Without qualifications with reexamination in five years.   A program with this designation meets all standards for approval.

b.   Recommendation for Provisional Approval With Qualifications with reexamination in one, two, three, or four years. A program with this designation does not meet the standards for "approval without qualification" required by the State Regents. The team shall recommend measurable goals and timelines to correct deficiencies in the program. Within two months of the State Regents' accepting the report, the IEP will be required to submit an implementation plan addressing the noted deficiencies. Thereafter, an annual report on the status of the implementation will be required.

c.   Recommendation Denied. The program does not meet the criteria established by the State Regents and will not be an approved IEP program.

2.   Institutional Response. Upon receipt of the team report, the Chancellor will forward a copy of the report and recommendation to the IEP administrator or institutional president. Institutional representatives will be afforded an opportunity to correct any factual errors in the report within 15 working days from the date the report is sent. The team's evaluative comments and findings may not be modified by the institution. Thereafter, the draft report will be finalized and will be deemed formally submitted to the Chancellor.

If the evaluation team's report recommends denial, the IEP may objects within 15 working days from the date the final report is sent. In response to this objection to the evaluation team's report, the Chancellor will convene a neutral three-member panel of educators ESOL professionals to consider the objection (s). The appeals process will be directed by the Procedures for Denial, Revocation, or Nonrenewal of in Accreditation, of the State Regents' *Institutional Accreditation* policy with detailed procedures in the Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook. The former approval status of the IEP will not change dDuring the appeals process., the IEP will maintain the approval status it held prior to the evaluation. The IEP will pay for the cost of the appeal.

F.   State Regents' Action

The Chancellor will submit the team's evaluation report and recommendation as well as the State Regents' staff recommendation along with the IEP self-study, applicable objections, and appeals process materials, if any, to the State Regents for their consideration.

In the event of an appeal, the review panel will submit a report to the State Regents addressing the objections raised by the IEP. The review panel's findings will be submitted, together with any other records from the hearing, to the State Regents at its next regularly scheduled meeting. The State Regents, after considering the review panel's findings, the evaluation team's report, and the official records pertaining to the IEP's objections to the evaluation team's report, will take action on the objections. No new evidentiary materials will be received at the State Regents' meeting. The IEP will be given the opportunity to present remarks in support of the institution's objections. The State Regents' consideration of the matters and action taken thereon will constitute a final State Regents' review of the IEP's objections to the evaluation team's report.

3.5.4 IEP Standards

This section defines the required program performance standards that State Regents' IEP evaluation teams will use to direct their review process. IEPs will be evaluated based on students utilizing the services of the program for purposes of ~~college~~ admission under this policy. Students utilizing the program for other reasons will not be included in the IEP's evaluation.

A.   Language Program

1. Mission

The IEP must have a written statement describing how its goals, objectives, and future plans support the mission of preparing non-native speakers of English for college work as it relates to State Regents' policy. ~~If associated with an institution, the IEP must indicate evidence of cooperation and support.~~

2. Promotion

IEP promotion materials shall accurately describe program goals, admission requirements, hours of instruction, program length, calendar, prices, and student services. If associated with an Oklahoma institution of higher education, the IEP must indicate evidence of cooperation and support with that or those institutions.

3. Recruitment
The IEP shall adhere to ethical student recruitment standards as described in the NAFSA: Association of International Educators Code of Ethics and in the Standards for Postsecondary Intensive English

Programs approved by the American Association of Intensive English Programs (AAIEP).

4. Admission

    Student admission to the IEP shall rest with the program/institution and shall not be delegated to an external third party.

5. Curriculum

    a.   Quality~~:~~. The IEP will use current methods, materials, and technologies to provide effective language instruction designed to prepare students for college level work.

    b.   Scope~~:~~. The curriculum must ~~consider all language skill areas: listening, speaking, reading, and writing in addition to addressing campus/community acculturation~~ specifically include listening, speaking, reading and writing skills, text genres, and content relevant to English for academic purposes.

    c.   Written Documentation~~:~~. The IEP must have a written ~~curriculum~~ document clearly outlining goals and objectives for ~~all~~ levels of instruction appropriate to students to be admitted under this policy, as well as individual course syllabi for distribution by faculty to their students. Criteria for ~~advancement and~~ successful program completion should be articulated in the ~~curriculum~~ document.

    d.   Testing and Placement~~:~~. Testing and placement shall be executed in accordance with professional standards.

    e.   Faculty/Student Ratio~~:~~. The ratio should represent proportions that the field recognizes as being effective and should be appropriate to the goals of a particular course and the classroom size.

6. Assessment

    The IEP must utilize a formal system of assessment to include evaluation of personnel, courses, and student progress toward stated goals. Broad participation of faculty, staff, and students is required in the assessment process. Selection of assessment instruments and other parameters (target groups, scheduling of assessments, etc.) ~~I~~is the responsibility of the IEP. When appropriate, internationally standardized instruments should be employed. Data collected from assessments should serve as the basis for program modifications.

7. Contact Hours

Excluding lab work, students shall ~~experience~~ attend 18 or more teacher-instructed contact hours per week over a period of no less than 12 weeks (216 hours or more) or ~~experience~~ attend an equivalent number of teacher-instructed contact hours over a longer period not to exceed 18 weeks.

8. ~~Class Levels~~

~~The IEP must offer a sufficient array of class levels to accommodate students' needs.~~

B. Administration

1. Director

There is a program administrator with a main responsibility for the leadership and management of the IEP. Academic administrative personnel should have master's degrees or equivalent training/experience in a field appropriate to their responsibilities.

2. Policy Description

The IEP administration or institutional administration must clearly articulate policies and employment practices.

3. Record Keeping

An accurate record system for students and personnel shall be established. Student data should include enrollment history, immigration documentation, performance in the program, and when possible tracking of ~~student~~ subsequent academic ~~success, and immigration documentation~~ performance in college-level course work. Personnel data should include appropriate documentation of educational credentials and/or work experience for each position.

C. Faculty

1. Full-Time

In order to maintain instructional continuity, there shall be a core of regularly employed teachers who teach a full load (as defined by the IEP) and receive an appropriate salary and fringe benefits.

2. Degree Level

The members of the IEP faculty have at least master's degrees in ~~Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)~~ TESOL or training and/or experience appropriate to their course assignments.

3. Faculty ~~Responsibility~~ Workload

17

Faculty workload, including ~~Instructional contact hours should include~~ class preparation and presentation, ~~student contact~~ work with students out~~side~~ of class, committee work, and staff meetings~~.~~. ~~Workloads~~ should be comparable to similar IEPs in like settings.

4. Professional Development

Faculty shall have adequate opportunity and support for in-service training/professional development.

D.   Student Services

1. Advising

Each student must be assisted with academic planning and have access to follow-up immigration counseling and a written grievance procedure.

2. Orientation

The IEP or the institution shall provide student orientation for the language program, the parent institution if applicable, and the local community.

3. Extracurricular Activities

The IEP or the institution shall address cross-cultural issues to assist student adjustment and have IEP students participate in extracurricular activities.

E.   Finance

Refund Policy: The IEP or the institution must provide students with a written explanation of the refund policy.

F.   Physical Facilities

The learning resources of the IEP must be sufficient for enabling students to develop the learning competencies described above. Adequate office, classroom, and laboratory facilities must be provided. Access to college libraries and instructional activities is highly desirable.

Approved May 1979. Revised October 23, 1989; August 16, 1994; April 11, 1997; May 30, 2003; April 2, 2009.

AGENDA ITEM #8-b:

> **Policy.**

SUBJECT: Approval of revisions to the State Regents' *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents approve revisions to the *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy, as described below.**

BACKGROUND:

In 1988, the State Regents adopted the Educational Outreach General Policy – Policies and Procedures Pertaining to Off-Campus Programs and Courses. This policy served as the umbrella policy for both electronic media and off-campus courses and programs. In 1994, the Council on Instruction and State Regents' staff recommended that the electronic media and off-campus policies be separated because the policy was dated and "….*no longer provides the institutional flexibility coupled with the appropriate State Regents' oversight to serve the increasing population of nontraditional learners, particularly as it relates to emerging technologies*…." The Off-Campus Policy was adopted in September 1994 and the separate Electronic Media Policy was adopted in June 1995.

In 1999, the State Regents adopted the *Oklahoma Learning Site Policies and Procedures.* The policy was developed in response to a 1998 National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) report that found 93 percent of the state's population is within 30 miles of an existing campus or site, but also found that 63 of Oklahoma's 77 counties had unmet higher education needs of some kind. The Learning Site Policy was designed to encourage the creation of a proactive, equitable means of using higher education resources to address unmet higher education needs in communities around the state. This policy was designed to operate under the umbrella of the Electronic Media Policy.

In 2003 the State Regents adopted the *Policies and Procedures Pertaining to the Delivery of Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs.* This policy revision effectively combined the three existing policies: *Policies and Procedures Pertaining to the Electronic Delivery of Courses and Programs, Policy and Procedures Pertaining to Off-Campus Programs and Courses,* and *Oklahoma Learning Site Policies and Procedures.* Substantial changes were made by eliminating large sections of duplicative or unnecessary policy sections and merged sections (academic standards, fiscal provisions, reporting) that involve the electronic media program approval process.

POLICY ISSUES:

The policy revisions of the State Regents' *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy were incorporated to help reduce redundancy, streamline the program approval

process and create a policy that will be consistent with the Higher Learning Commission's electronically delivered program review process.

ANALYSIS:

Throughout the history of this policy, there has been a need to address changes amid a dynamic policy environment that is impacted by emerging technological changes. The proposed policy revisions reflect an initiative to eliminate confusion of policy implementation and streamline the program approval process.

Revisions to the policy were developed by the Council on Instruction (COI) Electronic Media Committee. All academic vice presidents who have online course and programs were invited to participate in the policy revision. It was passed by COI in November 2008. The President's Council reviewed and approved the policy changes in December 2008. A copy of the final draft is attached. Highlights of the revised policy are summarized below.

- **3.16.1.A**
    - Changed title of subsection to "Scope."
    - Updated content to expand on the benefits of electronic delivered format as well as highlight the ties between higher education, the business community and how both contribute to the growth of Oklahoma's economy.

- **3.16.2 Definitions**
    - Added definitions for "Asynchronous," "Blended," "Major," "Online Delivery," "Online Program," and "Synchronous." Updated the "Electronic Media" definition.

- **3.16.4 Program and Course Principles and Procedures**
    - Section was moved from 3.16.11 all subsequent subsections were re-numbered accordingly.
    - Clarified 3.16.4 A-D to be inline with the belief of what constitutes electronically delivered and traditional off-campus courses and programs as it is structured in this policy.

- **3.16.5 Academic Standards**
    - Language was added to strengthen the academic standards for electronic media and off-campus courses and programs and is consistent with Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Best Practices for Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs.
    - Some existing paragraphs were rearranged from their original order to provide a consistent flow of content.

- **3.16.7 Copyright and Intellectual Property**
    - Section was updated to reflect the content and intent of current federal law.

- **3.16.10 Program Approval Procedures for Online Programs**
    - Streamlined the Approval Process
    - Changed the requirement for program approval 100 percent of the major which will allow institutions sufficient time to make necessary changes before submitting request for approval to HLC.
    - Approval is required if the institution meets the following: 1) 100 percent of the courses for the major offered through online delivery or other computer mediated format, or 2) the program is advertised as available through online delivery or other computer mediated format.
    - Moved the procedures section before the Program Proposal Content.

- o Strengthened the Program Proposal Content section by adding language requiring specificity.
- o Deleted the Provisional and the Continuing Approval including Best Practice Review requirements.

- **3.16.11 Approval of Subsequent Online Programs**
  - o Created 3.16.11 from last paragraph of 3.16.10 because it was a separate action.
  - o Added "Letter of Intent" as a requirement for requesting approval for subsequent online programs.
  - o Institution governing boards must approve the program for subsequent program category.

- **3.16.18 Fiscal Provisions for Electronic and Traditional Off-campus Instruction**

Attachment

ELECTRONICALLY DELIVERED AND TRADITIONAL OFF-CAMPUS COURSES AND PROGRAMS

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish standards and procedures for offering electronic media and traditional off-campus courses and programs and for the operation of designated learning sites. The policy builds on the programmatic strengths and the existing capabilities of the State System institutions respectively. Institutions are responsible for ascertaining and aggressively meeting the educational needs in their respective communities as guided by their function statement. In serving those needs, institutions are encouraged to utilize the programmatic and course expertise of sister institutions. The electronic delivery of programs and courses should be used to enhance efficiency while increasing institutional sharing of resources, all for the purpose of enhancing access to postsecondary education opportunities to Oklahoma citizens. Above all, the policy is intended to promote systemwide cooperation and collaboration.

~~Goals~~ Scope

The use of electronic media and traditional off-campus instruction should be applied to the multiple goals of the Oklahoma college and university system:

1. to extend access to place ~~and time~~ bound ~~students;~~ and nontraditional students through the electronic delivery of courses and programs and inform business, government, and community organizations about the benefits of this delivery format;

2. to improve the achievement and skill level of students, whether in traditional campus programs, ~~distance learning~~, or in traditional off-campus settings, or by means of electronic media by actively engaging them in the learning process;

3. ~~to improve the linkages between Oklahoma higher education and other sectors of education~~ to facilitate Oklahoma's economic development by providing needed graduates, offering appropriate academic programs and marketing the State System and its institutions as an economic asset of the state; and

4. ~~to be a force for the dissemination of information and knowledge to business, government, and community organizations,~~

~~5.~~ 4. to enhance institutional resource efficiency ~~while increasing institutional sharing of resources~~, all for the purpose of ~~enhancing access to postsecondary educational opportunities to~~ improving student participation and enrollment by increasing access to postsecondary education and expanding use of distance education for the citizens of Oklahoma ~~citizens~~.

Electronic and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs

22

The policy applies to courses and programs delivered by Oklahoma State System institutions both within and outside of the state of Oklahoma. This policy incorporates language and standards from Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Higher Education and the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association Commission of Colleges and Universities (HLC).

Learning Sites

A 1998 study conducted by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) found that 93 percent of Oklahoma's population is within 30 miles of an existing campus or site. However, it also found that 63 of Oklahoma's 77 counties have unmet higher education needs of some kind. These educational needs are in low population areas and are episodic in nature; thus the creation of centers, branch campuses, or other traditional higher education infrastructure is not warranted. These higher education needs will be met through this policy.

Definitions

The following words and terms, when used in the Chapter, shall have the following meaning, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Asynchronous" learning occurs when students and faculty are not present and available at the same time. Regular communication and instruction may be facilitated by e-mail, discussion boards or other electronic formats.

"Distance Education" is a planned learning that normally occurs in a different place from teaching and as a result requires special techniques of course design, special instructional techniques, special methods of communication by electronic and other technology, as well as special organizational and administrative arrangements. (Moore and Kersley, *Distance Education: A Systems View*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, CA, 1996.)

"Electronic Media" includes, but is not necessarily limited to, video, audio and computer conferencing, CD-ROM, radio, telephone instruction, Internet-based delivery, and combinations thereof. Courses and programs offered at higher education centers, branch campuses, or constituent agencies are not considered traditional off-campus or electronic media offerings as defined in this policy. Branch campuses and constituent agencies may offer courses or programs as indicated in the State Regents' *Functions of Public Institutions* policy. for the purpose of this policy, electronic media includes courses and programs offered through videotape, CD ROM, telecourses, web-based (online), Interactive Television, or other digital methodologies.

"Blended" program or course utilizes both on-site and electronic delivery methods. Blended programs must meet quality standards outlined in 3.16.5 and are not exempt from online program approval if offered as defined in sections 3.16.10 or 3.16.11.

"Learning Site" is a site designated by the State Regents with the function and responsibility of ensuring that higher education needs are met either through programs offered by the designated institution or importing courses from sister institutions. Designated learning sites include the 25 public colleges and universities, the Ardmore Higher Education Center, and the University Center in Ponca City.

"Major" for the purpose of this policy is defined as courses in the discipline of the student's declared major, excluding support courses, general education courses, and elective courses.

"Online Delivery" for the purpose of this policy is defined as teaching and learning that occurs in an online environment through the use of the Internet or other computer-mediated format that results in the awarding of a degree.

"Online Program" for the purpose of this policy is defined as (1) a program that is offered in such a manner that an individual can take 100 percent of the courses for the major through online delivery or other computer-mediated format, or (2) the program is advertised as available through online delivery.

"Program" is a sequentially organized series of courses and other educational experiences designed to culminate in an academic degree or certificate. For purposes of this policy, instructional program, academic program, and course of study will be considered synonymous. Programs offered through electronic media must also meet the requirements outlined in section 3.16.10 of this policy.

"Synchronous" learning takes place when learners and/or instructors are in different geographical locations but are able to interact (or meet) in real-time using specific enabling technology.

"Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs" are those taught for credit at a location which is remote from the main campus of the State System college or university and is not considered part of the college or university's physical plant.

Applicability of Credit

Credit awarded for the completion of courses offered through electronic media and traditional off-campus instruction is fully applicable toward the satisfaction of requirements for academic degrees and certificates consistent with State Regents' and institutional residence and degree requirements.

NOTE: The Program and Course Principles and Procedures section was moved from 3.16.11 to 3.16.4, all subsequent subsections have been edited, re-ordered, and re-numbered as appropriate.

3.16.4 Program and Course Principles and Procedures

The principles and procedures in this section apply to electronically delivered and traditional off-campus programs or courses as indicated.

Note: Courses and programs offered at higher education centers, branch campuses, or constituent agencies are not considered traditional off-campus or electronic media offerings as defined in this policy. Branch campuses and constituent agencies may offer courses or programs as indicated in the State Regents' *Functions of Public Institutions* policy.

B.A. Online and Traditional Off-Campus Programs. College and university requests for new online or traditional off-campus educational programs will be submitted in the same manner as on-campus program requests. Requests for new programs to be delivered electronically or by traditional off-campus delivery will be submitted in the same manner as on-campus programs (See the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval policy*).

B. Online Programs. College and university requests to offer an eExisting programs offered through online delivery will be submitted as specified in 3.16.10 and 3.16.11.

C. Electronic Programs in Other Formats. Existing courses and programs offered through electronic delivery formats that do not meet the requirements outlined in 3.16.10 do not require a program approval. However, courses offered through these methodologies remain within the jurisdiction of this policy and must meet 3.16.5 requirements.

A.D. Traditional Off-Campus. The principles outlined below apply to section 3.16.12.

1. Courses and programs authorized for offering on campus at State System colleges and universities will form the basis for traditional off-campus offerings at State System colleges and universities. Colleges and universities may offer approved on-campus courses within their geographic service area without separate approval by the State Regents.

C.2. A college or university may offer approved on-campus courses outside its geographic service area without separate approval by the State Regents providing that a college or university off-campus agreement exists with the college or university closer to the class site and is on file at the State Regents' office. Courses outside a college's or university's geographic service area shall be for a specified time period.

3.16.5 Academic Standards

The section applies to electronically delivered and traditional-off-campus courses and programs. Certain standards may address particular delivery methods as appropriate. Overall, the expectation is that there is Nno differences should exist

in the academic quality, academic standards including admission and retention standards, and student evaluation standards for courses and programs regardless of delivery method. All State Regents' and institutional policies, standards, and guidelines for on-campus instruction apply to electronic and traditional off-campus instruction. <u>Some of the language in this section is from the Higher Learning Commission's *Best Practices for Electronically Offered Degrees and Certificate Programs.*</u>

<u>NOTE: Some paragraphs below were rearranged from their original order to provide a better flow.</u>

Electronic media and traditional off-campus courses and programs must meet the following academic standards.

A.   <u>Faculty.</u> The work shall be taught by a person qualified for appointment to the faculty of the college or university proposing to award the credit. All appointments must be recommended by the academic unit awarding the credit and approved through the established procedures for academic appointments. ~~Faculty should be competent in the technology required for teaching at a distance.~~

        ~~B~~1.   <u>Faculty should receive training and faculty development to achieve competency in the technology required for teaching at a distance.</u>

~~C.~~   ~~Provisions have been made to assure a robust and secure technology infrastructure, providing maximum reliability for students and faculty.~~

        ~~D.~~2.   <u>The originating institution will appoint qualified faculty as oversight to ensure that the </u>course objectives, curriculum, and academic requirements ~~shall be~~ <u>are</u> equivalent to those for the courses and programs as presented on campus.

B.   <u>Faculty/Student Interaction. Institutions offering electronically delivered courses and programs must make </u>~~P~~provisions for appropriate real-time or delayed interaction between faculty and students and among <u>other</u> students <u>enrolled in the class</u>.

C.   <u>Academic Integrity. The integrity of student course work and credibility of credits and degrees awarded must be ensured. Methods for ensuring academic integrity shall be in place, including methods for administering exams.</u>

D.   <u>Student confidentiality. There shall be methods in place to ensure the confidentiality and privacy of students' personal data.</u>

E.   <u>Advertising. Institutions that advertise to recruit students must provide adequate and accurate information. This includes, but is not limited to the following: admissions requirements, equipment standards, estimated or average program costs, skills needed to complete the programs, curriculum design and time frame for which courses are offered, estimated time to completion, required trips to campus, other services available, etc.</u>

F.	Learning resources. ~~The s~~Students shall have access to facilities and learning materials (textbooks, library, tapes, etc.) on essentially the same basis as students in the same ~~course~~ program or courses taught at the main campus. This includes library privileges for students through interlibrary loan and/or electronic resource access, including online access to catalogs, databases, and other materials.

G.	Academic calendar requirements. The standards observed relating to the number of course meetings and total time spent in the course or in satisfying the course requirements shall be comparable to those observed on the main campus. An exception to course meeting time is allowed ~~for electronic instruction of course meeting time~~ as defined in the Competency-Based Learning (CBL) section in the State Regents' *Academic Calendars* policy. Institutions utilizing this exception must have documented and validated methods for students to demonstrate competencies, student assessment, and awarding academic credit as required by the CBL section.

H.	Admission, retention, assessment. The standards for student admission, retention, and assessment ~~and retention~~ shall be the same as those standards observed for the same courses ~~and~~ or programs on the ~~main~~ originating campus. Similarly, the applicable concurrent enrollment policies apply (see the State Regents' *Institutional Admission and Retention* and *Assessment* policies*)*.

I.	Student ~~S~~services. ~~s~~Students shall have access to program guidance and academic support services, including admissions, enrollment, academic advisement, career counseling, enrollment/registration, tutoring, financial aid, and related services on the same basis as the students located on the main campus. Online programs must make these services available to students in electronic format using the working assumption that these students will not be physically present on campus.

J.	Technical support system. Students in electronic media off-campus courses~~/~~or programs ~~should~~ and faculty shall ~~also~~ have access to appropriate technical support services. A comprehensive technical support system will be defined and available for all hardware, software and delivery systems specified by the institution as required for the courses and program. The support system must include a process for responding to technical problems in a timely manner.

~~M~~K.	Equipment and software/tools. Institutions ~~hosting electronic media~~ offering courses or programs in the formats outlined in this policy shall provide ~~access to facilities that are well equipped and maintained~~ students with accurate information about the technology requirements necessary to complete the course requirements. ~~Additionally, students should have access to general~~ Students must be informed in clear and understandable terms of the electronic or computer resources necessary for successful completion of the class, including, but not limited to, word processing and other productivity tools, e-mail, and Internet services. ~~This would not include class-specific, specialized software programs which should be provided by the originating institution.~~ Institutions that

serve as a learning site by hosting electronic media or traditional off-campus courses or programs delivered by another institution shall provide access to facilities with the electronic or computer resources necessary for successful completion of the class.

3.16.6 Institutional Assessment

Institutional policies governing faculty evaluation, including student evaluation of instruction, apply. Course and program assessment policies of the institution transcripting the course and the State Regents apply. ~~Each college or university offering traditional off-campus and electronic media courses or programs will evaluate them as part of the college or university program review procedure required by the State Regents.~~ Program assessments including faculty and student evaluations are defined with results to be included in the institution's program review process as required by the State Regents. The results of the review should be used to improve the program as appropriate.

3.16.7 Copyright and Intellectual Property

~~All applicable copyright laws apply. All applicable institutional policies regulating intellectual property apply.~~ Institutions must have policies in place that communicate copyright laws regarding the appropriate use of films, videotapes, recordings, and other protected works.

3.16.8 Courses and Programs Offered Out-of-State by Oklahoma Colleges and Universities

A.   The research universities are authorized on a limited basis to carry out programs and projects on a national and international scale. Other colleges and universities seeking approval to offer out-of-state courses must ensure through documentation in a prescribed format that all applicable State Regents' policies are followed, with special attention given those pertaining to educational standards, fiscal provisions, and reporting. (See the State Regents' *Functions of Public Institutions* policy).

B.   The primary responsibility of a State System college or university is to serve the citizens of the state of Oklahoma, therefore a college or university must document that offering courses out of state will in no way diminish the performance of that responsibility. That documentation--when audited and upon State Regents' approval certified--will be provided by the college or university to appropriate state agencies and accrediting associations in whose jurisdiction the courses are to be available and the college or university shall meet their requirements within those jurisdictions.

3.16.9 Courses and Programs Offered in Oklahoma by Out-of-State Colleges and Universities

Out-of-state colleges and universities planning to offer courses for credit in Oklahoma may do so after satisfying the conditions contained in the State Regents' *Institutional Accreditation* policy.

3.16.10 ~~Electronic Media~~ Program Approval Procedures for Online Programs

~~State Regents' approval is required~~ Institutions that have not been approved previously to offer online programs are required to request approval ~~to electronically extend existing campus-based academic programs defined~~ as follows: (1) if ~~courses~~ programs are offered in such a manner ~~or location~~ that an individual student can take ~~50~~ 100 percent ~~or more~~ of the courses for the major ~~electronically;~~ through online delivery or other computer-mediated format; or (2) the program is advertised as available ~~in electronic~~ through online delivery or other computer-mediated format. For the purpose of this policy, major is defined as courses in the discipline of the student's declared degree program, excluding support courses, general education courses, and elective courses. Criteria for ~~provisional~~ approval are based on qualitative consideration and the compatibility of the requested offering with the institution's mission and capacity as ~~defined~~ described below. ~~Criteria for continuing approval will be based on a best practices review or, where appropriate, a joint Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (HLC) evaluation as detailed below.~~ Once an institution establishes that a verifiable structure is in place including appropriate student and faculty support systems and other required quality standards, subsequent programs may be requested through an abbreviated process (see section 3.16.11).

NOTE: 3.16.9.A Procedures section was moved in front of Program Proposal Content for better content flow.

A. Program Request Procedures

The ~~submitting~~ institution requesting the State Regents' ~~for provisional~~ approval of an existing academic program to be offered ~~electronically~~ in an online format will ~~follow~~ adhere to the following procedures.

~~a.~~1. The institutional president must submit a letter of intent to the Chancellor to initiate the request. The Chancellor will then inform the other institutional presidents of this request and provide the opportunity for comment, questions and protests, as well as request for copies of the proposals when received. This "letter of intent" will be active for a period of one year and must be received by the Chancellor at least 30 days prior to the program request.

2. Submission of a Program Request

Upon the Chancellor's receipt of the Program Request from an institution, copies of the Program Request will be provided to institutions that have asked for a copy. Institutions will have 30 days from the date the copy is sent to provide comment, submit questions, or protest the proposed program.

~~b.~~a. The institutional governing board must approve the program request prior to the institutional president formally submitting the request to the Chancellor for the State Regents' consideration.

d.b. The Chancellor will submit a recommendation to the State Regents. Prior to the formal submission of the recommendation, the institution will be informed of the Chancellor's recommendation.

e.c. The State Regents will take one of three actions:

    i. disapprove the program with written explanation to the institution of the reasons for this action;

    ii. defer the program request until the institution meets specified criteria or provides additional information; or

    iii. provisionally approve the program for a specified period of time pending a best practices evaluation detailed in the following section 3.16.9.B.1 for offering in an online format as long as academic standards and policy are followed.

B. Provisional Approval Program Proposal Content:

The program request must address the following information/criteria how the institution will meet the Academic Standards specified in section 3.10.5 and the criteria listed below:

1. Approval Criteria

a. The location(s) and/or students the program is designed to serve.

1. Mission. The proposal must contain a statement of the program's connection to the institution's mission.

2. Method of Delivery. Describe the method that will be used to deliver the program content (e.g., Blackboard, Desire2Learn, etc.) and the major features that will facilitate learning.

b.3. Student demand. Evidence of sufficient student and/or employer need for the program in this learning mode. Evidence should demonstrate employers' preference for graduates of the proposed program and target student audience.

c.4. Duplication. Demonstration that the program does not unnecessarily duplicate existing programs in the state (see the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval* policy).

5. Curriculum. A list of the curriculum will be provided with a request to offer an existing program online.

Requests for new programs for offering on-campus and/or through an online format will be submitted for initial approval through the *Academic Program Approval* policy.

a. ~~Appropriateness of the proposed technology to meet the program's objectives and demonstration that the institution possesses the equipment and technical expertise to offer the program in this mode of delivery.~~

b. ~~Coursework will be taught by persons qualified for appointment to the faculty of the discipline in the institution instructing the course. All appointments must be approved by the academic unit instructing the course and approved through established procedures for academic appointments. Provisions must be made for faculty support services and faculty training specifically related to teaching via the planned technology~~

c. ~~Assurances that appropriate learning resources including library resources, laboratories, facilities, and equipment are available to students.~~

d. ~~Reasonable and adequate student access to the range of student services appropriate to support their learning including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, business office services, placement and counseling, and technical support.~~

e. ~~Provisions for appropriate real-time or delayed interaction between faculty and students and among students.~~

f. ~~Plans to insure the integrity of the student work and the credibility of degrees and credits awarded.~~

g. ~~Provisions to ensure that advertising, recruiting, and admissions materials. These materials must clearly and accurately represent the program and the services available to the student.~~

h.6. Program cost. Productivity goals related to the cost and funding of the proposed program must be included in the proposal. (see on the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval* policy).

C. ~~Continuing Approval~~

~~During the period of provisional program approval, the institution is required to conduct an organized, rigorous, and thorough best practices review. Continuing program approval will be based upon the conduct of this best practices review; the plans for implementing the recommendations as a result of the review; review and approval of the HLC, as appropriate; and other productivity or qualitative standards that may be set at the time of provisional approval. The best practices review~~

will include the areas outlined below. To assist institutions in this process, *A Best Practices Review Guidelines* document is provided in the procedures manual.

1. This best practices review will include:

    a. The systematic identification of the qualitative processes that contribute to high performing institutions in the particular mode of delivery and field experiences using external consultants to assist as needed in this process.

    b. The identification of quantitative benchmarks against which progress and success can be measured

    c. The systematic survey of potential "best practice" sites both in the state of Oklahoma and outside the state to discover which institutions have been successful.

    d. Site visits and/or personal interviews with key personnel at the best practices sites.

    e. A summary of findings.

    f. An implementation plan for making the necessary improvements in processes to achieve "best practice" in this institutional program.

2. Additional evaluation of the provisionally approved program will include the following student success information:

    a. Students' background, knowledge, and technology skills.

    b. Assessment of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student and faculty satisfaction.

HLC requires an on-site visit for the first-time delivery of a program offered primarily through distance delivery methods; to add an instructional site, an evaluator's panel or on-site visit is required. Review and approval by HLC are required prior to the program receiving continuing approval by the State Regents.

The role of the State Regents' staff is to assist in the design of the best practices study and to solicit other participants initiating similar programs. State Regents' staff may serve as observers during any required HLC review.

Both the HLC, where appropriate, and the best practices reviews must be completed with results and institutional plans for implementation submitted to the State Regents prior to the expiration of the provisional program approval. State Regents' approval is required for the program to continue beyond the provisionally approved time period.

NOTE: Separated last paragraph from 3.16.10.C because it is a separate action. The following subsections have been re-numbered accordingly.

<u>3.16.11 Approval of Subsequent Online Programs.</u>

Once ~~an institution has successfully completed a best practice review and received provisional and continuing (final) approval of an electronic delivery program, existing~~ <u>the State Regents have approved an institution's offering a program through online delivery or other computer-mediated format, additional</u> programs may be considered ~~for electronic delivery~~ that do not require the ~~two-step~~ <u>comprehensive</u> approval method described above. The process for requesting additional existing programs <u>(new programs must be requested through the</u> *Academic Program Approval* <u>policy)</u> ~~for electronic~~ <u>through online</u> delivery <u>or other computer-mediated format</u> is for the President to send the following information to the Chancellor: 1) <u>letter of intent 2)</u> the name of the program, <u>3</u>) delivery method/s, <u>4</u>) information related to population served and student demand, <u>5</u>) cost and financing. ~~And 6) provide any substantial updates to previous best practices reviews.~~ The State Regents will consider the program request and take the appropriate action. If the program is approved, no additional action is required.

3.16.12 Off-Campus Geographic Service Areas

This section outlines principles and procedures that colleges and universities will use to coordinate traditional off-campus offerings. Coordination with nearby colleges or universities should take place prior to proceeding with traditional off-campus offerings, particularly as it relates to duplication. Attached maps A and B are provided to clarify colleges' and universities' geographic perimeters.

The primary criterion is that each state college or university will have first priority for offering programs and courses consistent with its mission within its approved service area. However, no college or university may deliver higher education services at any site whose location is closer to another college or university than the college or university desiring to offer the service ("home rule") without having an off-campus agreement on file with the State Regents.

A.   Community Colleges

        A map is on file at the State Regents' office that defines the service areas in which the community colleges will have first priority for offering programs and courses consistent with their respective missions.

B.   Regional Universities

        A map is on file at the State Regents' office that defines the service areas in which regional universities will have first priority for offering programs and courses consistent with their respective missions.

C.   Research Universities

        The research universities will have first priority for offering courses and programs consistent with their respective missions. In addition, to the extent resources are available, research universities are authorized to offer programs and courses on a national and international scale.

D.   Branch Campuses and Constituent Agencies

Courses and programs generally may not be extended off campus from branch sites or constituent agencies. The technical branches have a statewide responsibility for offering unique technical or specialized programs when expressed need is documented and when the institution's resources permit the meeting of that need.

E.   Unique Programs

Colleges and universities with unique programs will also have statewide geographic responsibility for offering courses and programs when need is documented and resources are available.

F.   Historical Presence

Existing authorization for programs that have a historical presence in a service area other than in the assigned service area of the college or university offering the program will be honored.

G.   Ardmore Higher Education Program

Requests for traditional off-campus courses in the proximity of the Ardmore Higher Education Center will be coordinated with the center.

When geographical conflicts occur, college or university officials with sufficient authority will meet to resolve the geographical conflict prior to proceeding with the course offering. Any geographical conflict not resolved at this level will be submitted to the Chancellor who may refer the issue to the Presidents' Academic Affairs Committee, which is advisory to the Chancellor. The State Regents will ultimately be responsible for conflict resolution.

3.16.13 Fiscal Provisions for Electronic and Traditional Off-campus Instruction

A.   It is the intent of the State Regents that, to the extent possible through the authorized fee structure, direct instructional costs be recovered for electronic media and traditional off-campus offerings. Direct instructional costs include, but are not limited to, faculty salaries, fringe benefits, materials and supplies, printing, and travel. All new facilities for traditional off-campus offerings shall be provided at no expense to the state.

B.   Contract Credit Course Fee. As set forth in 70 O.S.§3219.3 (2001), the 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."

C.   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

34

assessment and collection of additional fees from students (resident tuition, nonresident tuition, other special fees, student activity, health facilities fees, etc.) shall be waived.

~~Program and Course Principles and Procedures~~

~~A.~~ ~~Courses and programs authorized for offering on campus at State System colleges and universities will form the basis for traditional off-campus offerings at State System colleges and universities. Colleges and universities may offer approved on-campus courses within their geographic service area without separate approval by the State Regents.~~

~~B.~~ ~~College and university requests for new traditional off-campus educational programs will be submitted in the same manner as on-campus program requests. Requests for new programs to be delivered electronically or by traditional off-campus delivery will be submitted in the same manner as on-campus programs (See the State Regents'~~ ~~*Academic Program Approval policy*).~~

~~C.~~ ~~A college or university may offer approved on-campus courses outside its geographic service area without separate approval by the State Regents providing that a college or university off-campus agreement exists with the college or university closer to the class site and is on file at the State Regents' office. Courses outside a college's or university's geographic service area shall be for a specified time period.~~

3.16.14 Oklahoma Learning Site State Goals, Objectives, and Strategies

To achieve the potential and promise of learning sites, the following state goals with accompanying objectives are established. Also detailed are key strategies to achieve the state goals.

Statement of Goals

Improve the quality of life of Oklahoma citizens.

Improve Oklahoma's rankings on national economic indicators – achieve a condition in which Oklahoma's growth rate on national economic indicators is consistently above the national average.

Objectives

~~In furtherance of these state goals,~~ The State System is committed to pursuing a public agenda for higher education encompassing the following objectives:

Provide access for citizens and employers in all geographic areas of the state to needed academic programs and associated support services.

Enhance the capacity of Oklahoma's colleges and universities to meet

the needs of the individual and the corporate citizens of the state. This capacity should have these characteristics:

Accessibility: Oklahoma institutions will have the capacity to deliver educational content to all parts of the state at appropriate times and in appropriate formats.

Programmatic relevance: Consistent with this policy, Oklahoma institutions will have the capacity to provide needed programs or, if necessary, to acquire programs from out of state. The authority to acquire programs from out-of-state colleges and universities shall be based on demonstrated demand and a State Regents' determination that ongoing programmatic capacity should not be created in the state.

Quality: As detailed in this policy, Oklahoma institutions will have the collective capacity to provide programs that are competitive in the marketplace with regard to both academic quality and the capacity to be delivered at off-campus locations.

Responsiveness: Oklahoma's higher education institutions will respond and will be provided the incentives to respond to client needs in a timely fashion. This responsiveness applies to both academic programs and problem-solving/technical assistance.

Cost-effectiveness: Oklahoma will enhance the quality of existing educational assets (physical and human) and utilize these assets to serve a broader array of clients. Decisions to invest in new educational assets will be made on a very selective basis.

Strategies to Increase the Educational Attainment Levels of the State's Adult Population

A sub-goal is to reduce the within state variation in educational attainment (i.e., reducing the proportion of the population in the lowest categories of educational attainment).

Promote the development of an economy that fully utilizes the talents of a more highly educated citizenry.

A sub-goal is to reduce the disparities among the state's regions and between urban and rural areas in economic strength (e.g., capacity to attract and retain business, industry, and other employers who provide employment for an educated workforce).

3.16.15 Designation and Operation of Learning Sites

The 25 public colleges and universities, the Ardmore Higher Education Center, and a learning site in Ponca City are officially designated as learning sites. To most effectively meet the educational needs of the state, the institutional branch campuses must play active roles. At this time, the branch campuses are not officially designated as learning sites. Nonetheless, the home institutions should exercise the philosophy inherent in the learning site initiatives at their branch campuses and work aggressively to meet community educational needs.

These designated learning sites provide geographic access to nearly all Oklahoma residents. Therefore, rather than proactively seeking the development of new sites in additional communities, the State Regents will focus attention on ensuring the capacity of these initial sites to function effectively as learning sites.

The State Regents recognize that communities in addition to those where initial site designations are made may want a learning site as one component of a broader community development strategy. The State Regents will decide the designation of such locations as learning sites on a case-by-case basis. Among the factors that will be considered in making a decision regarding such a designation:

The proximity of the proposed site to one previously designated and the extent and nature of adverse impacts on the existing learning sites.

The availability of appropriate physical facilities. These facilities can be located either in existing structures – libraries, schools, community centers, or corporate offices – or in structures constructed expressly for this purpose. In the latter case, funding for construction must come from sources other than the state.

The availability of necessary technology (bandwidth, computing capacity, interactive video, etc.).

Provision for ensuring the availability of the staffing necessary to offer required administrative and student support services at the learning site.

3.16.16 Responsibility

Consistent with the State Regents' functional assignments, each institution is assigned a geographic area within which it, as a learning site, is charged with ensuring that priority educational needs in their assigned areas are met.

In the case of learning sites that are not based at an existing institution, the State Regents will designate an institution as responsible, or the State Regents will assume the responsibility for identifying the educational needs and providers with the advice of clients and local community stakeholders.

3.16.17 Coordination of Multiple Learning Sites in the Same Area

There are instances in which multiple learning sites serve residents of the same geographic area. Initially, the State Regents will recognize each such learning site as equal within the context of this policy. These learning sites are encouraged to develop a mechanism for working cooperatively to identify and

arrange for provision of educational services to residents of their responsibility area.

After monitoring the level of service delivery relative to community need, the practice detailed above may be altered and one or more learning sites may be selected to assume a leadership position in assessing local needs and devising a response to those needs.

3.16.18 Program Approval and Review

This policy and the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval policy* and *Academic Program Review policy* guide new program approval and review.

Consistent with the State Regents' Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (APRA) initiative, priority for investments in programmatic capacity will be given to selective improvement of existing programs rather than to the creation of new academic programs. The state's existing educational institutions' programmatic capacity is to be utilized to extend the reach to students not currently served by these programs. Institutional identification of programs for selective improvements is to be incorporated into the institutions' academic program review process.

New programs will be approved when, in addition to meeting the requirements in the related State Regents' policies cited above:

No acceptable providers either within or outside the state of a needed program can be identified.

The State Regents determine that the new program is in the long-term interests of the institution and the state.

Opportunities for improved quality, delivery, and cost savings can be achieved through collaboration of several institutions in the development of programs, courses, or modules for off-campus delivery.

3.16.19 Planning

    Select programmatic areas in which the institution has or intends to develop the capacity to deliver high-quality learning opportunities at sites distant from the campus.

    Identify areas where the institution should consider collaborating with other institutions to develop joint programs, courses, or modules for both distance and on-campus delivery.

    Identify areas, in conjunction with the institution's learning site designation, where the institution should import programs, courses, or modules from other institutions to serve both learning site and on-campus students.

    Identify programs or courses for redesign (perhaps in collaboration with other institutions) to be better suited to distance delivery and/or to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, and flexibility of on-campus delivery.

3.16.18 ~~Fiscal Provisions for Electronic and Traditional Off-campus Instruction~~

    ~~It is the intent of the State Regents that, to the extent possible through the authorized fee structure, direct instructional costs be recovered for electronic media and traditional off-campus offerings. Direct instructional costs include, but are not limited to, faculty salaries, fringe benefits, materials and supplies, printing, and travel. All new facilities for traditional off-campus offerings shall be provided at no expense to the state.~~

    ~~Contract Credit Course Fee. As set forth in 70 O.S.§3219.3 (2001), the 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 tuition, nonresident tuition, other special fees, student activity, health facilities fees, etc.) shall be waived.~~

3.16.20 Host Institutions

    The objective of new fiscal provisions and incentives for the host institutions/learning sites is founded on the need to develop and maintain essential infrastructure and support services and to incentivize the importing of courses and programs to meet priority needs in the region.

    Capacity Building/Sustaining Grants (Receive Site Funding)

        Each learning site recognized by the State Regents will receive an annual grant to be used in the creation and maintenance of the basic infrastructure necessary for successful functioning of a site. In the initial years, it is anticipated that the funds will be utilized primarily to equip

interactive video classrooms, computer labs, etc. In subsequent years, it is anticipated that these funds will be utilized to replace equipment on a regular cycle and provide some funding for necessary support staff. Since capacity building/sustaining grants are largely institutional grants, institutions with more than one site (a branch campus, center, etc. in addition to the main campus) are encouraged to target their funding on those sites where there is the least potential overlap with other institutions.

Service Level Rewards

In addition to capacity building grants, as funds become available learning sites will be funded for the amount of service provided to clients in the responsibility areas which they serve. As additional funds become available, funding officially designated higher education sites at appropriate levels is the recommended first priority and incentive funding is the recommended second priority. The greater the service provided, the greater the funding that flows to the learning site. This funding mechanism component is based on only service delivered by an institution other that the host institutions, including services produced by another institution that replace those that would normally be taught by an institution's own faculty. (A methodology to determine service level rewards will be developed.)

Priority Investment Fund

To the extent funding is available, the State Regents will develop a priority investment fund tied to economic and workforce development objectives set in cooperation with the Oklahoma Department of Commerce. The objective of the priority investment funds is to make it cost feasible for institutions to provide new, high-priority offerings for low numbers of potential learners in sparsely populated regions. The intent of the fund will be to ensure that priority programs and services are available and that the target audience can gain access to the services through learning sites.

3.16.21 Provider Institutions

Electronic Curriculum Development Fund. Because provider institutions need support to develop and deliver high-quality electronic courses, modules, or programs, the State Regents will expand on the cooperative curriculum development project by creating and maintaining a curriculum development fund, as funds become available. The intent of this fund will be to support initiatives from institutions, consortia of institutions, or inter-institutional teams to develop new curricula, modules, or new educational methods. Many of the needs in Oklahoma are likely to be in locations and fields where new approaches to curricular design and delivery will be necessary. To the extent funds are available; grants under this fund will be made annually on a competitive basis. The purpose of the grants will be to develop courses that can be: a) effectively delivered to off-campus locations and b) simultaneously utilized on campus to deliver instruction in a more effective and efficient way.

3.16.22 Reporting

All electronic media and traditional off-campus course data will be an integral part of each institution's unitized data system.

To the fullest extent possible, reports of authorized electronic media and traditional off-campus courses will be completed using the Unitized Data System (UDS). Until such time as UDS can accommodate these reports, institutions will submit the needed information.

Copies of signed and executed college or university traditional off-campus agreements will be provided to the State Regents' office prior to the offering of the course(s).

Institutions will annually report on learning site operations in the Academic Plan submitted to the State Regents in July each year. Periodically, a report on the status of learning sites will be published by the State Regents.

3.16.23 Policy Review

This policy will be reviewed on a regular basis. Benchmarks for evaluating the policy's effectiveness should be based on the academic quality of the courses and programs and the cost and accessibility to Oklahoma citizens. Additional measures for evaluating student success should include retention, grades, graduation rates, general satisfaction with course quality, methods of delivery, and academic support services.

AGENDA ITEM #9:

Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System.

SUBJECT: Annual Report of the 2008-2009 Educational Planning and Assessment System.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents have sponsored the Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS) as a student preparation initiative since 1993. In the 2008-2009 academic year 81,958 students took the EPAS assessments. The EXPLORE assessment was taken by 42,998 8th grade students and 38,960 students took the 10th grade PLAN assessment. Beginning with four school districts in the 1993 pilot, EPAS has now grown to include over 500 participating districts, including 48 private schools. Currently 97.5% of Oklahoma's 429 K-12 school districts are participating in EPAS.

Each of these districts voluntarily participates in EPAS, which is over and above the state's required testing for K-12 education. The EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT assessments are linearly scaled, and developmentally progressive allowing for longitudinal monitoring of student progress toward college readiness over time. EPAS is the only state-funded assessment system that provides feedback to the student, parents and educators relative to college benchmarks.

POLICY ISSUES:

EPAS was originally created as a social justice initiative to strengthen student academic preparation following State Regents' policy action to raise admissions standards in the 1990's. State Regents' EPAS involvement was deepened by State 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. EPAS is the foundation of State Regents K-16 student preparation efforts.

ANALYSIS:

The EXPLORE assessment, administered to 8th graders, is a good estimate of what a student would score on the PLAN assessment. In turn, PLAN is a good predictor of what the student would score on the ACT, had the student taken those assessments on the same date. The predictive nature of EPAS indicates that students will typically score two to four points higher on each successive assessment.

Eighth Grade EXPLORE Assessment Results

ACT has analyzed Oklahoma's EPAS student data for a number of years and has established the Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmarks based on the ACT cut score of 19. The following table

displays the EXPLORE results over the past five testing years against these Benchmarks. Data in bold indicate scores that fall below the Oklahoma benchmarks.

Oklahoma EPAS The EXPLORE Assessment over Five Years (Scale 1-25)						
Testing Area	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmark (based on ACT cut score of 19)
English	**13.8**	**13.9**	14.0	14.0	**13.9**	14
Mathematics	**14.0**	**14.1**	**14.2**	**14.4**	**14.6**	15
Reading	**13.9**	**13.9**	14.0	14.1	14.0	14
Science	15.8	15.9	15.9	15.9	15.9	15
Composite	14.5	14.6	14.7	14.7	14.7	

At the eighth grade level, Oklahoma's students appear to be on track for college readiness in Reading and Science. Mathematics, although showing steady improvement, continues to fall below the benchmark. The dip in the English score is of concern and will be monitored to ensure it is not a trend.

EXPLORE and Achievement Gaps

This table compares the 2008-2009 scores of ethnic groups to the Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmarks which are based on the ACT cut score of 19. Data in bold indicate scores that fall below Oklahoma benchmarks.

Oklahoma EPAS The EXPLORE Assessment 2008-2009 (Scale 1-25)							
Testing Area	African American (3,715)	American Indian (5,309)	Caucasian (22,127)	Hispanic (3,769)	Asian (877)	Multiracial, Other, Prefer not to respond (PFR) (4,673)	Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmark (based on ACT cut score of 19)
English	**11.9**	**13.2**	14.8	**12.2**	15.2	**13.2**	14
Mathematics	**12.6**	**14.0**	15.3	**13.3**	16.5	**13.2**	15
Reading	**12.4**	**13.6**	14.7	**12.6**	15.0	**13.5**	14
Science	**14.6**	15.5	16.5	15.1	17.2	15.5	15
Composite	13.0	14.2	15.4	13.4	16.1	14.2	

Oklahoma continues to struggle relative to equity of preparation for all subgroups. The disaggregated data by ethnic group shows significant achievement gaps for African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics and those students identifying themselves as Multiracial, Other or PFR. When the EXPLORE data are disaggregated by gender, female students outscore their male counterparts in all content areas except mathematics. Males score 14.6 and females score 14.5 in mathematics at the 8th grade level. Data in bold indicate scores that fall below the Oklahoma benchmarks.

Oklahoma EPAS The EXPLORE Assessment 2008-2009 (Scale 1-25)			
Testing Area	Females	Males	Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmark (based on ACT cut score of 19)
English	14.4	**13.3**	14
Mathematics	**14.5**	**14.6**	15
Reading	14.3	14.0	14
Science	16.1	15.7	15
Composite	15.0	14.5	

Other EXPLORE Data

The EXPLORE test includes questions that allow students to self report information in several key areas, such as educational aspiration and potential career plans. Additionally, State Regents are able to add some Oklahoma specific questions to the exam. The following are a sample of student responses:

- Sixty-six percent indicate a plan to attend a two-year or four-year college after high school.
- Thirty-eight percent of eighth-grade students indicated they believe their courses are challenging.
- Only twenty-nine percent agreed or strongly agreed that a teacher or counselor helps them plan their courses for school or graduation.
- Forty-seven percent get most of their information about college from parents, friends or family while twenty-four percent get this information from teachers, counselor or coaches.

Tenth Grade PLAN Assessment Results

This table compares the PLAN results over the past five testing years against the Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmarks. Data in bold indicate scores that fall below the Oklahoma benchmarks.

Oklahoma EPAS The PLAN Assessment 2008-2009 (Scale 1-32)						
Testing Area	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmark (based on ACT cut score of 19)
English	16.2	16.4	16.2	**15.8**	16.0	16
Mathematics	**16.5**	**16.5**	**16.5**	**16.4**	**16.5**	17
Reading	16.4	16.5	16.5	16.4	16.2	15
Science	17.7	17.7	17.6	17.4	17.4	16
Composite	16.8	16.9	16.8	16.6	16.7	

PLAN and Achievement Gaps

This table analyzes the 2008-2009 scores of ethnic groups compared to the Oklahoma benchmarks. Data in bold indicate scores that fall below the benchmarks.

	Oklahoma EPAS The PLAN Assessment 2008-2009 (Scale 1-32)						
Testing Area	African American (3,333)	American Indian (5,004)	Caucasian (22,348)	Hispanic (3,148)	Asian (798)	Multiracial, Other, PNR (3,591)	Oklahoma College Readiness Benchmark (based on ACT cut score of 19)
English	**13.7**	**15.3**	16.9	**14.2**	17.3	**15.5**	16
Mathematics	**14.3**	**15.8**	17.2	**15.1**	18.9	**16.1**	17
Reading	**14.0**	15.8	17.0	**14.5**	17.3	15.7	15
Science	**15.7**	16.9	18.0	16.4	19.0	17.0	16
Composite	14.6	16.1	17.4	15.2	18.2	16.2	

The challenge of achievement gaps continues throughout high school years. Even the majority Caucasian population is outpaced by Asian students which is the smallest self-identified group. When the PLAN data are disaggregated by gender, female students outscore their male counterparts in all content areas except mathematics. Males increase the gap over females from EXPLORE to PLAN in the mathematics content area from one tenth to five tenths of a point. Females have increased their lead in English and Reading from the EPXLORE to the PLAN.

	Oklahoma EPAS The PLAN Assessment for 2008-2009 (Scale 1-32)		
Testing Area	Females	Males	OK College Readiness Benchmark (based on ACT cut score of 19)
English	16.7	**15.4**	16
Mathematics	**16.2**	**16.7**	17
Reading	16.7	15.7	15
Science	17.5	17.4	16
Composite	16.9	16.5	

Oklahoma Student Perspective

Among Oklahoma students who took the PLAN test in the 10th grade in 2008-2009:

- Forty-five percent agreed or strongly agreed that their classes are challenging.
- Thirty-nine percent agreed or strongly agreed that counselors or teachers help them plan their courses for graduation.
- Sixty-five percent plan to attend a two-year or four-year college after high school.
- Forty-seven percent of these students get most of their information about college from teachers, counselors or coaches while twenty-four percent get this information from parents, friends or family.

AGENDA ITEM #10:

ACT – Oklahoma 2008 College Readiness Awards.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

The ACT Assessment is the college admissions test that is used and accepted by colleges nationwide and throughout Oklahoma. In 2008, over 70% of Oklahoma students took the ACT which is the predominant college admissions and readiness achievement test in Oklahoma. These awards are given by ACT, Inc. to schools that test at least 30 students on the ACT, have shown an increase in their number of test-takers, and have seen an increase in the mean score of at least 1 point.

POLICY ISSUES:

The ACT Assessment is the capstone of the Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS). The State Regents have provided EPAS free of charge to all Oklahoma public and private schools since 1995. EPAS assists school faculty and staff as well as students and parents focus on college readiness. Each of the 2008 ACT College Readiness Award schools and their feeder schools have participated in the EPAS program for many years.

ANALYSIS:

These schools have made significant strides in increasing the college readiness of their graduates as demonstrated by their ACT score increases over the past five years as well as increases in the number of test-takers.   Only eleven high schools in Oklahoma were honored for this superior level of accomplishment.

2008 ACT College Readiness Awardees	2004		2008	
	Number	Average Composite	Number	Average Composite
Dickson High School, Ardmore	38	18.6	58	20.0
Idabel High School, Idabel	52	17.7	57	19.1
Madill High School, Madill	53	18.2	62	20.0
Star Spencer High School, Oklahoma City	35	14.8	73	16.1
Caney Valley High School, Ramona	35	20.1	36	21.5

Savanna High School, Savanna	33	18.5	34	19.5
Stroud High School, Stroud	33	20.1	37	21.2
Berryhill High School, Tulsa	67	19.9	90	21.3
Metro Christian Academy, Tulsa	66	23.1	90	24.3
Thomas A. Edison High School, Tulsa	126	19.6	187	20.6
Wagoner High School, Wagoner	75	19.0	76	20.5

AGENDA ITEM #11-a:

E&G Budgets.

SUBJECT: Approval of allocation of Brain Gain grant funds to Redlands Community College for the Higher Education Conference on Enrollment Management.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the allocation of $3,232.00 to Redlands Community College for the 2009 State System Higher Education Conference on Enrollment Management.

BACKGROUND:

In January 2005, the State Regents facilitated a system-wide assessment of the state-based financial aid and scholarship programs conducted by Noel-Levitz, a national consulting firm, to analyze the effectiveness of the State's programs in increasing the number of college graduates produced in the State. This assessment culminated in a workshop for institutional personnel to provide information on best practices in the fields of enrollment management and financial aid. The first system-wide conference was held in February 2006. At their May 2008 meeting, the State Regent allocated $3.75 million to Brain Gain both for performance funding and grant incentive awards. This allocation also supports an annual conference designed to provide continued professional development for improving opportunities in marketing, recruitment, retention and strategic uses of financial aid.

POLICY ISSUES:

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

ANALYSIS:

The fourth annual Higher Education Conference on Enrollment Management was held at Redlands Community College on February 26, 2009 with approximately 200 in attendance. Each institution in the State System was invited to bring teams of six persons to benefit from presentations by national experts and discussions with other institutions on best practices. This allocation is to fund expenses associated with the conference.

HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE ON ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
February 26, 2009

AGENDA

8 a.m. to 8:30 a.m.	**Registration and Refreshments**
8:30 a.m. to 9 a.m.	**Welcome – seating by institution**
	Chancellor Glen D. Johnson, The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education
	President Larry F. Devane, Redlands Community College
9 a.m. to 10 a.m.	**Opening Session**
	Kati Haycock, President, The Education Trust
	Access and Success in Higher Education: Can We Do More?
10 a.m. to 11 a.m.	**Concurrent Sessions**

Follow-up discussion with Kati Haycock
Kati Haycock, President, The Education Trust

Course Redesign
Phoebe Rouse, Precalculus Mathematics Coordinator, Louisiana State University

Call to Action: How to Use the ALFI Data
Dr. Judith B. Wertheim, Vice President, Higher Education Services, The Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL)

Using Higher Education Data Sources
Dr. Houston Davis, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Patrick Kelly, Senior Associate/Director of National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)

11 a.m. to 12 p.m.	**Concurrent Sessions**

Best Practices for Enrollment Management
Dr. Rosemary Hayes, Director, Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange (CSDRE), The University of Oklahoma

Oklahoma Strategic Enrollment Management Institute (OSEMI)
Joe Evans, Registrar/Director of Enrollment and Records, University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma
Dr. Bill Nowlin, Dean of Enrollment Management/Registrar, Northeastern State University
Amy Ishmael, Vice President for Enrollment Management/Student Records, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College

Using OKcollegestart.org as an Enrollment Management Tool
Dr. George Dixon, Senior Fellow, The Institute for College and Career Success (ICCS), working with Xap, Inc.

Leveraging Financial Aid and Maximizing the Impact of Scholarship and
Financial Aid Programs
Kevin W. Crockett, President/CEO and Principal of Noel-Levitz

12 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.	**Luncheon Session – seating by institution**
	The State of Adult Learning and Implications for Workforce Development

	Pamela Tate, President and CEO, The Council for Adult & Experiential Learning (CAEL)
1:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.	**Concurrent Sessions**
	Follow-up discussion with Pamela Tate
	Pamela Tate, President and CEO, The Council for Adult & Experiential Learning (CAEL)
	Course Redesign
	Phoebe Rouse, Precalculus Mathematics Coordinator, Louisiana State University
	Map Your Road to Enrollment Management Success—Using ACT's Enrollment Management Services
	Dr. Don Pitchford, Postsecondary Consultant, ACT Southwest Region
	Using Higher Education Data Sources
	Dr. Houston Davis, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
	Patrick Kelly, Senior Associate/Director of National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)
	Compiling and Interpreting Enrollment Management Data
	Kevin W. Crockett, President/CEO and Principal of Noel-Levitz
2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.	**Concurrent Sessions**
Refreshments will be available in the Conference Center Hallway.	*Presidents' Meeting with Pamela Tate*
	Pamela Tate, President and CEO, The Council for Adult & Experiential Learning (CAEL)
	The Role of Faculty in Student Retention: Tradeoff or Outreach?
	Dr. Larry G. Edwards, Vice President, Academic Affairs, OSU-Oklahoma City
	Call to Action: How to Use the ALFI Data
	Dr. Judith B. Wertheim, Vice President, Higher Education Services, The Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL)
	Engaging the Campus in Enrollment Management
	Dr. Myron Pope, Vice President for Enrollment Management, University of Central Oklahoma
	Jerry Legere, Associate Vice President/Registrar, Enrollment Management, University of Central Oklahoma
	Drew Duke, Executive Director of Student Financial Services and Special Liaison to the Athletic Department, University of Central Oklahoma
3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.	*Information Exchange Meetings*
	This session will provide the opportunity for facilitated discussions among colleagues with similar responsibilities.
	Evaluation, thoughts and suggestions for follow-up activities will be collected.
	Student Affairs, Student Services, and Student Development
	Enrollment Management, Admissions, and Registration
	Academic Affairs and Faculty
	Financial Aid and Business

AGENDA ITEM #11-b:

> **E&G Budgets.**

SUBJECT: Approval of allocations to Oklahoma State University Center for Health Sciences and the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center from the revenue derived from the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents approve the allocation of $967,304.24 to Oklahoma State University Center for Health Sciences (OSU CHS) and $967,304.24 to the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center (OUHSC) from revenue collected from the taxes placed on the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products.**

BACKGROUND:

The Oklahoma Legislature passed House Bill No. 2660 in May 2004, designating a portion of the revenue collected from taxes on the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products to be allocated for specific purposes at OUHSC and OSU CHS. This revenue will be deposited into dedicated funds, the "Comprehensive Cancer Center Debt Service Revolving Fund," at the Health Sciences Center and the "Oklahoma State University College of Osteopathic Medicine Revolving Fund," at OSU CHS. The bill states that the revenue collected shall be evenly deposited into accounts designated at these entities, for the purpose of servicing the debt obligations incurred to construct a nationally designated comprehensive cancer center at the OU Health Sciences Center and for the purpose of servicing debt obligations for construction of a building dedicated to telemedicine, for the purchase of telemedicine equipment and to provide uninsured/indigent care in Tulsa County through the OSU College of Osteopathic Medicine. The State Regents approved the first allocation of these funds in the meeting of May 27, 2005.

POLICY ISSUES:

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

ANALYSIS:

The fund currently has on deposit $1,924,608.45. This amount is sufficient for a transfer of $967,304.24 each to OSU CHS and OUHSC. The OU Health Sciences Center will hold their funds in an account designated for the construction of a Comprehensive Cancer Center to be expended at a future date. The OSU Center for Health Sciences will expend their funds on the following approved program components: (1) indigent patient clinical care, (2) telemedicine equipment and (3) facility upgrades.

The current accumulated allocation to each institution, including this allocation, totals to $20,768,235.23.

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 the provisions of House Bill No. 2660, 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, 2008, and ending June 30, 2009, said funds to be subsequently allotted for encumbrance and expenditure during said fiscal year, as provided by law.

University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center – Cancer Center Debt Service
Oklahoma State University College of Medicine – Telemedicine Program

From:	296-09-605-000000	$1,934,608.48
To:	296-770	$967,304.24
	290-773	$967,304.24
	Total	$1,934,608.48

Adopted by the State Regents in the meeting of April 1, 2009.

SEAL:

ATTEST:

Joseph Parker, Secretary   Ronald White, Chairman

I, Glen Johnson, 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, 2009.

Glen D. Johnson, Chancellor

Duly subscribed and sworn to before me this day.

_____
Notary Public

My commission expires _____.

AGENDA ITEM #11-c:

Deleted Item.

AGENDA ITEM #12-a:

Revenue Bond.

SUBJECT: Review of Statement of Essential Facts.

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 Oklahoma, Refunding Series 2009C an amount not to exceed $21,075,000, 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 2009C bonds will be used to refund previous series of bonds used (a) to construct, renovate, remodel, expand and equip utility and infrastructure projects on the Norman campus, and (b) pay the costs of issuance of the Series 2009C Bonds.

The bonds to be issued as fully registered bonds will be payable on January 1 each of the years 2009 through 2039 with interest payments commencing on July 1, 2010, and semiannually each year thereafter. The bonds are special obligations of the Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma. These bonds are being issued on parity with the following general obligation bond issuances: 2006A, 2007A, 2007B, 2007C, 2007D, 2009A, and 2009B.

The University has pledged, as security for the bonds the General Revenues consisting of the following revenues sources including per credit hour Academic Facilities and Life Safety Fee revenue, utility system revenues, energy efficiency savings and revenue from the College of Continuing Education. No reserve requirement will be established with respect to these series of bonds. The pledged revenues as anticipated by the University's Board will provide sufficient revenue to pay principal of and interest on the Bonds.

The refunding will generate an approximate $105,000 in savings on an annual basis. The University is acting on a more advantageous financial market with significant interest rate savings by refunding bonds previously issued in prior years.

The Statement of Essential Facts as reflected in the Preliminary Official Statement for the multiple facilities projects 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. The University of Oklahoma maintains compliance with their Board of Regents' "Debt Policy," and will support the bonds by an achievable financial plan that will include servicing the debt, meeting new or increased operating costs, and maintaining an acceptable debt service coverage ratio.

A copy of the Preliminary Official Statement is available for review.

AGENDA ITEM #12-b:

      Revenue Bond.

SUBJECT: Review of Statement of Essential Facts.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents certify to the Attorney General of Oklahoma that the Statements of Essential Facts for Oklahoma State University's General Revenue Bonds, Series 2009A an amount not to exceed $225,000,000, 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 2009A bonds will be used to (a) to finance the acquisition of student housing and related dining facilities on the Stillwater campus and (b) to pay costs of issuance. The student housing facilities were originally financed through bond issuance of the Payne County Economic Development Authority Variable Rate Demand Student Housing Bonds, Series 2002 and Series 2005. The facilities are being acquired by the University for the purpose of reducing the financing costs related to the previous issuances.

The bonds to be issued as fully registered bonds will be payable on January 1 each of the years 2010 through 2038 with interest payments commencing on July 1, 2010, and semiannually each year thereafter. The bonds are special obligations of the Board of Regents for the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges. These bonds are being issued as the first series under their general obligation bond authority.

The University has pledged, as security for the bonds the General Revenues consisting of the following revenue sources including rents and fees collected through the Department of Residential Life. No reserve requirement will be established with respect to this series of bonds. The pledged revenues as anticipated by the University's Board will provide sufficient revenue to pay principal of and interest on the Bonds.

The Statement of Essential Facts as reflected in the Preliminary Official Statement for the housing facilities 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.

A copy of the Preliminary Official Statement is available for review.

AGENDA ITEM #13-a:

>   **Tuition and Fees.**

SUBJECT: Posting of legislative tuition and mandatory fee limits for resident and nonresident undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs for Fiscal Year 2010 and posting of institutional requests for changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2010.

RECOMMENDATION:

>   **It is recommended that the State Regents approve the posting of 1) legislative tuition and mandatory fee limits for resident and nonresident undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs for Fiscal Year 2010; and 2) institutional requests for changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2010, as reported on the attached schedules.**

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 research universities and less than the average rate charged at peer institutions for regional universities and community colleges, 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) Legislative Tuition and Mandatory Fee Limits

The attached schedule lists "Not to Exceed" amounts for tuition and mandatory fees that are recommended for posting at this time for Fiscal Year 2010, as provided by law, for resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees for undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. The guaranteed tuition rate of undergraduate resident tuition charged to students shall not exceed one hundred and fifteen percent (115%) of the nonguaranteed tuition rate charged students at the same institution. Institutions and governing boards will submit their requested increases for tuition and mandatory fees for Fiscal Year 2010 in June, after the higher education appropriation is known. It is expected that most institutions will request new rates that are in compliance with and well under the maximum rates.

2) Academic Services Fees

The attached schedule lists institutional requests for changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2010. Institutions assess special fees for instruction and academic services as a condition of enrollment and as a condition of academic recognition for completion of prescribed courses. These fees are required for all students receiving certain courses of instruction or academic services as designated by the institution. The requested changes to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2010 are recommended for posting at this time. Institutions have provided justifications for requested increases in these fees, the total revenue to be collected from the fees, and the use of increased revenues.

A public hearing will be held at the State Regents' office on a date still to be determined for the purpose of receiving views and comments on the requested changes to academic services fees and the legislative limits for resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees. Institutional requests are posted here for discussion purposes. The State Regents will act on proposals at their regular meeting scheduled to be held on Thursday, June 25, 2009. State Regents' staff will subsequently review institutions' published tuition and fee schedules for compliance with State Regents' action.

POLICY ISSUES:

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

ANALYSIS:

1) Legislative Tuition and Mandatory Fee Limits

70 O. S. 2004 Supp., Section 3218.8, specifies the legislative limits for resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees by tier, i.e., research universities, regional universities, community colleges and for professional programs. Regents' staff compiled a listing of tuition and mandatory fees charged at public institutions in the Big Twelve Conference, at like-type public institutions in surrounding and other states, at public community colleges receiving no local tax funding in surrounding and other states, and for professional programs, as shown in the *FY10 Legislative Peer Limits for Tuition and Mandatory Fees* schedules attached. Peer institutions in each tier also increased their tuition and mandatory fees in FY09, resulting in Oklahoma's rates, relative to those of their respective peers, increasing slightly as well. Research universities' current average tuition and mandatory fee rates are 87.2 percent of the Big 12 Conference average, an increase of 6.3 percentage points; the average for regional universities increased 4.2 percentage points to 84.1 percent of the peer average; and the average for community colleges increased 2.4 percentage points to 70.0 percent of their peer average for resident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees. The State Regents annually monitor and publish the tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions, at each institution in Oklahoma, and the maximum possible increase for the next academic year. This information is available upon request.

2) Academic Services Fees

Of the twenty-five public institutions in The State System, seventeen requested changes in academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2010 and eight had no requests for changes in these fees. Twelve institutions have requested 177 changes in Special Instruction Fees; seven institutions have requested 241 changes in Facility/Equipment Utilization Fees; seven institutions have requested 28 changes in Testing/Clinical

Services Fees; nine institutions have requested changes in 279 Classroom/Laboratory Supply and Material Fees; and seven institutions have requested 91 changes in various Other Special Fees. A total of 816 changes have been requested to academic services fees for Fiscal Year 2010, a decrease of 482 requests (-37.1%) when compared to FY09 requests. Institutions estimate approximately $7.6 million in new revenue will result from these changes to fees. The complete listing of requests for posting is attached.

This information is being posted for State Regents' review and public comment.

Insert Undergraduate and Graduate Peer Limits Chart

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
FY10 Legislative Peer Limits for Tuition and Mandatory Fees

Professional Programs	FY10 Peer Limit for <u>Resident</u> Tuition and Mandatory Fees	FY10 Peer Limit for <u>Nonresident</u> Tuition and Mandatory Fees
University of Oklahoma		
College of Law	$18,787.00	$30,415.00
OU Health Sciences Center		
Doctor of Medicine	$22,047.00	$47,217.00
Doctor of Dental Science	$23,238.00	$49,036.00
Physician's Associate	$12,598.00	$23,352.00
PharmD	$16,830.00	$30,318.00
Occupational Therapy	$8,270.00	$16,990.00
Physical Therapy -- Masters*	$8,736.00	$19,421.00
Physical Therapy -- Doctoral*	$10,147.00	$22,133.00
Doctor of Audiology	$9,898.00	$20,413.00
Public Health	$8,662.00	$19,135.00
Nursing -- Doctoral	$6,393.00	$15,422.00
Oklahoma State University		
Center for Health Sciences	$24,431.00	$48,337.00
College of Veterinary Medicine	$18,330.00	$37,007.00
Northeastern State University		
College of Optometry	$20,839.00	$35,131.00
Southwestern Oklahoma State University		
PharmD	$11,868.00	$23,928.00
Langston University		
Physical Therapy -- Doctoral	$10,147.00	$22,133.00

70 O.S. 2004 Supp., Section 3218.9, provides that the limits for professional program resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees shall be less than the average of resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fees for like-type professional programs at public institutions.

At their meeting in June 2009, State Regents will consider FY10 professional program tuition and mandatory fee requests from institutions which are within the legislative limits posted above.

*The OUHSC Physical Therapy professional program is moving to a doctoral degree program. Beginning in FY09, incoming students will begin in the doctoral level program while current students will be allowed to complete the masters level program, which will then be phased out.

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

TUITION AND FEES
Effective Academic Year 2009-2010

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 on Wednesday, April 29, 2009 at 1 p.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 p.m. on Wednesday, April 22, 2009 at 655 Research Parkway, Suite 200, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 73104, or by phone at (405) 225-9120.

Signed_____ Date_____
Glen D. Johnson, Chancellor

AGENDA ITEM #14:

> **Master Lease.**

SUBJECT: Master Lease Purchase Program.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents authorize for submission to the Council of Bond Oversight the 2009A Master Lease Series. The total projects from four entities amount to approximately $3.9 million.**

BACKGROUND:

The Oklahoma State Legislature approved in May 1999, Senate Bill 151, which authorized the State Regents to establish a master lease program. State System entities may enter into lease agreements for projects having a project value of $50,000 up to a maximum of $10 million. The terms of the lease agreements will vary by the useful life of the equipment purchases.

The State Regents' office works in conjunction with the Oklahoma Development Finance Authority (ODFA) to administer this program with each institutional lease purchase agreement submitted to the Council of Bond Oversight for approval. The institutional governing boards have given prior approval of all equipment purchases submitted under this program.

POLICY ISSUES:

Recommendation is consistent with current State Regents' policy.

ANALYSIS:

The Master Lease Purchase Program provides the State System entities a method of financing major personal property acquisitions at significant efficiencies from both financing aspects and administration. This program is designed to provide flexibility in acquiring new capital equipment by allowing lease purchase payments or debt service payments to be made on a monthly basis from current capital and operating funds. Individual sub-lease agreements will be entered into with each participating institution and the State Regents, under the terms of the Master Lease Purchase Agreement. The institution's fee structure shall be based on the individualized purchase package and interest rates available on the day of bond pricing.

The first series for 2009 includes four system institutions with an estimated total of approximately $3.9 million of equipment purchases. The following table summarizes this series of project totals by institution.

Institution	Total Amount to be Financed in December Issue
University Oklahoma	$2,758,670
Rose State College	475,000
Redlands Community College	500,000
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College	120,000
Total for June Issue	$3,853,675

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MASTER LEASE-PURCHASE DETAILED LISTING
Fiscal Year 2009

								Name of Institution:	**UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA - NORMAN CAMPUS**	
Item #	**State Regents' Campus Master Plan Project #**	**Description--Be Specific (i.e., size, model, series)**	**Estimated Cost**	**Number of Years you wish to finance the debt service**	**Estimated Date Funding Needed mm/dd**	**Estimated Useful Life in Years**	**Estimated Replacement Strategy Life* in Years**	**Will a Third Party Benefit Economically by use of this Equipment (i.e. Taxable Third Party such as For-Profit Entity)**	**Point of Contact (Name and Phone Number)**	**Remarks**
1		Couch Cafeteria Kitchen Equipment & Furniture	$ 446,000	7	June-09	10	7	No	Chris Kuwitzky, 325-5161	Upgrades Kitchen equipment and furniture in the University's primary residence hall cafeteria.
2		Instantaneous heat exchangers in Walker, Adams & Couch Center	$ 345,000	20	June-09	30	20	No	Chris Kuwitzky, 325-5161	Replaces domestic water heaters with storage tanks in University's residence halls.
3		Furniture for Student Housing Residence Halls	$ 669,000	10	June-09	15	10	No	Chris Kuwitzky, 325-5161	Provides new furniture for student residence halls
4		Sponsored Programs Administration Office Furniture	$ 656,520	10	June-09	15	10	No	Chris Kuwitzky, 325-5161	Provides furniture for sponsored programs administrative offices
5		Enterprise Server Hardware and Software Refresh	$ 642,150	5	June-09	5	5	No	Chris Kuwitzky, 325-5161	Technology refresh of enterprise hardware and software supporting the student information system
	Total (Subtotal if multiple sheets)		$ 2,758,670							

* If the requested capital lease item is part of an ongoing replacement program within the institution, provide how often such equipment is replaced.

Please return your survey to smauck@osrhe.edu or by fax to 405-225-9230.

71

MASTER LEASE-PURCHASE DETAILED LISTING
Fiscal Year 2009

Name of Institution: Rose State College

Item #	State Regents' Campus Master Plan Project #	Description--Be Specific (i.e., size, model, series)	Estimated Cost	Number of Year you wish to finance the debt service	Estimated Date Funding Needed mm/dd	Estimated Useful Life in Years	Estimated Replacement Strategy Life* in Years	Will a Third Party Benefit Economically by use of this Equipment (i.e. Taxable Third Party such as For-Profit Entity)	Point of Contact (Name and Phone Number)	Remarks
1	5310038	Prevost Spec. 2.3.09 H3-45 with 45ft. Coach	$475,000	10 years	Jun-09	15	15	No	Keith Ogans, VP for Business Affairs (405) 73-7306	The bus will be used to transport athletic teams, student government and clubs, faculty and staff to College related events & activities.
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
	Total (Subtotal if multiple sheets)		$475,000							

* If the requested capital lease item is part of an ongoing replacement program within the institution, provide how often such equipment is replaced.

Please return your survey to smauck@osrhe.edu or by fax to 405-225-9230.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MASTER LEASE-PURCHASE DETAILED LISTING
Fiscal Year 2009

Name of Institution: Redlands Community College

Item #	State Regents' Campus Master Plan Project #	Description--Be Specific (i.e., size, model, series)	Estimated Cost	Number of Years you wish to finance the debt service	Estimated Date Funding Needed mm/dd	Estimated Useful Life in Years	Estimated Replacement Strategy Life* in Years	Will a Third Party Benefit Economically by use of this Equipment (i.e. Taxable Third Party such as For-Profit Entity)	Point of Contact (Name and Phone Number)	Remarks
1	2410012	VOIP Shoretel Phone System	$ 199,900.00	5	Jun/Jul 2009	5-10 yrs	at end of life	No	Karen Boucher 422-1265	ROI over current phone system should cover annual maintenance & support costs
2	2410002 2410006	SAN server	$ 120,000.00	5	Jun/Jul 2009	5-10 yrs	at end of life	No	Karen Boucher 422-1265	Investment in this technology will reduce # of servers needed, which will reduce overhead expenses such as space, HVAC, and annual maintenance/support costs
3	241002	4 Polycoms	$ 28,000.00	5	Jun/Jul 2009	5-10 yrs	at end of life	No	Karen Boucher 422-1265	Current Polycoms are past end of life and are not compatible with current technology, requiring additional maintenance/support costs for outdated & unreliable equipment
4	2410006	Network Switches	$ 23,100.00	5	Jun/Jul 2009	5-10 yrs	at end of life	No	Karen Boucher 422-1265	Replacement of current end of life network switches
5	2410004	POISE server	$ 40,000.00	5	Jun/Jul 2009	5-10 yrs	at end of life	No	Karen Boucher 422-1265	Replacement of old server which is at end of life, does not support current POISE software upgrades, and is not compatible with SAN server. Cost w/o SAN would be $15,000 higher for stand-alone server.
6	2410002 2410006	Videoconferencing Equipment	$ 53,000.00	5	Jun/Jul 2009	5-10 yrs	at end of life	No	Karen Boucher 422-1265	Add videoconferencing capability to existing classrooms; increase compatibility with current technology available to instructors in other classrooms.
7	2410006 2410012	Wireless Equipment	$ 36,000.00	5	Jun/Jul 2009	5-10 yrs	at end of life	No	Karen Boucher 422-1265	Add additional wireless capability to complete campus-wide wireless technology.
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
	Total (Subtotal if multiple sheets)		$ 500,000.00							

* If the requested capital lease item is part of an ongoing replacement program within the institution, provide how often such equipment is replaced.

Please return your survey to smauck@osrhe.edu or by fax to 405-225-9230.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MASTER LEASE-PURCHASE DETAILED LISTING
Fiscal Year 2009

Name of Institution: Northeastern OK A&M College

Item #	State Regents' Campus Master Plan Project #	Description--Be Specific (i.e., size, model, series)	Estimated Cost	Number of Years you wish to finance the debt service	Estimated Date Funding Needed mm/dd	Estimated Useful Life in Years	Estimated Replacement Strategy Life* in Years	Will a Third Party Benefit Economically by use of this Equipment (i.e. Taxable Third Party such as For-Profit Entity)	Point of Contact (Name and Phone Number)	Remarks
1	480-0052	College Board Recruitment Plus Software, 20 User Licenses, & Training for 3 People	$120,000	5	Jul-09	5	5	No	Jessica A. Boles - (918) 540-6217	
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
	Total (Subtotal if multiple sheets)		$120,000							

* If the requested capital lease item is part of an ongoing replacement program within the institution, provide how often such equipment is replaced.

Please return your survey to smauck@osrhe.edu or by fax to 405-225-9230.

AGENDA ITEM #15:

      Purchasing.

SUBJECT: Approval of FY-2009 Purchases in excess of $100,000.

RECOMMENDATION:

      It is recommended that the State Regents approve FY-2009 purchases for amounts that are in excess of $100,000.00.

BACKGROUND:

Agency purchases are presented for State Regents' action. They relate to previous board action and the approved agency budgets.

POLICY ISSUES:

The recommended action is consistent with the State Regents' purchasing policy which requires State Regents' approval of purchases in excess of $100,000.00.

ANALYSIS:

The items below exceed $100,000.00 and require State Regents' approval prior to issuing a purchase order.

Purchases Over $100,000.

$420,000 for the purchase of a hardware-based multipoint conferencing bridge (MCU) to serve the distance learning and business needs of institutions of higher education, K12s, and state agencies. Final specifications and vendor selection are being completed. This bridge will replace an existing legacy MCU that is no longer sufficient to meet OneNet member needs. Equipment to be purchased from an existing statewide contract. This is a priority one budget item for FY09.

AGENDA ITEM #16:

Investments.

AGENDA ITEM #17:

      Commendations.

SUBJECT: Staff Recognitions.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

- **Jolynn Horn,** State Coordinator for GEAR UP, presented at the ACT Invitational Symposium on College Readiness, Course Rigor, and Student Preparation in January 2009; presented at the College Board's Southwestern Regional Forum on February 2009.

- **Sid Hudson,** Vice Chancellor for Legislative Relations, Communications, Economic Development and Research, spoke at the Leadership Oklahoma Educator's Leadership Academy at the University of Central Oklahoma in March 2009.

- **Kyle Dahlem,** Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration, was the featured speaker at the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Education Leadership Oklahoma Conference at the Capitol in March 2009.

- **Sandy Decker,** Student Portal Coordinator, presented at the Oklahoma State Department of Education's *Counselor's-Only* Conference in March 2009.

- **Chancellor Glen D. Johnson.** In February Chancellor Johnson spoke to the Senate Pages at the Capitol; spoke at the Council of Presidents' "New" Legislators Breakfast; presented the Annual Report to the Higher Education/Career Tech Committee meeting at the Capitol; spoke at the College Board Southwest Regional Forum and Reception; was a guest on *Flashpoint* on KFOR with hosts Mike Turpen and Kirk Humphreys; spoke at Higher Education Day at the Capitol; addressed the Regional University System of Oklahoma's Higher Ed Day "New" Legislator Breakfast; addressed the Association for Continuing Education at the University of Oklahoma; spoke to the Governor's Global Education Conference at the University of Central Oklahoma; was featured in *"Distinctly Oklahoma"* magazine; served as keynote speaker for the Achieving the Dream National Conference in San Francisco, California; spoke and presented awards at EPSCoR's Research Day at the Capitol; addressed the 2009 Enrollment Management Conference at Redlands Community College; spoke at the dedication ceremony for the new Visual and Performing Arts Center at Oklahoma City Community College; spoke at the First Robotics Competition in Oklahoma City. In March Chancellor Johnson met with

Governor Brad Henry and the Council of Presidents on the State Regents' legislative agenda and the future plans of the federal stimulus package; spoke at Northeastern State University's Centennial Celebration at Tahlequah; spoke at Langston University ribbon cutting and dedication of their new facility in Tulsa; welcomed the Financial Aid Database Advisory Committee; spoke to the Oklahoma Association of Community Colleges at the Reed Center in Midwest City; represented Higher Education at the American Recovery and Reinvestment Coordinating Council meeting at Governor Brad Henry's office; served as guest lecturer at the E.T. Dunlap Lectureship Series at Southeastern Oklahoma State University.

- **Dr. Kermit McMurry,** Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, spoke at Oklahoma's TRIO Day Celebration at the Capitol in February 2009.

- **Mary Mowdy,** Executive Director of Guaranteed Student Loan Program, was appointed to the Loans--Lender/General Loan Issues Team (Team I) of the Negotiated Rulemaking project of the United States Department of Education.

- **Armando Peña,** Assistant Vice Chancellor for GEAR UP, contributed to the Achieving the Dream State Policy Meeting in San Francisco, California; presented at the Oklahoma State Department of Education's *Counselor's-Only* Conference in March 2009.

- **Dr. Debra Stuart,** Vice Chancellor for Educational Partnerships, served on the panel, *Policies, Practices and Partnership: Transforming the Way We Serve Students of Low-Income Background,* at the College Board's Southwest Regional Forum at the Cox Convention Center; contributed to the Achieving the Dream State Policy Meeting in San Francisco, California; and served on the SHEEO Higher Education Policy Conference 2009 Planning Council.

- **Lorri Thomas,** GEAR UP Trainer/Coordinator, presented at the College Board's Southwestern Regional Forum in February 2009.

AGENDA ITEM #18:

Executive Session.

Not Available Electronically.

AGENDA ITEM #19-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)
> > 4 degree program course requirement changes
> > 2 degree program requirement changes
> > 1 degree program option addition
>
> Oklahoma State University (OSU)
> > 2 degree program option deletions
> > 1 degree program option name change
> > 2 degree program requirement changes
>
> Oklahoma State University Center for Health Sciences (OSU-CHS)
> > 1 degree program option addition
>
> East Central University (ECU)
> > 5 degree program option additions
> > 2 degree program requirement changes
> > 3 degree program course requirement change
> > 1 degree program designation change
> > 1 degree program option name change
>
> Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU)
> > 8 degree program course requirement changes
> > 1 degree program requirement change
> > 2 option additions
>
> Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SEOSU)
> > 3 degree program course requirement changes
>
> Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU)
> > 4 degree program course requirement changes

POLICY ISSUES:

These actions are consistent with the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval* policy.

ANALYSIS:

OU-Bachelor of Science in Meteorology in Meteorology (165)
Degree program course requirement change:
- Add AGSC 1013 and AGSC 2014 to curriculum.
- Proposed change provides students with lower division science courses that are not part of the major within the department to satisfy the College of Atmospheric and Geographic Science requirements.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses have been added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OU-Bachelor of Science in Education in Mathematics Education (156)
Degree program requirement change and degree program course requirement change:
- Delete EDMA 4242, EDMA 4001, MATH 4232 and EDMA 3001 from required courses.
- Add EDMA 4243 and EDMA 4233.
- Require EDMA 4242 as Senior Capstone course.
- Delete ILAC 4043 from Professional Education courses.
- Delete MATH 4513 from Senior Capstone course.
- Change Professional Education requirements from 28 to 25 hours.
- Change General Education electives from "4-5 hours" to "7-8 hours."
- Change Specialized Education requirements from 51 to 54 hours "to be chosen in consultation with the advisor."
- Proposed changes will allow teacher candidates in Mathematics Education to be better prepared in mathematics content while also being prepared pedagogically.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Two new courses will be added.
- No new funds are required.

OU-Bachelor of Arts in International and Area Studies in International and Area Studies (018)
Degree program option addition:
- Add option "Middle Eastern Studies."
- Proposed option addition will allow students to specialize in a significant geographical area not covered by other options in the program.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses have been added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OU-Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering in Architectural Engineering (357)
Degree program course requirement changes:
- Delete ENGR 1420, CEES 3663 and CEES 3673 from course requirements.
- Add CEES 3774 to course offerings.
- Delete ENGR 1420 as elective course for transfer students.
- Proposed changes will create a new course to allow better student exposure to areas of study and improve student knowledge for the professional world.
- Total credit hours will change from 126 to 127.
- One new course will be added.
- No new funds are required.

OU-Bachelor of Science in Environmental Engineering (331)

Degree program course requirement change:
- Change ENGR 2003 to ENGR 2002.
- Proposed change will eliminate the duplication of materials presented to students.
- Total credit hours will change from 126 to 125.
- No courses will be added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OSU-Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (004)

Degree program option deletion:
- Delete option "Agricultural Education Double Major."
- Proposed option deletion is due to lack of interest and enrollment in option.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses will be added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OSU-Bachelor of Arts in English (085)

Degree program option name change:
- Change option name "Technical Writing" to "Professional Writing."
- Proposed name change will provide consistency with content of program and with current trends.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses will be added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OSU-Bachelor of Science in Geography (109)

Degree program option deletion:
- Delete option "Applied Resource Management."
- Proposed option deletion is due to low enrollment and student interest.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses will be added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OSU-Bachelor of Science in Microbiology/Cell and Molecular Biology (149)

Degree program requirement change:
- Change GPA from 2.0 to 3.0 in Biomedical Science option.
- Proposed change will correct error in previous program paperwork.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses will be added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OSU-Bachelor of Arts in American Studies (416)

Degree program requirement change:
- Change minimum GPA from 2.0 to 2.5.
- Proposed change will align program with majors in English and History, which require a GPA of 2.5 or higher.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses will be added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

OSU-CHS-Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine (001)

Degree program option addition:

- Add option "Rural Health."
- Add CLME 8111 and CLME 8112 to elective courses.
- Proposed option addition will increase number of students interested in rural practice and provide training specific to rural health.
- Total credit hours will change from 191 to 195.
- Two new courses will be added.
- No new funds are required.

ECU-Bachelor of Science in Family and Consumer Sciences (024)

Degree program option addition:
- Add option "Early Care."
- Proposed option addition will enable ECU, as one of the three pilot institutions in Oklahoma to offer the 2+2 Early Care option, to assist the child care profession in Oklahoma to comply with the federal law requirements pertaining to certain percentages of employees in the childcare profession to obtain baccalaureate degrees.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses have been added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

ECU-Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice (052)

Degree program course requirement change and degree program requirement change:
- Add CRJS 4343, HURES 4623, CRJS 3333, HURES 4946, SOC 3833 and KIN 2272 to required courses.
- Change required courses from 39 to 50 in Law Enforcement concentration.
- Add MATH 2213 and SOC 3833 to required Law Enforcement concentration electives.
- Change required courses in Law Enforcement option from 45 to 59.
- Change required elective hours from 13-18 to 20.
- Delete the minor requirement for the degree program.
- Proposed changes will reflect changes in state law, Senate Bill 920 and Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training requirements that will affect student certification with state licensing agencies.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Two new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

ECU-Bachelor of Science in Music (033)

Degree program option addition:
- Add option "Sacred Music."
- Add MUS 2122, MUS 2142, MUS 2152, MUS 3012 and MUS 3021 to Sacred Music option.
- Proposed option addition will reflect student demand as an alternative to traditional music programs.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Five new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

ECU-Bachelor of Arts in Art (002)

Degree program option addition, degree program option name change, degree program designation change and degree program course requirement change:
- Add option "Graphic Arts."
- Change option name "Art" to "Studio Art."
- Delete ART 3133 from teacher certification option.
- Add ART 3273 to teacher certification option.

- Add ART 2423 to graphic arts option.
- Add ART 3143 to studio art option.
- Change degree designation from "Bachelor of Arts" to "Bachelor of Fine Arts."
- Proposed option addition and changes will better prepare students for specific careers in art and the course changes will comply with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards in Oklahoma.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Three new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.
-

ECU-Bachelor of Science in Accounting (001)

Degree program course requirement change and degree program requirement change:
- Change statement "Nine (9) additional upper level accounting hours selected after consultation with advisor" to "Three (3) additional upper level accounting hours selected from the following courses: ACCT 3713, ACCT 3423 and ACCT 4303."
- Add ACCT 3423 to upper level accounting electives.
- Delete ACCT 3843 and ACCT 4303 from required courses.
- Add ACCT 3413 to required courses.
- Remove requirement: "Required to be eligible to sit for the CPA exam in Oklahoma for the applicants on or after July 1, 2003, in addition to the above requirements."
- Delete related work requirements section "B".
- Change number of elective hours from 7 to 13.
- Change special requirements from 42 hours of ACCT courses to 33 hours of ACCT courses.
- Delete special requirement for non-business courses.
- Proposed changes reflect requirements that were previously offered at the undergraduate level to be no longer necessary since those students interested in becoming Certified Public Accountants may now acquire necessary credit hours for certification at the graduate level.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- One new course has been added.
- No new funds are required.

ECU-Bachelor of Science in Nursing (034)

Degree program option additions:
- Add options "Nursing" and "RN to BSN Completion"
- Delete "not required for RN students" from nursing option.
- Add (Generic) to "C" Nursing option.
- Delete NRSG 3333 from nursing option.
- Add NRSG 2104 and NRSG 4186 to RN to BSN Completion option.
- Change elective requirements for "Nursing" option from 2-11 to 2-3.
- Change elective requirements for "RN to BSN Completion" option from 2-11 to 0-1.
- Proposed option additions and changes will allow student program separation for tracking student graduation and employment information and comply with Oklahoma Board of Nursing program requirements.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses have been added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Science in Biology (005)

Degree program course requirement changes and degree program option addition:
- Change BIOL 1225 to BIOL 1124.
- Change BIOL 1125 to BIOL 1224.

- Add BIOL 3011 and BIOL 4011 to required courses.
- Reduce number of elective hours from 18 to 17.
- Add options "Health Science" and "Natural History."
- Proposed changes will bring NWOSU into alignment with other state institutions.
- Proposed changes will establish a required service-learning component to the program.
- Proposed option additions will better prepare students for professional health programs and careers outside of health sciences.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Two new courses will be added.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Arts in History (019)

Degree program course requirement changes and degree program requirement change:
- Reduce the number of elective credits from 9 hours to 6 hours for Global Studies option.
- Reduce the number of elective credits from 12 hours to 9 hours for all History majors.
- Add HIST 4433 as a required course for all majors.
- Proposed changes will provide students with an opportunity to apply content knowledge to the development of an individualized research proposal.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- One new course will be added.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Arts in Education (035)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Add HIST 4441 and HIST 4442 to required coursework.
- Delete HIST 4443 from required coursework.
- Proposed changes will allow curriculum to better meet NCATE standards.
- Two new courses will be added and one course will be deleted.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (049)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Delete CMSC 1103 and CMSC 1203 from course requirements.
- Change CMSC 2033 to CMSC 3053.
- Change CMSC 1203 to CMSC 3043.
- Add CMSC 2003, CMSC 3313, CMSC 4513 and CMSC 4523 to required courses.
- Proposed changes will provide a better introduction to programming and overview of the program.
- Proposed changes will provide better course integration and alignment with current business and industry.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Four new courses will be added.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Arts in Sociology (037)

Degree program course requirement change:
- Add SOC 4713 to course requirements.
- Proposed course addition will introduce students to management level leadership.
- Proposed course addition will provide opportunities for students to gain more understanding of government offices and non-profit programs that are operating in their home communities.

- Total credit hours will not change.
- No courses will be added or deleted.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice (022)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Require CJUS 1113 in core courses.
- Delete CHUS 1123 and CJUS 1223 from course requirements.
- Add CJUS 1223 to course requirements.
- Delete CJUS 2123, CJUS 3213 and SOC 4523 from requirements for Law Enforcement option.
- Add CJUS 4143, CJUS 4223, CJUS 4703 and POLS 4253 as requirements for Law Enforcement option.
- Proposed changes will better reflect current practices and professional changes in the profession.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Two courses will be deleted.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Music in Music (053)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Add MUSI 2013 to required courses.
- Change credit hours for MUSI 1132, MUSI 1152 and MUSI 2222 from two to one.
- Change credit hours for MUSI 3101 from one to two.
- Change MUSI 2111 to MUSI 3121.
- Change credit hours for MUSI 2201 from one to two and change name to "Language Diction."
- Delete MUSI 2211 from course requirements.
- Change credit hours for MUSI 3202 from two to three.
- Change credit hours for MUSI 4251 from one to two.
- Change credit hours for MUSI 4402 from two to three and change name to "Vocal Pedagogy."
- Change required number of applied voice hours from 17 to 16.
- Change credit hours for MUSI 4261 from one to two.
- Change required number of applied music hours from 19 to 16.
- Add 4 hours of approved electives for instrumental option.
- Proposed changes will provide means for meeting both the Oklahoma teacher certification competencies and the National Association of Schools of Music competencies.
- Proposed changes will bring NWOSU into alignment with other state institutions.
- Proposed changes will provide added focus in addressing state and national competencies and will expand the scope of courses from public schools to include church choirs and community choirs.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- One new course will be added.
- No new funds are required.

NWOSU-Bachelor of Science in Education (055)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Delete EDUC 3923 and EDUC 4443 from Core requirements.
- Add EDUC 4453 to Core requirements.
- Add EDUC 4203 to Related Studies requirements.
- Add EDUC 3112 to Professional Education requirements.

- Delete EDUC 3313, EDUC 4323, EDUC 4333 and EDUC 4413 from Related Studies requirements.
- Proposed changes will meet requirements for the Council for Exceptional Children and NCATE standards.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Four new courses will be added.
- No new funds are required.

SEOSU-Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice (059)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Add CJ 3113, CJ 3123, CJ 3133, CJ 4333 and SOC 3123 to required courses.
- Add CJ 3233, CJ 3333, CJ 3433, CJ 4253, CJ 4283, CJ 4403, CJ 3343, CJ 4543, CJ 4260, CJ 4440, PSY 3373 and PSY 4973 to Elective courses.
- Delete CJ 3833, CJ 3933, CJ 4003, CJ 4033, CJ 4133 and CJ 4233 from required courses.
- Delete CJ 2423, CJ 3223, CJ 3773, CJ 4633, PSY 2113, PSY 3213, PSY 3233, SOC 3323, SOC 3883, and SOC 4153 from Elective courses.
- Change required courses from 39 to 27 credit hours.
- Change Elective courses from 15 to 30 credit hours.
- Proposed change will reflect revisions to meet the Academy of Criminal Justice Science accreditation standards.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- Seventeen new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

SEOSU-Master of Science in Occupational Safety and Health (107)

Degree program course requirement change:
- Change SFTY 5243 to SFTY 5244.
- Proposed change will reflect instructional, program and student needs.
- Total credit hours will change from 34 to 35.
- No new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

SEOSU-Bachelor of Arts in Theatre (060)

Degree program course requirement change:
- Delete THTR 2753 from required core.
- Add THTR 2163 to required core.
- Delete THTR 2122 from "Technical Theatre Design" option.
- Add THTR 2753 to "Technical Theatre Design" option.
- Proposed changes will reflect recommendation from external evaluation, student concerns and faculty input.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

SWOSU-Bachelor of Science in Health Care Administration (005)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Delete ALHLT 3072 from required core.
- Add ALHLT 3073 to required core.
- Proposed change will meet the student needs for a pharmacology based course in terminology to meet the accreditation recommendations, and for the changing health care industry, the Health Care Administration program, and the job market.
- Total credit hours will not change.

- No new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

SWOSU- Bachelor of Science in Health Information Management (033)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Delete ALHLT 3072 from required core.
- Add ALHLT 3073 to required core.
- Proposed change will meet the student needs for a pharmacology based course in terminology to meet the accreditation recommendations, and for the changing health care industry, the Health Information Management program and the job market.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

SWOSU-Bachelor of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science (034)
    Bachelor of Science in Health Science (137)

Degree program course requirement changes:
- Add ALHLT 4074 as an option/alternative course for BIOL 3904 in required core.
- Proposed change meets the current accreditation requirements for the Clinical Laboratory Science program in hospital based clinical training.
- Total credit hours will not change.
- No new courses have been added.
- No new funds are required.

AGENDA ITEM #19-a (2):

> **Programs.**

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

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the approved institutional request to suspend an existing academic program, as described below.**

BACKGROUND:

Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU) requests authorization to suspend the Master of Education in Special Education (081).

POLICY ISSUES:

Suspending programs is consistent with State Regents' *Academic Program Review* policy. Institutions have three years to reinstate or delete suspended programs. Students may not be recruited or admitted into suspended programs. Additionally, suspended programs may not be listed in institutional catalogs.

ANALYSIS:

SWOSU will be submitting new program requests for the baccalaureate programs in this area and requests suspension of the master-level program until these changes have been approved. SWOSU requests suspension of the program until February 1, 2011.

Authorization was granted by the Chancellor for the above requests. State Regents' ratification is requested.

Meeting of the
OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
April 2, 2009

AGENDA ITEM #19-b:

Cooperative Agreements.

SUBJECT: Ratification of approved institutional request regarding cooperative agreements.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify Connors State College's request to delete a Cooperative Agreement, as described 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, 367 cooperative agreements (involving 122 associate in applied science programs) are offered through 18 colleges and 29 career technology centers (CTCs) within Oklahoma.

At the January 24, 1997 meeting, the State Regents approved revisions to the Cooperative Agreement policy that allows high school students meeting specified requirements to enroll in cooperative agreements.

Connors State College (CSC) requests authorization to delete the cooperative agreement with Green Country Technology Center (GCTC) in the Associate in Applied Science in Applied Technology (085).

POLICY ISSUES:

These actions are consistent with the State Regents' *Cooperative Alliances Between Higher Education Institutions and Technology Centers.*

ANALYSIS:

CSC requests authorization to delete the cooperative agreement with GCTC for the Associate in Applied Science in Applied Technology (085)

CSC reports that there have been no enrollments in the technology center with CSC during the past five years. CSC has attempted to recruit and enroll students with no success. The technology center is in an alliance with Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee, therefore no future enrollments are anticipated.

Approval to delete this cooperative agreement was granted by the Chancellor. State Regents' ratification is requested.

AGENDA ITEM #19-c:

> **GEAR UP.**

SUBJECT: Ratification of GEAR UP College Access Subgrants for Oklahoma School Districts and School Sites.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents ratify incentive grants to support program activities designed to increase college access for Oklahoma middle and high school students. Grantees are required to implement and sustain professional development/educational programs and may also incorporate unique college access activities that meet local needs.**

BACKGROUND:

While some public high schools have seen some score gains on academic achievement tests, for most students significant achievement gaps remain. In mathematics for example, 32.3 percent of students attending college directly after high school still require a mathematics remedial course before entering credit-bearing math courses.

Another weakness in Oklahoma involves teacher credentials. As in most of the nation, Oklahoma has many courses in grades 7-12 taught by teachers without a major in the subject area. Nationally the most recent U.S. Department of Education survey indicates that in high poverty schools 27% of core academic classes are taught by teachers without a major in the subject they teach. Student achievement mirrors this; therefore, upgrading teacher content knowledge and pedagogical practice through high quality professional development are critical to preventing educational failure.

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) is a U.S. Department of Education initiative created to significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education's ongoing GEAR UP project (2005-2011) provides subgrants to Oklahoma middle and high schools to implement and sustain professional development/educational programs designed to address the student academic and teacher weaknesses described in the paragraphs above and to incorporate "college access" activities that meet local needs. The goal is to ultimately increase college access for participating Oklahoma middle and high school students.

The State Regents' GEAR UP project has partnered with three exemplary professional development/educational programs in this phase of the project. As a project participation requirement, school districts and school sites must select one of these programs for implementation with subgrant funds. These programs include:

- Dr. Ruby Payne's *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* – This program is designed to train school faculty in strategies for recognizing and supporting children and parents who live in poverty. The strategies are utilized in classroom settings and are designed to enhance student academic achievement.

- *Thinking Maps* – This program is designed to train school faculty in the implementation of "visual thinking tools" in the classroom. The eight *Thinking Maps* can be used across subject areas and grades. They serve as strategies students can use to process, recall and utilize information in a demanding curriculum.

- <u>LOGIC</u> Professional Development – This sequence of workshops is designed to provide 12 days of intensive professional development that focuses on educational leadership, guidance and curriculum. The training is designed for school leadership teams (site leaders in administration, teachers and counselors) committed to creating a culture of high expectations. The <u>LOGIC</u> workshops integrate elements from ACT's Educational Planning and Assessment System; the College Board's training for Advanced Placement teachers; and the Southern Regional Leadership Board's (SREB) Leadership Initiative modules.

In addition, school districts and school sites may initiate or enhance other professional development/educational programs with GEAR UP subgrant funds; but must provide evidence that the program is "scientifically research based" as required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Generally, scientifically based research refers to research that applies rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to improving student academic achievement.

Other college access activities may be incorporated into the school district's overall plan including: promotion of Oklahoma's Promise, tutoring, mentoring, after-school and Saturday programs, summer programs, college awareness counseling, financial aid counseling, and activities that promote effective communication with parents and/or the development of skills that help parents support their child's education.

Oklahoma public school districts or sites that provide services to students in grades 7-12 are eligible to apply for the subgrant funds if (1) fifty percent or more of enrolled students are eligible for free or reduced lunches and (2) the school district participates in ACT's Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS). The school district or school site must partner with one or more community-based organizations and one or more Oklahoma colleges or universities. Also, to improve the likelihood of sustaining local college access intervention activities, Oklahoma GEAR UP has pledged a portion of this year's 2009 subgrant funds to school district and school site subgrantees from 2006 and 2007 that have developed a plan for continuing college access intervention activities initiated in earlier years.

POLICY ISSUES:

The creation of early intervention services is a required component of the U.S. Department of Education's GEAR UP programs. Early intervention services is defined as "comprehensive mentoring, counseling, outreach, and supportive services" for students. The subgrants for school districts and school sites provide opportunities for eligible school districts and school sites to take advantage of available "supportive services" such as professional development/educational programs provided by GEAR UP staff and by grant partner organizations, as well as opportunities to customize counseling and outreach efforts to meet specific needs identified by the local school district or site. The federal GEAR UP program also endorses the involvement of colleges and universities as well as community-based organizations as partners to ensure local sustainability of early intervention strategies for college readiness.

ANALYSIS:

In response to a GEAR UP request for proposal, eighteen eligible school districts and school sites submitted acceptable proposals to participate in the "College Access Subgrants for Local Education Agencies" project. The proposals were evaluated by GEAR UP staff. The attached table lists the school districts and school sites that are receiving project funding, the amount of grant funding, their higher

education partners and community-based partners. The timeline for the project is for the upcoming summer and school year (May 2009 through June 2010). The projects will be evaluated using criteria linked to measurable outcomes identified in each of the school district or school site project proposals. The outcomes are consistent with the GEAR UP overall goal – to significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

The eighteen school districts and school sites that will receive subgrant funding are fairly well distributed throughout the state of Oklahoma including many school districts and school sites in rural areas. Total funding for the grants is $312,000 federal dollars - all derived from the State Regents current GEAR UP grant award. No state grant dollars are involved.

	School District/School Site	City or Community	Higher Education Partner	Grant Amount
1	Amber-Pocasset Public Schools	Amber	Southwestern Oklahoma State	$25,000
2	Agra Public Schools	Agra	Southeastern Oklahoma State	$12,500
3	Broken Bow High School	Broken Bow	Southeastern Oklahoma State	$12,500
4	Buffalo Public Schools	Buffalo	Northwestern Oklahoma State	$12,500
5	Crooked Oak Public Schools	Oklahoma City	Rose State College	$12,500
6	Dickson Public Schools	Dickson	Oklahoma State University	$25,000
7	Drumright Public Schools	Drumright	Oklahoma State University	$12,500
8	Duke Public Schools	Duke	Western Oklahoma State	$25,000
9	Durant Middle School	Durant	Southeastern Oklahoma State	$25,000
10	Durant High School	Durant	Southeastern Oklahoma State	$12,500
11	Fletcher Public Schools	Fletcher	Cameron University	$25,000
12	Mason Public Schools	Mason	Seminole State College	$12,500
13	MountainView-Gotebo Public Schools	Mountain View	Western Oklahoma State	$12,500
14	Putnam City West High School	Oklahoma City	Southern Nazarene	$25,000
15	Silo Public Schools	Durant	Southeastern Oklahoma State	$12,500
16	Snyder Public Schools	Snyder	Cameron University	$25,000
17	Thackerville Public Schools	Thackerville	Southeastern Oklahoma State	$12,500
18	Turner Public Schools	Burneyville	Murray State College	$12,500
	TOTAL			**$312,500**

Meeting of the
OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
April 2, 2009

AGENDA ITEM #19-d:

      Capital.

SUBJECT: Ratification of Capital Allotments for FY2009.

RECOMMENDATION:

      It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the capital allotments made during the period of January 22, 2009, through March 12, 2009.

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 22, 2009, through March 12, 2009, is attached. This listing is provided to the Regents for ratification.

POLICY ISSUES:

State Regents' Delegation of Authority Policy (2.8) 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 $4,513,893. This total is represented by $1,100,800 in Section 13/New College allotments and $3,413,093 in State Fund allotments.

| | | | ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS (For the Period of January 22, 2009, through March 12, 2009) Section 13, New College, and State Funding Sources | | | | |

Institution	Resolution No.	Source of Funds	Project Name	Date Allotted	Section 13/New College Amounts	State Fund	Totals by Institution
Oklahoma State University	Not Required	600-Section 13	Compressed Natural Gas Station	3/ 12/ 2009	200,000		
	Not Required	650-New College	General University Buildings Repair & Renovation	3/ 12/ 2009	440,000		
	Not Required	600-Section 13	General University Buildings Repair & Renovation	3/ 12/ 2009	221,800		
	Not Required	650-New College	Institute for Teaching & Learning Improvements	3/ 12/ 2009	75,000		
	Not Required	650-New College	PIO Building Repair & Renovation	3/ 12/ 2009	89,000		
	4885	295-State	Murray Hall Renovation	3/ 12/ 2009		443,038	
			Total		1,025,800	443,038	1,468,838
OSU Tulsa	4886	295-State	VPR Core Facility Program	3/ 12/ 2009		137,600	
			Total			137,600	137,600
OSU Oklahoma City	4884	295-State	Engineering Technology Skills Center	3/ 6/ 2009		2,537,000	
			Total			2,537,000	2,537,000
Northeastern State University	4881	295-State	Repairs & Renovation to Campus Buildings	1/ 22/ 2009		330,761	
	4881	295-State	Hazardous Materials Removal			141,678	
			Total			141,678	141,678
Roger State University	4882	295-State	Institutional Furniture & Fixtures	1/ 29/ 2009		20,000	
			Total			20,000	20,000
OK Panhandle State University	Not Required	650-New College	Holter Hall Pipe Replacement Debt Service	3/ 6/ 2009	75,000		
			Total		75,000	0	75,000
Carl Albert State College	4883	295-State	Non-Structural Improvements	1/ 29/ 2009		70,180	
	4883	295-State	Motor Pool	1/ 29/ 2009		63,597	
			Total		0	133,777	133,777
			System Totals		1,100,800	3,413,093	4,513,893

AGENDA ITEM #19-e:

> **Agency Operations.**

SUBJECT: Ratification of Purchases.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents ratify purchases in amounts in excess of $25,000 but not in excess of $100,000 between January 17, 2009 and March 10, 2009.**

BACKGROUND:

Agency purchases are presented for State Regents' action. They relate to previous board action and the approved agency budgets.

POLICY ISSUES:

The recommended action is consistent with the State Regents' purchasing policy which provides for the Budget Committee's review of purchases in excess of $25,000 and requires State Regents' approval of purchases in excess of $100,000.

ANALYSIS:

For the time period between January 17, 2009 and March 10, 2009, there were three (3) purchases in excess of $25,000 but not in excess of $100,000.

Purchases Between $25,000.00 and $99,999.99.

One (1) of the three (3) items relate to OGSLP. A requisition has been issued to Vaters of Oklahoma City Incorporated in the amount of $42,352.40 for office furniture and related equipment and dealer services for the OGSLP office reconfiguration project.

One (1) of the three (3) items relate to OGSLP-IT. A requisition has been issued to ITRS LLC in the amount of $29,988.00 for additional implementation and training needs related to security appliances and applications.

One (1) of the three (3) items relate to OGSLP. A requisition has been issued to ELM Resources in the amount of $27,000.00 to pay a per record fee for loan records processed through the ELMNet data exchange.

Change Orders to Previously Approved Purchase Orders Exceeding $100,000

One (1) of the five (5) items relate to CORE. A change order has been issued to Xerox in the amount of $7,000.00 for an increase in the number of copies being made.   This change increases the purchase order total to $173,294.68.

One (1) of the five (5) items relate to ONENET. A change order has been issued to Indian Nations in the amount of $17,000.00 for an increase in Ethernet circuit charges. This change increases the purchase order total to $161,999.92.

One (1) of the five (5) items relate to OGSLP. A change order has been issued to Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System in the amount of $35,932.00 for necessary construction at OGSLP to relocate OGSLP legal staff from RP3 to Colcord. This change increases the purchase order total to $464,729.50.

One (1) of the five (5) items relate to ONENET. A change order has been issued to ATT in the amount of $95,200.00 for additional customer circuits. This change increases the purchase order total to $5,142,250.00.

One (1) of the five (5) items relate to CORE. A change order has been issued to Hammond Associates in the amount of $77,362.94 for investment consulting services from April 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009. This change increases the purchase order total to $261,112.94.

AGENDA ITEM #19-f (1):

Non-academic Degrees.

SUBJECT: University of Oklahoma.

AGENDA ITEM #19-f (2):

Non-academic Degrees.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma State University.

AGENDA ITEM #19-f (3):

Non-academic Degrees.

SUBJECT: Northeastern State University.

AGENDA ITEM #20-a:

Programs.

SUBJECT: Current Status Report on Program Requests and Annual Report on Program Requests.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

The Status Report on Program Requests tracks the status of all program requests received since July 1, 2008 as well as requests pending from the previous year.

POLICY ISSUES:

This report lists requests regarding degree programs as required by the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval* policy.

ANALYSIS:

The Status Report on Program Requests lists all program requests received by the State Regents and program actions taken by the State Regents within the current academic year (2008-2009).

The current status report contains the Current Degree Program Inventory and the following schedules:

1. Letters of Intent
2. Degree Program Requests Under Review
3. Approved New Program Requests
4. Requested Degree Program Deletions
5. Approved Degree Program Deletions
6. Requested Degree Program Name Changes
7. Approved Degree Program Name Changes
8. Requested Degree Designation Changes
9. Approved Degree Designation Changes
10. Cooperative Agreements
11. Suspended Programs
12. Reinstated Programs
13. Inventory Reconciliations
14. Net Reduction Table

Supplement available upon request.

AGENDA ITEM #20-b (1):

> **Reports.**

SUBJECT: Annual Student Assessment Report.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **This item is for information only.**

BACKGROUND:

The fourteenth annual report on student assessment in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is presented as required by the State Regents' policy on *"Assessment."* Reports submitted by each institution are provided as an overview of the 2007-08 academic year assessment activities. Additional remediation information will be presented to the State Regents in separate documents: the Annual Student Remediation Report and The High School Indicators Report.

The purpose of assessment is to maximize student success. The assessment plan requires the 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.

Assessment activities are reported according to the following areas:
- *Entry-Level Assessment and Course Placement* - to determine academic preparation and course placement.
- *General Education (Mid-Level) 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.
- *Licensure/Certification Assessment* – to measure student achievement, program effectiveness, and appropriateness of the professional exam used for licensure or certification.
- *Assessment Budgets* – to monitor how assessment fees are being allocated for the support of assessment activities.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS:

As evidenced by the institutional reports, Oklahoma's colleges and universities are achieving the two major objectives of student assessment: to improve programs and to provide public accountability. As institutional implementation of student assessment has evolved, continued enhancements and improvements have been documented. Examples of successful assessment practices, as well as areas that could be improved upon, are outlined below.

- Entering student surveys are administered at various institutions to examine expectations and characteristics of the student population. The data are then utilized in further studies on retention and academic success.
- Secondary testing instruments, cut-scores, and course curriculum are continually analyzed to assure relevance and effectiveness.
- 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, resulting in greater involvement of faculty members and students.
- Three institutions (Tulsa Community College, Oklahoma City Community College, and Rose State College) have joined the Achieving the Dream initiative, a national organization designed to increase student success at community colleges. This initiative emphasizes the use of data in improving retention and graduation rates.
- Efforts to improve retention are vital to increasing student success. Several institutions form retention committees or employ retention specialists to provide a greater focus.
- Areas of concern include the wide variance in secondary test cut-scores for a given instrument. Also, secondary testing for science is not practiced at all institutions. While some use a combination of reading and math scores and others use science tests, many institutions do not test.
- Administration of general education assessment varies in methodology among institutions with several using locally developed tests. Using national exams could provide more consistency and comparison to national benchmarks, while locally developed tests may be more effective in addressing the specific needs and goals of institutions.
- Persistence and graduation rates depend on the ability of a student to succeed not only in higher level courses but in the wider world of business and industry. Implementation of state-wide assessments in writing and mathematics prior to being allowed to take courses beyond 30 hours would assure that students would have the requisite skills to be successful in college and in the work place. Pass rates of these assessments could be included in the Annual Student Assessment Report as a means of monitoring progress and increasing public transparency and accountability. Such assessments could assist in regional and departmental accreditation.

POLICY ISSUES: NONE

AGENDA ITEM #20-b (2):

      Reports.

SUBJECT: Teacher Education Annual Report on Systemwide Review.

RECOMMENDATION:

      It is recommended that the State Regents accept the eleventh Teacher Education Annual Report on Systemwide Review.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents initiated teacher education reform efforts in the summer of 1992 with the External Program Review. The 10-member team conducting the review was charged with assessing the status of teacher preparation in the State System and making recommendations for its enhancement. The team submitted 23 recommendations to establish the state of Oklahoma as a national leader in teacher preparation. The State Regents monitor the implementation of the recommendations with periodic status reports.

In 1995, two members of the original External Team, Chairman J.T. Sandefur and Dr. Larry Clark, returned to the state to visit the 12 teacher preparation programs for the purpose of assessing the continuing progress of the institutions in responding to the 23 recommendations. The external reviewers affirmed that the universities were working seriously and conscientiously to comply with the recommendations and that all had made significant progress. The team recommended that the State Regents formally close the three-year teacher education study with the exception of submitting an annual report.

During the 1995 External Team visit, the number of recommendations to be addressed in the annual report was reduced to 15. In 2002, based on the progress of State System institutions and the fact that many of the recommendations are monitored through other processes, the State Regents further reduced the number of recommendations subject to reporting from 15 to 7.

The first annual report was presented to the State Regents at the May 29, 1998, meeting. This, the eleventh annual report, covers the 2007-2008 academic year and contains a summary of findings for each recommendation. To facilitate reporting efforts, the State Regents' annual reporting requirements are merged with those of the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation.

In a year that an institution has a National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) site visit, the Institutional Report replaces the required annual report. The following colleges had NCATE site visits in the 2007-2008 academic year, so they, therefore, did not need to respond to these specific questions: University of Central Oklahoma – visit, April, 2008, approved by the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) in October 2008; and Cameron University – visit, April, 2008, approved by UAB in October 2008.

POLICY ISSUES:
As noted above, the information and actions described in this report are consistent with the State Regents' teacher education initiative, the APRA effort, and the State Regents' commitment to efficiency and excellence.

ANALYSIS:

Over 15 years have passed since the 1992 external review team offered its recommendations to enhance teacher education and position Oklahoma as a national leader in teacher preparation. In that time, colleges of education have developed and implemented competency-based teacher preparation programs and candidate assessments.

Research shows that good teaching matters. College going rates are influenced by knowledgeable teachers who know the art of teaching and use it to motivate students. Each of the twelve state teacher education programs has developed an assessment system that annually collects and analyzes data on the teacher applicant qualifications and candidate and graduate performance to make improvements to programs and courses so teacher candidates have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to impact student achievement. The data and analyses are shared with faculty across the unit to ensure that programs and graduates are of the highest quality. To assist in the collection and management of the data, information technologies are being used. Most colleges report adopting *LiveText or Chalk and Wire,* web based tools for candidate portfolios, which are required for graduation and to show evidence of candidate performance in meeting the fifteen required teaching competencies.

In its efforts to continue the recommendations set in motion by the State Regents in 1992, the State Regents Minority Teacher Recruitment Center administers and/or funds a number of programs as designated in Oklahoma law for improving the quality and supply of Oklahoma's teacher workforce.

In August 2008, the State Regents received the eighth consecutive No Child Left Behind (NCLB) grant from the United States Department of Education (USDE). The State Regents awarded subgrants to seven colleges of education which have formed partnerships with eligible local education agencies to provide professional development to teachers to improve teacher content knowledge in literacy, mathematics, and science.

The results have been that since 2001, Oklahoma consistently has ranked in the top fifteen in Improving Teacher Quality in the *Education Week Quality Counts Report.* In 2009, in *The Teaching Profession* category, Oklahoma received a grade of B minus compared to the national average of a C and was ranked 10th in the nation.

REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Graduate programs should be examined to assure that they are rigorous, vigorously administered and adequately supported with resources.**

    Report on the number of graduate students admitted conditionally

Universities	Admitted Conditionally
Cameron University (CU)	NA
East Central University (ECU)	346
Langston University (LU)	4
Northeastern State University (NSU)	0
Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU)	0
Oklahoma Panhandle State University (OPSU)	NA
Oklahoma State University (OSU)	0
Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SOSU)	10
Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU)	38
University of Central Oklahoma (UCO)	NA
University of Oklahoma (OU)	23
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma (USAO)	NA

2. **The appointment of a Regents' staff member to coordinate teacher education should be continued.**

   Lisa Holder has served as Director of Teacher Education and the Minority Teacher Recruitment Center since August 2008. Prior to her hiring, Kyle Dahlem served as Director from January 2000 to July 2008.

3. **Academic preparation in elementary education should be strengthened, which may require more flexibility in certification requirements.**

   East Central University (ECU)
   No significant changes were made in elementary education during the 2007-08 year.

   Langston University (LU)
   The Elementary Education and Special Education programs have been streamlined to reduce the number of hours required, yet continue to meet the 4 X 12 and foreign language requirements of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation, and the university.

   Northeastern State University (NSU)
   Using certification test data and survey responses which indicated that our initial candidates needed additional practice in assessing student learning, the unit began the process of implementing a teacher work sample, called the Learning Project, for all full interns during the 2007-08 academic year. Piloted in the spring, a subset of teacher candidates completed a teacher work sample based on the Renaissance model and aligned with NSU's conceptual framework. Using results of the pilot group, unit faculty revised the assignment prompts and rubrics for full implementation in Fall 2008. In addition, key course assessments throughout the professional sequence have been revised to provide a basis for candidates to learn and practice the skills needed to successfully complete the Learning Project during their full internship semester. A proposal for a formal assessment course was developed and will be directed through university processes in the 2008-09 year.

Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU)
More Interactive Television courses (ITV) have been offered for undergraduate courses. The Reading Specialist Program has been revised with a new program coordinator this year.

Oklahoma Panhandle State University (OPSU)
All existing programs leading to certification (agriculture education, business education, elementary education, health and physical education, and math education) have had their programs approved by the Specialized Professional Associations (SPA's) and/or the state.

Beginning in fall 2008, the Internship (student teaching) changed to a full-semester course (12-hour credit). The two existing "block classes": EDUC 4312 Classroom Management and EDUC 4362 Educational Tests and Measurements have been combined into one (actually two) new class(es) – EDUC 4433 Elementary Classroom Management and Assessment and EDUC 4533 Secondary Classroom Management and Assessment. These two classes are taught each semester.

Oklahoma State University (OSU)
No significant changes were made in elementary education during the 2007-08 year.

Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SOSU)
No significant changes were made in elementary education during the 2007-08 year.

Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU)
A Reading Specialist Program has been submitted to the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation for initial approval. It was reviewed and recognized with conditions in March 2009.

Faculty in the mathematics and education departments worked collaboratively to revise math requirements and course sequence for elementary, special education and early childhood majors. This revision was prompted by survey results and course grades of these candidates in math.

University of Oklahoma (OU)
Changes in the Masters of Education Reading Education program have been made to meet International Reading Association accreditation requirements. These changes include a 24 hour graduate credit in reading and language arts and a 6 hour credit of supervised practicum.

University of Science & Arts of Oklahoma (USAO)
Although we continually seek ways to update and improve courses, no major changes have taken place during this report period.

4. **The State Regents for Higher Education should require an annual report on grades given by education faculty compared to those given in general education and academic disciplines from each institution. The 1995 External Review follow-up report stated that grade inflation trends existed at all levels of course work, and the field of teacher education led in the grade inflation trend, especially when ACT scores were considered.**

Percentages of "A" and "B" Grades Awarded in
Selected Upper Division Courses at Public Universities

Subject	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Change	2006 Enrollment	2007 Enrollment
Education*	76.1%	76.7%	0.6%	21,546	20,704
Biological Sciences	63.0%	62.1%	-0.9%	6,421	6,692
Business	62.8%	62.8%	0.0%	35,862	35,791
Engineering	75.9%	73.3%	-1.7%	6,845	6,861
English	71.9%	72.0%	0.1%	8,277	7,922
History	65.7%	66.4%	0.7%	15,395	14,528
Mathematics	60.1%	61.7%	1.6%	2,827	2,741

Source: OSRHE Survey of 2007 Fall Enrollment and Grading Level of Courses

*Excludes physical education courses

- In 2007, the highest percentage of "A" and "B" grades was in Education (76.7 percent), 3.4 percentage points higher than the next highest discipline, Engineering (73.3 percent).
- In 2007, only Biological Sciences and engineering grade points declined from 2006.

- In 2007, the percentage of "A" and "B" grades in Education (76.7 percent) was 0.6 percent more that in 2006 (76.7 percent).

- Since 1996, all education students must present a grade point average of 3.0 in liberal arts and sciences courses before admission to a teacher education program. If a candidate's grade point average is below 3.0, passing scores on the OGET or the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) must be attained.

5. **The state of Oklahoma needs to make a massive financial commitment to computerizing instructional technology and otherwise upgrading the technology used in its institutions of higher education.**

In 1996-97, the State Regents funded more than $1,000,000 for technology in teacher education programs; subsequently, the amount was incorporated into base institutional budgets. In 2005-2006, colleges of education reported that technology expenditures included but were not limited to upgrade network infrastructure, purchase computers, update phone systems, create a web-based data collection system, provide on-line courses, technology upgrades.

ECU
A total of $63,380 was spent on technology last year for the education unit. The Education Department equipment budget for technology included $5,000, and the education supplies budget was $8,000. Additionally, the Education Department Computer Lab spent $30,380 for the Office of Academic Affairs to provide computer upgrades to the Education Computer Lab. An additional $18,800 was allocated and spent by the Education Department Media Lab. Expenditures for the

media lab included $15,500 for equipment and $3,300 for supplies. Finally an additional $1,200 was spent for replacement printers for the Education PC and Mac labs.

LU
A total of $2,000 was expended for a television/VCR/DVD combo to provide the audio/visual component of instructional delivery and enhance the learning environment. A fax machine was also purchased. Additional funding was used for the maintenance of existing computers and other technological equipment. All the computers in the education computer laboratory are networked and have access to local, state, and national resources. This networking capability allows candidates and faculty access to any technological resource for research and publications.

NSU
The College of Education spent $197,456 for technology purchases during the 2007-08 academic year. Technology funds come from the College of Education's portion of student technology fees as well as other institutional funds. These funds supported instruction directly and included the purchase of SmartBoards, mobile computer labs, video projection systems and Sympodiums, document and digital cameras, and specialized equipment and software for elementary, instructional technology, and physical education. Productively purchases included laptops, scanners, response systems, and specialized software such as Inspiration and Adobe Acrobat. These purchases enhanced learning of teacher candidates and provided opportunities to model effective use of technology in the P-12 classroom.

NWOSU
NWOSU spent $501,999 on technical supports and updates in 2007-08.

OPSU
The OPSU administration continues to support the unit and members of the unit by providing the necessary funding to update technology both in the faculty offices and in the classrooms used by the members of the unit. Many classrooms have now been equipped with SmartBoards allowing the presentations of PowerPoint along with the integration of Internet information, and more are planned. Candidates learn how to use the SmartBoard in EDUC 4333 Educational Technology and are integrating its use into the lessons they present to their peers in their methods classes. All members of the OPSU Teacher Education Program, and some unit members, have had their computer and printer updated to newer equipment. The budget for technology continues to be adequate for the needs of the unit.

During the 2007/2008 school year, over $7,000 was spent from the education budget for technology, including computers, printers, and projectors. All equipment is relatively new and in excellent working condition.

OSU
College of Education Technology currently provides technology services in support of the College in the areas of Technical Support, Instructional Support, and Administrative Applications.
College of Education Administrative Applications - $33,960
The Administrative Applications area of COE Technology is dedicated to the development of college-wide or mission critical network applications for streamlining administrative processes and functions. These activities include the design, development, and implementation of multi-user network database applications for assisting in the performance of College of Education administrative functions and in streamlining and automating day-to-day College of Education operations. This area also manages the collection of information, encompassing all College of

Education activities, for online distribution. This includes the collection of academic, program, faculty and staff information for the College of Education and its dissemination through the internet and other media, the development of online calendars for College of Education activities, and development and design of web pages to promote College of Education events and course offerings.

College of Education Computer Support - $314,675
The College of Education Technical Support area is responsible for support of COE hardware and software including faculty and staff computers, classroom technology facilities, and student lab resources. The College of Education Technical Support area provides not only technology resources in terms of hardware and software, but it also support for technology related problems and individualized training. Desktop computer support is provided for faculty and staff including acquisitions, new installations, upgrades, and troubleshooting of hardware and software, and network administration. Faculty and staff are provided with desktop computers in their offices and access to laser printers, e-mail, and the internet. Additionally, wireless capability has been implemented throughout Willard Hall and the academic wing of the Colvin Center. Faculty and staff desktop computer hardware are scheduled on a three-year replacement cycle. Technical support staff maintains computing and multimedia equipment within all COE offices, classrooms, and student computer labs.

College of Education Instructional Support - $333,490
College of Education Instructional Support provides resources and instruction for all students, faculty, staff, and administrators in the College. The area is divided into two main parts, the COE Technology Resource Center and COE Faculty Support. Resources in the COE Technology Resource Center include access to and assistance with a cross-platform computer lab, with very wide range of hardware and software available for both faculty and students, and with traditional media and equipment for making less IT oriented projects and presentations. This facility is open weekdays, weekday evenings, and on weekends during the fall and spring semesters; a reduced schedule is implemented for student holidays and the smaller academic terms. There are additional computer lab facilities available in other areas of the college. The COE Technology Resource Center maintains multimedia equipment in the instructional spaces of the COE. Resources include access to and assistance with multimedia educational technologies, video production, and traditional media equipment and production. The facility has a wide range of hardware and software available for both faculty and students. The Faculty Support staff is dedicated to streamlining resources for the integration of technology into the classroom and support its use in teaching and learning initiatives in the College of Education. The Faculty Support staff provides consultation and assistance in instructional design, web and multimedia production, delivery, distance and distributed learning, and evaluation to most effectively utilize technology tools within learning strategies. Services provided include one-on-one or small group assistance with: 1) determining the most appropriate technology tool for an instructional activity, 2) website development and on-line course components, 3) video-conferencing, and multimedia presentations. Instruction and training are provided in the use of instructional resources as well as consultation in the development of strategies for the effective implementation of these tools.

<u>SOSU</u>
Expenditure for educational technology is estimated at $186,345 for the 2007-08 school year. These funds were used to update and replace faculty computers, update and replace classroom computers, purchase Smart Boards for two classrooms, upgrade IETV technology, and provide new software for the Teacher Education data base.

The Comptroller reported an amount for instructional technology of $66,451 for FY 07-08. Distance learning classrooms are located in the Educational Building and utilized by the Department of Education faculty. This includes computers, video projectors and document cameras. The unit also receives an additional budget allocation each year for library resources. The allocation for 2007-08 remained at $6,988.

OU
The total amount spent on technology resources was $270,611. The funds were used for purchasing equipment, training faculty and staff, as well as support and student staff to assist in classrooms and the college computer lab.

USAO
Please find listed below the expenditures for instructional technology benefiting the Division of Education & Speech-Language Pathology:

SCT Software*	$ 6,777.80
Extreme Network Equip.*	5,446.01
Telephone Equip.*	3,000.00
1 Targus Ultra Mini 4-Port USB Hub	18.99
8 Dell Optiplex 745 Computers	8,560.00
1 HP DeskJet 6940dt Color Printer	174.00
4 SmartBoard (SB680) - 77" screen	5,350.80
29 Dell Optiplex 755 Computers	26,738.00
1 OKI B4400 Laser Printer	169.33
48 Microsoft Office 2007 Professional Pro Plus Licenses	2,496.00
Education Lab Supplies (Paper)	458.00
Total:	$59,188.93

6. **Professional development should be focused on university faculty members' ability to model such effective teaching styles as inquiry, group discussion, collaborative learning, etc.**

Funding in units has made it possible to provide enriched faculty professional development. In addition to the professional development requirements, education faculty members are required to spend at least ten hours per year in meaningful teaching opportunities with K-12 students as well as to mentor student teachers and serve on Resident Year Teacher Committees (RYTC). Serving on the RYTC gives faculty an opportunity to observe, assess and model best practices.

ECU
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development. Almost all of the faculty in the unit have now been trained in the Blackboard delivery system and have attended numerous hours of training at the university's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL). Over one hundred hours of professional development have been made available to unit faculty through university programs such as the CETL. Regular university sponsored professional development

activities are provided on campus during the academic year. Additionally, all unit faculty have listed substantial individualized faculty development as part of the required reporting to the Education Faculty Development Committee, a standing committee of the university. In the Education Department alone, over 200 hours of professional activities were noted as professional activity and service to the community. A majority of all classes offered by the unit now employ some phase of Blackboard assignments.

LU

Faculty in Teacher Education are required to participate in faculty development to assure that they are modeling the best practices and to remain abreast of current developments in the field. They are highly qualified and fully trained in their area of expertise, and are able to assess their own effectiveness as it relates to candidate performance. The majority of the faculty has public school teaching experience and holds a terminal degree. The Unit has the opportunity to partake of the university faculty development activities, as well as those sponsored by the School of Education and Behavioral Sciences. The university sponsors monthly presentations for the entire faculty. Topics that have been presented are "Curriculum Design," "Writing Across the Curriculum," "Test Biases," "Effective Use of Test Results," and "Grant Writing and Research." Scheduled training workshops are also presented by the Computer Technology Integration department on the following topics: "D2LTraining," "PowerPoint Basics," "Excel," "Windows 2007," and "Microsoft Outlook." The School of Education's faculty development activities and programs are on topics as suggested by members to the Faculty Development Committee. Presentations have been given on "NCATE Updates," "Curriculum Mapping," "National Certification," and Innovative Technology Used in Public Schools." Faculty also receive staff development by attending professional conferences, such as the Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (OACTE)/ Oklahoma Association of Teacher Education (OATE) annual conference, the Cooperative Teaching Conference for Special Education, Service Learning/Teaching Methodology Conference, Teacher Work Sample Conference, Women in Leadership Seminar, and National Aeronautics, Space Administration (NASA) Pre-Service Teacher Conference. In addition, faculty are encouraged to attend professional conferences specific to their area of expertise.

NSU

The NSU Center for Teaching and Learning coordinates periodic needs assessments of professional development and then schedules appropriate sessions. Sessions include on-line teaching skills, enhanced use of course management software, and working with millennial learners. Teacher education faculty access these sessions as well as attend professional conferences in their specific disciplines.

NWOSU

The faculty participated in a variety of professional development activities. The University provided professional development in the following areas in which the faculty were involved: Improving ITV Instruction, Creating your Professional Portfolio Using LiveText, Individualizing Instruction, Improving Instruction through Understanding Teaching and Learning Styles. Retreats and workshops included LiveText and BlackBoard Instruction. Faculty members have attended state and/or national conferences and made presentations. The following conferences were attended by a variety of faculty members: OACTE, AACTE; Oklahoma Reading Association; Oklahoma Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; National American Alliance for Health Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; Safe Schools Conference; Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders; National Association of Schools of Music; Oklahoma Music Educators Association; National Science Teacher Education; LiveText; Phi Beta Lambda Leadership Conference; and National Business Education Association.

OPSU

Multiple professional development activities have been provided by members of the unit to area public schools during the past summer and the beginning of the current school year. These professional development presentations have been in the areas of reading, mathematics, and science. A math seminar directed primarily for Oklahoma mathematics teachers for grades P-12 showing the relationship between technology, reading proficiency and math proficiency was presented during the summer of 2008. This seminar provided professional development training for 25 area math teachers, and was conducted totally by members of the unit. Another similar seminar is planned for the summer of 2009.

Members of the unit attended and presented at the annual Oklahoma Association of Teacher Educators conference, the Oklahoma Association of Colleges of Teacher Education conference and American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education during the 07/08 year, with more presentations scheduled for 08/09.

OSU

Faculty are required to prepare and submit a professional development plan annually during the performance assessment process. Those plans are reviewed by department administrators who work with the faculty to target any concerns or special skill development. In addition, OSU has a faculty development program that offers ongoing workshops and seminars to support professional growth in teaching and research. The OSU Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence provided workshops including topics such as Using Web-Based Tools to Assess Team-Based Learning Effectively and Efficiently, Communication and Conversation: The Art of Listening in the Classroom and in Everyday Life, Using Nvivo Software in Qualitative Inquiry, Mentoring and How to be Mentored, Practices for Teaching Online, and Classroom Assessment Strategies. Professional education faculty continue to attend professional conferences to present their research, teaching, and to learn about others' work in the education field.

SOSU

The Teacher Education Faculty have many opportunities to develop new knowledge and skills throughout in-service education, conference attendance, workshops, and work in PK-12 schools. During 2007-08, twenty-four (24) teacher education faculty attended a professional development activity. The following list indicates the types of professional activities in which the faculty had the opportunity to participate: Ninth International Conference on Caribbean Literature; 35th Annual Children's Literature Association; Paverpol Sculpture Workshop; Oklahoma Music Educators Association Convention; Association for Counselors and Supervision Convention; Native American Symposium; American Democracy Project; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; College Reading Association; Association for Mathematics Teacher Educators; Midwest Symposium for Leadership in Behavioral Disorders; KDP Convocation; American College Theatre Festival; Oklahoma Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance; and National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education.

SWOSU

All teacher education faculty have reported meeting their requirements for 15 hours of professional development and 10 hours of public school service during the past academic year. All faculty members without terminal degrees are enrolled in doctoral course work.

During the past year, professional development programs focused on effective teaching include the following: the Desire 2 Learn electronic education platform; scoring seminars to improve

inter-rater reliability in scoring the Culminating Performance Assessment used for student teachers; effective methods of teaching with Interactive Television (distance learning); embedding performance assessment into the curriculum; NCATE Board of Examiners training; attendance at state/national conferences such as International Reading Association; OACTE Annual Conference attendance; service learning and Campus Compact; promoting student critical thinking; detecting/preventing plagiarism and cheating.

OU

Oklahoma University College of Education faculty conducted, attended and presented their research at nearly 250 professional conferences at the state, national and international settings in the 2007 calendar year. Faculty average 2.5 publications each year which are used across the state and country to provide professional development to educators. Finally, OU faculty provided 2906 hours of professional development activities to Oklahoma teachers across the state.

USAO

A summary of professional development opportunities offered on campus to unit faculty members is provided below. It does not include participation in professional meetings or organizations outside the state or subject matter professional meetings inside Oklahoma.

SNEA programs open to faculty
11/5/07 Ag in the Classroom (Presented by Mary Ann Kelsey and Janice Cunningham)
2/4/08 How are U.S. Schools Similar to and/or Different from Schools in the Middle East (presented by Adeel Siddiqui)
2/29/08 Read Across America (opportunity)
3/5/08 Writing Action – Adventure Novels for the Young Adult (presented by Richard Trout)
Grady County Reading Council open to faculty
9/20/07 Helping the Struggling Reader
Other – Unit or University Sponsored
Deaf, Deaf World
NBPTS Support Group
Faculty participation in local district Adopt-a-Reader program
Faculty participation in Technology Center Career Fair
2/18/08-2/22/08 – Beethoven festival
3/6/08 Co-Teaching seminar
3/6/08 Greenblatt forum, dinner and lecture
3/25/08 Transformation Learning Web Seminar
9/17/08 Web Seminar – Autism
10/28/08 Autism Seminar
10/30/08 Jody Williams forum, dinner, lecture

7. **The State Regents should continue to acquaint and involve education and arts and sciences faculty in the implementation of H.B. 2246** (now H.B. 1549).

The 1996 State Regents' emphasis on subject content taught by arts and sciences faculty preceded the same recommendations from the national level by several years. Title II of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 called for partnership programs with schools of arts and sciences, because many entities contribute to the success of teacher education programs. In 2000, National Accreditation of the Colleges of Teacher Education (NCATE) required that teacher candidates have in-depth knowledge of the subject matter that they plan to teach which is assessed with the Oklahoma General Education Test and the Oklahoma Subject Area Test. Since academic core course work in elementary, early childhood and special education and secondary

subject major courses are taught by the arts and sciences faculty, they play an integral role in teacher preparation, as they teach the content and model the teaching methodologies of these subjects. The 2008 NCLB grants provide models of arts and science faculty, teacher education faculty and K-12 teacher collaborations.

ECU

ECU includes faculty representatives from all arts and sciences teacher ed programs on our Teacher Education Committee. Additionally, we include a representative from each of our Colleges and School (College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, College of Health and Sciences, and, School of Business) as members of our Faculty Development Committee. Also, the education dean provides monthly updates to the Academic Affairs Council (AAC) – which consists of all the academic deans, academic administrators and several other academic representatives at ECU – concerning our teacher education programs and have a forum where they too can discuss issues relevant to our programs.

LU

The Unit at Langston University acquaints and involves arts and sciences faculty in the areas of approved programs through the Teacher Education Committee, of which a representative from each area is a member. The Committee is responsible for any changes, requirements, and/or concerns affecting teacher education. The Committee also approves all candidates for admission to teacher education and candidates for clinical teaching. Arts and Sciences faculty serve as College Supervisor for clinical teachers in the respective area, as well as the higher education representative for the Resident teacher, if there is not a subject area teacher in the local school to serve as mentor.

NSU

At NSU, faculty in the arts and sciences play an important role in candidate assessment, curriculum development, program improvement, and unit governance. Arts and sciences faculty who teach specialized methods courses and courses in the 4x12 for elementary, early childhood, and special education all participate in candidate assessment using course-based key assessments or through field observation and supervision. Data from these assessments are then used by faculty to identify areas for program improvement. Arts and science faculty also participate in curriculum change and development activities, proposing targeted changes in program design to strengthen candidate performance. In fact, several recent changes in the elementary education program have originated from arts and science faculty. Finally, all arts and science faculty who serve as program coordinators for secondary and K-12 programs serve on the Teacher Education Council, the governing committee for all teacher education programs. This group provides oversight for curriculum, policy, and assessment activities for all teacher education programs.

NWOSU

Arts and Science faculty have been included as part of our Teacher Education Committee, the governing body for our Unit. The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) meets monthly to address a variety of issues, including collaboration efforts. Our secondary education majors are heavily involved with their respective Arts and Science faculty. In addition, our Arts and Science faculty serve on interview teams for the following: candidate admission into Teacher Education, Benchmark reviews, Portfolio reviews and Student Teaching/ Graduation interviews. The Arts and Science faculty also serve as evaluators during the student teaching semester.

OPSU

Members of the arts and sciences faculty are included in all aspects of the education of our pre-service teachers. Arts and sciences faculty are members of our Teacher Education Council and

are involved in all areas of decisions made about our programs. The math seminars previously mentioned in this report are a great example of the collaboration efforts between the unit and arts and science members, as the seminars have been designed, presented, and assessed by a group of faculty from education, math, library, and public schools.

OSU

OSU works closely with arts and sciences faculty to ensure high quality teacher education programs through several avenues. First, arts and sciences faculty are members of the Professional Education Council and participate in regular meetings to discuss issues related to teacher education and to develop policies that support a high quality teacher education programs. Second, arts and sciences faculty serve on program advisory committees that provide ongoing review of teacher education programs. Advisory committees meet during the year to consider issues related to a specific program, such as Secondary Math Education, and review assessment data, SPA and NCATE requirements and changes and work together to develop and implement policies that maintain the program. Third, College of Education faculty frequently collaborate with arts and sciences faculty to develop external funding proposals that address both content and teaching concerns. Fourth, arts and sciences faculty frequently serve on student thesis and dissertation committees. Fifth, arts and sciences faculty serve on search committees looking for teacher education faculty. Additionally, College of Education faculty serve on curriculum committees for general education course redevelopment.

SOSU

At Southeastern the arts and science and the education faculty are equal partners in providing education to our pre-service teachers. The Teacher Education Council, the governing body of our Unit, is comprised of a representative from each of the education programs. All standing committees have equal representation from education and arts and sciences, and the NCATE working committees are established to provide a balance between the faculty of both schools.

SWOSU

At the undergraduate level, faculty in the mathematics and education departments worked collaboratively to revise math requirements and course sequence for elementary, special education, and early childhood majors.

Individual arts and sciences faculty, along with education faculty, have written grants for K-12 professional development. Brian Campbell and Robbie McCarty, Department of Chemistry/Physics – SMART: Science and Mathematics Association of Rural Teachers awarded by the Oklahoma Department of Education. John Woods, Department of Mathematics – KESAM 2008: K-8 Scholars Appreciating Mathematics, A Hands-On Brains-On Journey of Excellence awarded by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

OU

Each one of our Certification areas has a committee comprised of faculty members from the appropriate arts/sciences areas. They meet on a regular basis and review all program assessment data in terms of program improvement. Any programs that are outside of the College also sit on our teacher education council known as the Education Profession Divisions Council.

USAO

Arts and Sciences faculty serve on the Teacher Education Committee. Faculty from the following divisions teach some of the 4x12 classes required of early childhood, elementary, and deaf education majors: arts/humanities, business/social sciences, math/science. Art, physical

education, and music faculty teach classes required for elementary. The preparation of program reports (to SPAs) require significant collaborative efforts. More collaborative efforts than usual preceded the fall NCATE/state accreditation visit. An ad hoc Teacher Education committee comprised primarily of non-Education-Division members has begun meeting to examine the issue of better preparing majors in secondary areas who are opting for alternative certification.

AGENDA ITEM #20-b (3):

> **Reports.**

SUBJECT: 2007-08 Tuition Waiver Scholarship Report

RECOMMENDATION:

> **This report is recommended for State Regents' acceptance.**

BACKGROUND:

The 2007-2008 Tuition Waiver Scholarship Report provides detailed information on the resident and nonresident tuition waiver scholarships granted by state public institutions during the 2007-2008 academic year. The number of scholarship recipients and the amount of scholarships granted are reported for each institution and reported in summary by the following categories: (1) basis of the award; (2) student classification; (3) gender; (4) race; (5) residency status; (6) field of study; and (7) semester.

In 2003, 70 O.S. 2001, Section 3218.8, as amended by Sections 2 and 8 of House Bill No. 1748 authorized the State Regents to establish tuition and mandatory fee rates at levels less than the average rate charged at peer institutions in the Big Twelve Conference for the research universities and at like-type institutions in surrounding and other states for regional universities and community colleges.   In addition, the legislation stipulated that the State Regents make a reasonable effort to increase need-based financial aid proportionate to any increase in tuition.   In May 2003, the State Regents approved an increase in tuition waivers to three and one half percent (3.5%) in an effort to comply with the legislative intent.   The increase in tuition waivers from three to three and one half percent (3% to 3.5%) became effective in FY2004.

ANALYSIS:
During FY2007-2008, public institutions granted resident and nonresident tuition waiver scholarships to 53,294 students totaling $111.4 million.

- Approximately one in every five students received a full or partial tuition waiver scholarship during the fiscal year.
- Compared to FY2006-2007, the total number of scholarships granted decreased by 1,099 (-2.0%) and the amount of scholarship funding increased by $11.1 million (11.1%).

During FY2007-2008, resident tuition waivers were granted to 39,235 students, totaling $50.3 million in scholarships granted.

- Compared to FY2006-2007, the number of scholarships granted decreased by 1,301 (-3.2%) and the amount of scholarship funding increased by $3.4 million (7.3%).
- In comparison, resident tuition rates for FY2007-2008 increased by an average of 9.0 percent.

State Regents policy authorizes institutions to grant discretionary resident tuition waivers up to three and one-half percent (3.5%) of their current Educational and General Budget, Part I. A minimum of 50% of these scholarships must be granted to students who demonstrate financial need. The remainder of these scholarships may be granted to students to promote scholastic and student achievement and to "benefits" eligible employees. In addition, institutions are authorized to grant special resident tuition waiver scholarships to students who meet the criteria established and authorized by legislation and by specific State Regents' policy.

- Tuition waivers subject to the 3.5% limitation were granted to 26,819 (68.4%) recipients totaling $33.2 million (66.1%).
    1. Students with financial need received 15,986 (59.6%) scholarships totaling $19.9 million (60.1%).
    2. Students with scholarship/achievement received 9,265 (34.5%) scholarships totaling $12.2 million (36.8%).
    3. Benefits eligible employees received 1,568 (5.8%) scholarships totaling $1.0 million (3.1%).

- Statutory and policy mandated resident tuition waiver scholarships, not subject to the 3.5% limitation, were granted to 12,416 (31.6%) recipients totaling $17.1 million (33.9%).

    1. Concurrently enrolled high school seniors received 5,348 (43.1%) scholarships totaling $2.9 million (16.8%).
    2. Graduate teaching and research assistants received 3,038 (24.5%) scholarships totaling $6.1 million (35.8%).
    3. Student recipients of the State Regents Academic Scholars Program received 1,452 (11.7%) scholarships totaling $4.5 million (26.7%).
    4. Oklahoma National Guard members received 1,302 (10.5%) scholarships totaling $1.8 million (10.6%).
    5. Other recipients including senior citizens, students in custody of DHS, former prisoners of war or missing in action and/or their dependents, students called to active duty, recipients of the regional university baccalaureate scholarship program, and dependents of firefighters or law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty received 1,276 (10.3%) scholarships totaling $1.7 million (10.1%).

During FY2007-2008, nonresident tuition waivers were granted to 14,060 students totaling $61.1 million.

- Compared to FY2006-2007, the number of nonresident scholarships granted increased by 202 (1.5%) and the amount of scholarship funding increased by $7.7 million (14.4%).

- In comparison, nonresident tuition rates for FY2007-2008 increased by an average of 8.7 percent.

From FY2001-2002 to FY2007-2008, the number of resident and nonresident tuition waivers has increased from 45,121 scholarships to 53,294 scholarships, an increase of 8,173 recipients or 18.1%. The dollar amount of scholarships granted has increased from $59.8 million to $111.4 million, an increase of $51.6 million or 86.2 percent.

- Resident tuition waivers have increased by 4,667 (13.5%) scholarships, and scholarship funding has increased by $19.6 million or 63.9%.

- Nonresident tuition waivers have increased by 3,507 (33.2%) scholarships, and scholarship funding has increased by $32.0 million or 109.6%.

AGENDA ITEM #20-b (4):

> **Reports.**

SUBJECT: Degrees Conferred in Oklahoma Higher Education 2007-08.

RECOMMENDATION:

> **It is recommended that the State Regents accept this report.**

BACKGROUND:

- During the 2007-08 academic year, Oklahoma public higher education institutions conferred a total of 29,660 certificates and degrees. Compared to 2006-07, the number of certificates and degrees conferred increased 0.5 percent from 29,519. An accurate comparison of the number of degrees conferred at private institutions is not possible because not all private institutions reported or verified their data in both years.

| | | | | One-Year Difference | |
Type of Degree	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	05-06 / 06-07	06-07 / 07-08
Public Institutions					
Certificate	587	555	544	-5.8%	-2.0%
Associate	8,091	8,232	8,235	1.7%	0.1%
Bachelor's	15,207	15,469	15,610	1.7%	0.9%
First-Professional	727	896	890	18.9%	-0.7%
Graduate Certificates	*	*	35	*	*
Master's	3,970	3,982	4,006	0.3%	0.6%
Doctoral	352	385	340	8.6%	-13.2%
Total Public	28,934	29,519	29,660	2.0%	0.5%

*Graduate certificates not included in the report for this year.

- The number of bachelor's degrees conferred per person increased 4.2 times from 1941-42 to 2007-08, from one in 973 to one in 229. The number of master's degrees awarded per person increased 13.5 times, from one in 12,038 to one in 893. The number of doctoral degrees conferred per person increased 70.2 times, from one in 738,333 to one in 10,520.

- During the last 15 years from 1993-94 to 2007-08, the largest number of degrees conferred at public institutions was bachelor's, followed by associate, master's, first-professional, and doctoral, respectively.

- The number of degrees conferred increased from 1993-94 to 2007-08 for the associate degree (from 6,207 to 8,235), for the bachelor's degree (from 12,696 to 15,610), for first-professional degrees

(from 576 to 890), for master's degrees (from 3,754 to 4,006), and decreased for doctoral degrees (359 to 340).

POLICY ISSUES:

Article XIII-A of the Oklahoma Constitution states that the State Regents *"shall grant degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of the prescribed courses in all of such institutions."* This report is a summary of degrees granted.

ANALYSIS:

- In 1993-94, and from 1998-99 to 2007-08, the largest number of bachelor's degrees awarded at public institutions was in business and management followed by education. From 1994-95 to 1997-98, education had the largest number of bachelor's degrees awarded. In 2007-08, the most master's degrees were awarded in education followed by business and management. Education accounted for the most doctoral degrees conferred during the past 15 years.

- From 1993-94 to 2007-08, the largest percentage of degrees was awarded to White students, averaging 81.4 percent at the first-professional level, 77.8 percent at the associate level, 75.2 percent at the bachelor's level, 69.6 percent at the master's level, and 63.0 percent at the doctoral level. In 2007-08, American Indian students ranked second at the associate, bachelor's, and first-professional levels. Nonresident Alien students ranked second at the master's and doctoral levels.

- Comparing 2007-08 to 2006-07 at public institutions, the number of degrees conferred increased for associate, first-professional, and master's for men; and increased for certificates and bachelor's for women.

This report will be available on the State Regents' website at www.okhighered.org under Studies and Reports.

	CERTIFICATES			ASSOCIATE			BACHELOR'S		
	544			**8,235**			**15,610**		
Top Three Degree-Producing Institutions	TCC	296	54.4%	TCC	2,023	24.6%	OU	3,818	24.5%
	OCCC	54	9.9%	OCCC	1,000	12.1%	OSU	3,818	24.5%
	CASC	43	7.9%	RSC	697	8.5%	UCO	2,199	14.1%
Top Three Fields of Study	Consum. Ed.	254	46.7%	Health	1,849	22.5%	Business	3,463	22.2%
	Health	137	25.2%	Lib. Arts	1,835	22.3%	Education	1,732	11.1%
	Business	87	16.0%	Business	1,208	14.7%	Health	1,161	7.4%
Gender									
Men		99	18.2%		2,938	35.7%		6,649	42.6%
Women		445	81.8%		5,297	64.3%		8,961	57.4%
Race									
White		384	70.7%		6,051	73.6%		11,635	74.5%
Black		77	14.2%		581	7.1%		933	6.0%
Hispanic		19	3.5%		287	3.5%		463	3.0%
Asian Amer.		6	1.1%		172	2.1%		417	2.7%
Amer. Indian		49	9.0%		984	12.0%		1,544	9.9%
Nonres. Alien		8	1.5%		149	1.8%		615	3.9%
Hawaiian/Pac Isl		1	0.2%		11	0.1%		3	0.0%

FIRST-PROFESSIONAL			GRADUATE CERTIFICATES			MASTER'S			DOCTORAL		
890			**35**			**4,006**			**340**		
OUHSC	460	51.7%	OUHSC	26	0.6%	OU	1,476	4217.1%	OU	173	50.9%
OULAW	164	18.4%	OSU	8	0.2%	OSU	865	2471.4%	OSU	141	41.5%
SWOSU	85	9.6%	UCO	1	0.0%	UCO	402	1148.6%	OUHSC	26	7.6%
Pharmacy	204	22.9%	Health	23	0.6%	Education	1,035	2957.1%	Education	55	16.2%
Law	164	18.4%	Education	5	0.1%	Business	919	2625.7%	Engineering	45	13.2%
Medicine, MD	139	15.6%	Interdisc.	3	0.1%	Health	278	794.3%	Bio Science	40	11.8%
	399	44.8%		5	14.3%		1,588	39.6%		198	58.2%
	491	55.2%		30	85.7%		2,418	60.4%		142	41.8%
	691	77.6%		28	80.0%		2,819	70.4%		171	50.3%
	23	2.6%		4	11.4%		264	6.6%		9	2.6%
	25	2.8%		0	0.0%		120	3.0%		5	1.5%
	66	7.4%		2	5.7%		79	2.0%		3	0.9%
	79	8.9%		0	0.0%		294	7.3%		11	3.2%
	6	0.7%		1	2.9%		428	10.7%		141	41.5%
	0	0.0%		0	0.0%		2	0.0%		0	0.0%

Small differences in percentages are due to rounding.
Source: Top Three Degree-Producing Institutions from Figure 17, Table 111-121;
Top Three Fields of Study from Figure 3, Tables 6-10; Gender and Race from Figures 5-7, Tables 15-46

Acronym	Institution Name	Acronym	Institution Name
CASC	Carl Albert Community College	OUHSC	University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
OCCC	Oklahoma City Community College	OULAW	University of Oklahoma Law Center
OSU	Oklahoma State University	RSC	Rose State College
OSUCHS	Oklahoma State University Center for Health Sciences	TCC	Tulsa Community College
OU	University of Oklahoma	UCO	University of Central Oklahoma
		SWOSU	Southwestern Oklahoma State University

AGENDA ITEM #20-b (5):

> **Reports.**

SUBJECT: Student Data Report 2006-07.

BACKGROUND:

The *Student Data Report: Oklahoma Higher Education 2006-07* is the 25th annual publication of comprehensive student data from the State Regents' Unitized Data System (UDS).

POLICY ISSUES:

The annual *Student Data Report* uses the UDS to produce many of the primary measures of student involvement in higher education such as movement into college, enrollments, student transfer, persistence, and semester credit hours. The tables and figures are intended for use by public officials, institutional administrators, faculty, staff, and regents in the development of higher education plans and programs.

ANALYSIS:

The following are some highlights from the report.

- The projection of high school graduates shows a gradual increase from 38,314 in 2006-07 to 38,714 in 2009-10, then a decline over the next four years to 35,788 in 2013-14, followed by a sharp rise to 38,182 in 2016-17.

- From 2002 to 2004 Oklahoma was 0.3 of a point below the national composite ACT mean scores. The gap between Oklahoma and the nation increased to 0.5 of a point in 2005 and 0.6 of a point in 2006. In 2007 the gap again is at 0.5 of a point.

- Public higher education headcount enrollment increased from 209,371 in 1997-98 to 211,876 in 1998-99, declined in the in the following year to 209,559, then generally increased over the next five years to 238,235 in 2004-05. Enrollment has decline in the two subsequent years to 233,203 in 2006-07.
- At the public institutions, females outnumbered males in 2006-07 by 57 percent to 43 percent. In 1962, males outnumbered females in Oklahoma higher education by 65 percent to 35 percent. In the fall of 1972, males outnumbered females by 60 percent to 40 percent.

- At the public institutions, Education was the most popular field of study in 2006-07 with 23,630 (10.1 percent) students enrolled. Business Management was second with 21,721 (9.3 percent) students enrolled. In 2003-04 and 2002-03, Business Management was first and Education was second. These have been the top two fields since the first Student Data Report was published in 1982-83.

- The most recent three-year average college-going rate direct from high school was 57.6 percent, three tenths of a full point lower than the previous year.

- Overall, the number of new freshmen in public institutions decreased 2.4 percent from 37,077 in 2002-03 to 36,174 in 2006-07. The number of new freshmen decreased by 10.1 percent from 40,243 in 2005-06. This is the largest percentage decline in the last ten years.

- From 1997-98 to 2006-07, persistence rates (within the institution) for new freshmen increased from 78.3 to 80.9 percent at the research universities, increased from 62.0 to 64.9 percent at the regional universities, and increased from 54.4 to 56.6 percent at the community colleges.

- From 1997-98 to 2006-07, six-year graduation rates (within the institution) for new freshmen increased from 48.0 to 61.1 percent at the research universities and from 25.2 to 32.1 percent at the regional universities. At community colleges, three-year graduation rates (within the institution) for new freshmen increased from 15.0 to 22.4 percent.

The *Student Data Report* will be available at www.okhigher.org under Studies and Reports.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City

MINUTES

Seven Hundred Seventeenth Meeting

February 12, 2009

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Minutes of the Seven Hundred Seventeenth Meeting
February 12, 2009

CONTENTS

Minutes of the Seven Hundred Seventeenth Meeting
of the
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
February 12, 2009

- **ANNOUNCEMENT OF FILING OF MEETING NOTICE AND POSTING OF THE AGENDA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETING ACT.** The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education held their regular meeting at 9 a.m. on Thursday, February 12, 2009, in the State Regents' offices in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Notice of the meeting had been filed with the Secretary of State on November 26, 2009. A copy of the agenda for the meeting had been posted in accordance with the Open Meeting Act.

- **CALL TO ORDER.** Regent White called the meeting to order and presided. Present for the meeting were State Regents Bill Burgess, Ron White, Stuart Price, Jody Parker, Ike Glass, Jimmy Harrel, Cheryl Hunter, and John Massey. Regent Julie Carson was not present for the meeting.

- **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.** Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the minutes of the State Regents' Committee-of-the-Whole on December 3, 2008, and the State Regents' regular meeting on December 4, 2008. Voting for the motion were Regents White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Hunter, Massey, and Burgess. Voting against the motion were none.

- **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN.** Chairman White noted that the 2009 legislative session had begun the previous week. He added thanks on behalf of the State Regents to the Governor and the Legislature for their continued support of higher education in Oklahoma.

- **REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR.** Chancellor Glen D. Johnson provided a report on Higher Education Day at the Capitol, an annual event which was held on Tuesday, February 10, 2009. He expressed his appreciation to Regent Burgess for attending the event and thanked State Regents' staff Sid Hudson and Hollye Hunt for their efforts to ensure a successful event. Higher Education

Day at the Capitol is designed to thank the Governor and the Legislature for their efforts in support of Oklahoma's public colleges and universities. The event is also an opportunity to inform legislators of higher education's accomplishments and needs. Chancellor Johnson encouraged Regents to participate in the event next year.

- **COMMENTS FROM THE PRESIDENT.** Chairman White welcomed President Roger Stacy, Northern Oklahoma College.

- **STUDENT PRESENTATION OF AWARDS.**

    o Regent Hunter presented the Oklahoma Campus Compact 2008 Vote Initiative awards to the Voter Registration Contest winning institutions. She explained that the voter registration contest is in its sixth year. For 2008, the contest was expanded to allow institutions to compete against others in the same enrollment range and allowed for three categories of winners. Sixteen campuses participated in the contest and set a new record of 5,331 students registered.

    Langston University was the winner in the Red category, which represents less than 3,000 full time students. Receiving the award on behalf of Langston University were Mr. Javon Brame, the Student Government Association Activities Coordinator for Langston University, Mr. Marc Flemon, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, and Dr. Angelia Jones, Vice President for Student Affairs.

    Rose State College was the winner in the White category, which represents enrollments from 3,000 to 7,000 full time students. Receiving the award on behalf of Rose State College were Mr. Rendon Chambers, Rose State College Student Senate, Dr. John Wood, Professor of Political Science, Mr. Brian Fowler, Ms. Haley Oliver, Rose State College Student Senate President, Ms. Christina McDade, Ms. Towrey Barnard, Director of Student Activities, and Dr. Jeanie Webb, Vice President for Student Affairs.

    The University of Oklahoma was the winner in the Blue category, which represents institutions with more than 7,000 full time students. Receiving the award on behalf of the

University of Oklahoma were Mr. Kurt Davidson, a University of Oklahoma Student Association Student Leader, Dr. Margaret Ellis, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Dr. Glen Krutz, Ms. Kayla Downing, Mr. Matthew Gress, and Dr. Clarke Stroud, Vice President for Student Affairs.

o   Regent Hunter presented the Carter Academic-Service Entrepreneur (CASE) awards, which recognize the best volunteer work of university students, faculty and staff as they partner with community groups and agencies. Three student proposals were chosen to receive the award and their community partner will receive a $1,000 grant from the Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter Partnership Foundation.

The first recipient was Ms. Sarah Smith, Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College, who worked with the Ottawa County Community Clinic to seek updated blood pressure and pulse vital sign machines. The second recipient was Mr. Corey Steward, Oklahoma State University, who worked in collaboration with the Central Oklahoma Community Action Agency to increase the quantity of food in the regional food bank and to extend the length of time that food may be distributed to needy individuals and families. The third recipients were Mr. Collins Uzuegbu and Ms. Meagan Decher, Southwestern Oklahoma State University, who propose to provide age and developmentally appropriate toys and fun activities to pediatric patients at the Weatherford Regional Hospital.

- **NEW PROGRAMS.** Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Parker, to approve the following requests for new programs:

o   Oklahoma State University requested to offer the Certificate in Aerospace Security. The program would offer advanced training to security managers and practitioners from across a wide spectrum of the aerospace community and will prepare professional leaders for positions in aerospace security.

o   The University of Central Oklahoma requested a function change to offer the associate in applied science degree and requested to offer the Associate in Applied Science in

Contemporary Music – Performance and the Associate in Applied Science in Contemporary Music – Production. The request for a function change reflects stipulations for the university's franchise agreement with the Academy of Contemporary Music in Guildford, England to establish a similar academy in the United States. The academy requires a two-year credential to coincide with the curricular structure of the academy.

Voting for the motion were Regents Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Hunter, Massey, and White. Voting against the motion were none.

- **PROGRAM DELETIONS.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve the following requests for program deletions: Northeastern State University requested to delete the Master of Education in Special Education and the Bachelor of Science in Engineering Physics. Voting for the motion were Regents Parker, Glass, Hunter, Massey, White, and Price. Voting against the motion were none.

- **ACCREDITATION.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve the recommendation to accredit the Education and Cultural Interactions, Inc (ECI) for three years and The English As A Second Language Program – Tulsa Community College (ESL-TCC) for five years. Voting for the motion were Regents Glass, Harrel, Hunter, Massey, Burgess, White, Price, and Parker. Voting against the motion were none.

- **TEACHER EDUCATION.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the Teacher Shortage Employment Incentive Program (TSEIP) benefit of $13,602 for each teacher eligible by December 2009. Teachers receiving the TSEIP benefit must sign a participation agreement with their college of education prior to graduation and then must return the required documentation after teaching for five years. Voting for the motion were Regents Harrel, Hunter, Massey, White, Price, Parker, and Glass. Voting against the motion were none.

- **GEAR UP GRANT.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Parker, to approve a grant in the amount of $5,400 to Oklahoma State University in support of the Strengthening Today's Young Leaders through Education (STYLE) program, which is an annual leadership

program for Oklahoma minority female high school students. Voting for the motion were Regents Hunter, Massey, White, Price, Parker, Glass, and Harrel. Voting against the motion were none.

- **HIGH SCHOOL INDICATORS PROJECT.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to accept the 2007 high school remediation rates, a part of the High School Indicators Project. Voting for the motion were Regents Massey, White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, and Hunter. Voting against the motion were none.

- **POLICY.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve items 14-b through 14-j, as described below. Item 14-a is for posting and does not require State Regents' action.

  o   Chairman White stated that revisions to the State Regents' electronically delivered and traditional off-campus courses and programs policy were recommended for posting. The proposed policy revisions reflect an initiative to eliminate confusion of the policy implementation and streamline the program approval process. Revisions to the policy were developed by the Council on Instruction (COI) Electronic Media Committee, approved by COI and the Council of Presidents.

  o   Policy changes regarding the University of Oklahoma medical school admission increase the number of incoming students from 165 to 200 and increase the percentage of out-of-state students to 25 percent of the total class size, contingent upon sufficient state funding. The policy also states that Oklahoma students who meet both qualitative and quantitative standards must be given priority. A copy of the revised policy is shown as Attachment "A".

  o   Policy changes regarding Oklahoma State University medical school admission increase the number of incoming students from 88 to 115, contingent upon state funding. No change is requested for the percentage of out-of-state students. The policy also states that Oklahoma students who meet both qualitative and quantitative standards must be given priority. A copy of the revised policy is shown as Attachment "A".

- Revisions to the State Regents' cooperative alliances between higher education institutions and technology centers policy formalize the pilot programs created in 2004. A copy of the revised policy is shown as Attachment "B".

- The University of Central Oklahoma requested an exception to the institutional exception previously granted to the university to allow the use of correspondence credit as resident credit to satisfy the 30 hours resident credit requirement. The request is to exceed the 30 hour limit on the application of correspondence credit toward baccalaureate degree completion for incarcerated female inmates at the Mabel Bassett Correctional Facility as part of a pilot project.

- Revisions to the Oklahoma Student Advisory Board (SAB) policy delineates meeting requirements and provides the SAB with a method of ensuring full representation and active participation. Additional changes clarify member responsibilities, formalize the position of vice-chair and its duties, increase the approval level from a majority to two-thirds, and updates references. A copy of the revised policy is shown as Attachment "C".

- Amendments to the Teacher Shortage Employment Incentive Program (TSEIP) allows a one year waiver for graduates that fail to enroll prior to graduation because of extenuating circumstances, deletes the timeline for notifying the State Regents, allows flexibility for considering the merits of each case, and clarifies other irrelevant or ambiguous language. A copy of the revised policy is shown as Attachment "D".

- Amendments to the Oklahoma's Promise – Oklahoma Higher Learning Access Program address four statutory changes from the 2008 legislative session. A copy of the revised policy is shown as Attachment "E".

- Amendments to the Oklahoma Tuition Equalization Grant (OTEG) were made to align policy to statutory amendments made by Senate Bill 1038 of the 2008 Oklahoma legislative session and to provide direction for situations when a student is found to be

ineligible after an institution has awarded and disbursed OTEG funds. A copy of the revised policy is shown as Attachment "F".

o   Oklahoma Money Matters (OKMM) is the State Regents' financial literacy initiative and serves as an information clearinghouse and develops outreach programs and community partnerships to increase public awareness for the need for financial education. Member enrollment in the OKMM AmeriCorps program never reached forcasted levels; therefore, OKMM elected not to compete for an AmeriCorps grant in 2008-09. As the OKMM AmeriCorps program has fulfiled the grant cycle, the APA rule for the program is no longer required. This item revokes the APA rule for the OKMM AmeriCorps Education Award Program.

Voting for the motion were Regents White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Hunter, and Massey. Voting against the motion were none.

- **E&G BUDGETS.**

    o   Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Hunter, to approve the allocation of $2,693,784.67 each to Oklahoma State University Center for Health Sciences and the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center from revenue collected from the taxes placed on the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products. Voting for the motion were Regents Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Hunter, Massey, and White. Voting against the motion were none.

    o   Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Parker, to approve a cooperative alliance academic service fee waiver and allocate funds to the institutions for reimbursement of fee waivers to eligible high school students during the Fall 2008 term. Voting for the motion were Regents Parker, Glass, Hunter, Massey, White, and Price. Voting against the motion were none.

- **ITEM DELETED.**

- **EPSCoR.** Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the following items:

  o   2008 Oklahoma EPSCoR Advisory Committee Annual Report

  o   Ratification of payment of annual EPSCoR/IDeA Coalition dues in the amount of $30,000 for the calendar year 2009.

  o   Appointment of individuals to the EPSCoR Advisory Committee.

  Voting for the motion were Regents Glass, Harrel, Hunter, Massey, Burgess, White, Price, and Parker. Voting against the motion were none.

- **PURCHASING.** Regent Price made a motion, seconded by Regent Hunter, to approve the following purchasing items:

  o   Approval of FY-2009 purchases in excess of $100,000.

  o   Ratification of emergency FY-2009 purchase in excess of $100,000.

  Voting for the motion were Regents Harrel, Hunter, Massey, White, Price, Parker, and Glass. Voting against the motion were none.

- **COMMENDATIONS.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Parker, to recognize staff for service on state and national projects. Voting for the motion were Regents Hunter, Massey, White, Price, Parker, Glass, and Harrel. Voting against the motion were none.

- **EXECUTIVE SESSION.** Bob Anthony, General Counsel for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, stated that there was not a need to go into executive session.

- **PERSONNEL.** Chancellor Johnson stated that external consultants, True Digital, had been engaged in early 2008 to review and make recommendations on the structure, composition, and alignment of the State Regents' IT department. Three recommendations for personnel changes at the level of director or above were included in their findings. It was recommended that Mr. Ricky Steele be promoted from his current position as Director of Software Development to Executive Director of Research and Information Systems. It was also recommended that Ms. Barbara McCrary be promoted from her current position as Assistant Director of OGSLP Network

Support Services to Chief Information and Security Officer. Additionally, it was recommended that Mr. Doug McCullar change positions from Director of LAN Operations to Director of Technology Planning and Development in order to provide targeted network planning, testing and training support for IT staff and projects.

Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Hunter, to approve the personnel changes as described above. Voting for the motion were Regents Massey, White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, and Hunter. Voting against the motion were none.

- **CONSENT DOCKET.** Regent Hunter made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the following consent docket items:

  o   Approval of institutional requests for program modifications.

  o   Approval of request from Oklahoma State University to offer an existing (Graduate) certificate via electronic delivery.

  o   Approval of requests for inventory reconciliations.

  o   Approval of request from Oklahoma State University Institution of Technology, Okmulgee for a cooperative agreement with Northwest Technical Center.

  o   Ratification of capital allotments.

  o   Ratification of purchases in excess of $25,000 but not in excess of $100,000.

Voting for the motion were Regents White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Hunter, and Massey. Voting against the motion were none.

- **REPORTS.** Regent Parker made a motion, seconded by Regent Hunter, to accept the following reports:

  o   Programs. Status report on program requests.

  o   Reports.

  ▪   Academic Policy Exceptions Quarterly Report.

  ▪   Oklahoma College Savings Plan Program Update.

  ▪   2007-2008 Remediation Report

- Supplemental Pension Report, FY2008

Voting for the motion were Regents Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Hunter, Massey, and White. Voting against the motion were none.

- **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEES.**

  o Academic Affairs and Social Justice and Student Services Committees. Regent Hunter stated that the committee's items had been acted on.

  o Budget and Audit Committee. Regent Massey reported that all of the committee's items had been handled during the meeting.

  o Strategic Planning and Personnel Committee. The Strategic Planning and Personnel Committee did not meet.

  o Technology Committee. Regent Glass reported that State Regents' staff provided an operations update on the major projects such as the Pricing/Cost Allocation Study, the IT/OneNet Salary Study, as well as, key developments in the agency's Security Policy Development. The committee also discussed the agency's network monitoring efforts and the purchasing items that were included in the meeting's agenda.

  o Investment Committee. Regent Parker stated that the committee had no action items to bring before the board.

- **NEW BUSINESS.** No new business was brought before the Regents.

- **ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING.** Chairman White announced that the next regular meeting of the State Regents would be held at 9 a.m. on Thursday, April 2, 2009, at the State Regents' offices in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

- **ADJOURNMENT.** With no additional items to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

_____   _____
Ron White, Chairman   Joseph   L.   Parker,   Jr.,   Secretary

Excerpt from:

Professional Programs

3.25.1 Purpose

This policy includes specific program requirements for admission, curriculum, retention, graduation, and other standards of those programs which require State Regents' oversight.

3.25.2 Definitions

The following words and terms, when used in the Chapter, shall have the following meaning, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA)" is the average of a student's earned grades calculated by point values assigned to letter grades that includes grades for all attempted regularly-graded course work, including activity courses and forgiven course work. This GPA may be used for financial aid or eligibility purposes, admission to graduate or professional programs, or to determine eligibility for graduation honors.

"Retention/Graduation Grade Point Average (GPA)" is the average of a student's earned grades calculated by point values assigned to letter grades that is used to determine a student's eligibility to remain enrolled or graduate from an institution. Activity courses and forgiven course work are not calculated in the retention/graduation GPA. (See the State Regents' *Grading Policy*.) This GPA may be used for financial aid or eligibility purposes, admission to graduate or professional programs, or to determine eligibility for graduation honors.

3.25.3 Admission Standards for the Oklahoma State University ~~(OSU)~~ College of Osteopathic Medicine (OSUCOM) and the University of Oklahoma ~~(OU)~~ College of Medicine (OUCOM)

The two public colleges of medicine within the state may admit students if they meet the specified Medical College Admission Test (MCAT) score and college GPA requirements or if they are admitted under the alternative admissions by the College of Medicine, using standards defined by the college.

In addition to meeting these quantitative standards, the student must also be judged to be qualified for entry through the qualitative institutional interview process. Within the total <u>incoming</u> class enrollment limits set by the State Regents <u>(OSUCOM – 115 and OUCOM – 200),</u> the colleges of medicine may admit ~~up to 15 percent or 20~~ out-of-state students per year ~~(whichever is larger).~~<u>as indicated below:</u>

<u>OSUCOM – 15 percent or 20 out-of-state students, whichever is greater</u>

<u>OUCOM – 25 percent or 50 out-of-state students</u>

Oklahoma students who have met both the qualitative and quantitative standards must be given priority over out-of-state applicants and, in addition, admission through the alternative admission category must give high priority to Oklahoma citizens and to addressing the need for cultural diversity within the student body.

When the MCAT system of scoring changes, the State Regents will specify the appropriate new MCAT score based on the same percentile ranking for the new scoring system as the percentile ranking of the scores specified above represent under the current scoring system. The State Regents *Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook* lists the current admission criteria and is available upon request.

OU and OSU Colleges of Medicine Admission Standards: Approved June 26, 1989. Revised August 16, 1994. OU College of Medicine: Approved May 27, 1981. Revised September 8, 1995. OSU College of Osteopathic Medicine: Approved April 22, 1981. Revised April 11, 1997. OU School of Dentistry: Approved January 19, 1971. OU School of Dentistry Functions: Approved January 19, 1971. OU Doctor of Pharmacy: Approved May 5, 1990, revised December 9, 1994. NSU College of Optometry Admission Standards: Approved July 23, 1980. NSU College of Optometry: Approved July 29, 1981. OSU College of Veterinary Medicine: Revised fall 1971; June 20, 1975; February 8, 1995; April 3, 1998; April 1, 2004. OU College of Law Functions: Approved May 1, 1970. Revised October 28, 1974. OU College of Law Admission Standards: Revised February 12, 1965; January 24, 1972; June 27, 1997. Nurse Education Programs: Approved December 15, 1970. Health Education with External Clinical Component: Approved April 28, 1980. Business Programs: Approved May 26, 2000. OU and OSU Admission of out-of-state students February XX, 2009.

3.6   COOPERATIVE ~~AGREEMENTS~~ ALLIANCES BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND ~~CAREER~~ TECHNOLOGY CENTERS

    3.6.1   Purpose

The purpose of Cooperative ~~agreements~~ Alliances is to expand student access to Oklahoma's educational opportunities with resource-sharing partnerships between institutions of the State System and ~~the state's~~ CareerTech technology centers for the benefit of Oklahoma citizens, business, industry, and students. ~~Cooperative agreements should also strengthen the education and training programs that lead to employment in occupational and technical fields.~~ Cooperative Alliances are student-centered partnerships organized to encourage and facilitate progress toward college graduation and designed to ensure that students obtain the technical and academic skills that will allow them to succeed in today's dynamic knowledge-based, technology-driven global economy.

Cooperative Alliances are formed with Oklahoma public colleges or universities that offer the Associate in Applied Science (AAS) as Cooperative Agreement Programs (CAP) with an Oklahoma public technology center. Students enrolled in CAPs are treated as members of the higher education community. These students benefit from college support services including academic advising and counseling, convenient admission and enrollment processes, financial aid, career advisement and job placement assistance.

    3.6.2   Definitions

The following words and terms, when used in the Chapter, shall have the following meaning, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degree" is typically a credential requiring two years of full-time equivalent college work (at least 60 credit hours) that emphasizes a technical or occupational specialty and is designed to lead the student directly to employment. Unlike the Associate in Arts (AA) or Associate in Science (AS) degrees, the AAS is not designed to transfer all courses to a Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science (BS); however, the courses may transfer to a technical baccalaureate degree program.

"Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP)" is a formal, ~~State Regents' approved agreement between a state higher education institution and a state technology center to offer courses leading to an associate in applied science degree. Associate in applied science degree programs may or may not apply to a baccalaureate degree. College credit is awarded only by the higher education institution.~~ academic program offered by institutions in the Oklahoma State System for Higher Education that includes approved courses taught by a CareerTech technology center and leads to an Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degree or a college-level certificate in a technical or occupational field.

"Cooperative Alliance" is an agreement between one or more institutions in the Oklahoma State System for Higher Education and one technology center as a joint vision of a collaborative partnership designed to benefit students and enhance the technical workforce in that part of Oklahoma. A Cooperative Alliance is voluntary and agreed upon by all partners and their governing boards. The State Regents for Higher Education and the State Board of Career and Technology Education review and approve the agreement for each Cooperative

Alliance. The approved Cooperative Alliance agreement remains in force until the governing boards of the Cooperative Alliance partners dissolve the agreement.

"Institution" refers to any college or university of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education listed in the State Regents' *Governance* policy (1.7) and that offers AAS degrees.

"Partners" are institutions and technology centers that enter into a Cooperative Alliance agreement. The agreement delineates the roles of each partner in providing the academic program and support services to the students enrolled in CAPs.

"Technology center" refers to a center established by criteria and procedures for the establishment prescribed for governance of technology center school districts by the State Board of Career and Technology Education as provided by Section 9B, Article X, Oklahoma Constitution, and such districts so established shall be operated in accordance with rules of the State Board of Career and Technology Education, except as otherwise provided in this title.

3.6.3   Principles and Goals

~~Cooperative agreements when fully implemented will:~~

~~A.   Adhere to academic educational standards and policies as specified by the State Regents and the State Department of Career and Technology Education.~~

~~B.   Articulate to students the roles and responsibilities of each partnering institution by clearly informing students of which institution delivers courses and that academic credit is awarded only by the college or university.~~

~~C.   Facilitate articulation with an uninterrupted sequence of learning experiences for high school students progressing from secondary to postsecondary learning.~~

~~D.   Provide students who are enrolled in a technology center program the opportunity to continue their educational careers in higher education.~~

~~E.   Insure the efficient use of scarce public resources and expand access to educational services. These agreements are particularly useful when two types of institutions having two different functions and equipment can serve the same students without unnecessary resource duplication.~~

The driving principle of the Cooperative Alliance is to build a student-centered, rather than institution-centered approach to the use of CAPs. The four goals of the Cooperative Alliance are:

A.   To enroll more high school students in college;

B.   To encourage more adults to continue their education or begin college;

C.   To expand access to postsecondary (college and career/technical) education; and

D.   To efficiently use federal, state and local resources.

The mission of the Cooperative Alliance is to offer AAS degrees and college-level certificates that benefit students, employers, and the public. By fulfilling the mission, the Cooperative Alliance significantly impacts the economy and quality of life in the areas served by the partners.

3.6.4 Requirements for Course Credit of a Cooperative Alliance Agreement

A.   High school students attending a state technology center and enrolled in courses offered through a cooperative agreement with adult students may earn college credit in only those courses that were previously approved as part of the cooperative agreement under conditions listed below. Students must:

1. Sign a Declaration of Intent while enrolled at a participating technology center indicating that the student plans to attend the participating higher education institution. The technology center and the higher education institution will each maintain students' declaration documents.

2. Complete the same projects and examinations as their adult counterparts who are participating in the cooperative agreement program.

3. Achieve a minimum grade average of "B" in all course work.

4. Graduate from high school and be admitted to the participating State System institution. Credit earned through cooperative agreement examination/assessment will be posted on the official college transcript as a grade of "S" or "P" after successful completion of 12 or more resident semester hours at the participating institution.

5. Have a maximum of two years after high school graduation to apply for the cooperative agreement credit.

6. High school students taking non-technical courses including general education courses must meet the admission standards as described in the State Regents' *Institutional Admission and Retention Policy.*

A.   Conceptual basis

1. The Cooperative Alliance is student-centered, focusing on an integrated learning experience for each student which has as its goal the completion of the AAS degree or college-level certificate program.

2. The Cooperative Alliance offers AAS degrees and college-level certificate programs that focus on technical knowledge and skills in addition to general academic knowledge and skills that are useful in the workplace and for a higher quality of life and lifelong learning.

3. A higher education institution partner will maintain an official college transcript for each student who enrolls in an approved course taught at the technology center and who chooses to take the course for college credit as part of a CAP.

4. All higher education partners and technology centers will participate in a statewide transfer equivalency matrix of technical courses maintained by State Regents for all approved courses in CAPs.

5. The Cooperative Alliance will focus on student success, including the completion of the AAS degree or college-level certificate program.

6. Each student at the technology center admitted to a higher education institution is a member of the collegiate community and receives services including academic advising, admission and enrollment, financial aid, career advisement, and job placement assistance. The provision of these services will be coordinated among partners in the Cooperative Alliance to insure consistency and to minimize duplication.

7. The Cooperative Alliance provides for student assessment consistent with State Regents' *Assessment* policy (3.20) and accreditation standards.

8. The Cooperative Alliance provides for tracking of students in a seamless manner from first-time enrollment through graduation and initial employment, or transfer within the Oklahoma State System for Higher Education.

B. ~~Adult students are 18 years or older and their high school class has graduated. Those attending a state technology center and enrolled in courses offered through a cooperative agreement may earn college credit under the following conditions.~~

1. ~~Simultaneously enroll in technology center courses and participating college courses.~~

2. ~~Automatically receive college credit upon successful completion of technology center courses that are approved for college credit in the cooperative agreement.~~

B. Scope

1. The Cooperative Alliance agreement supersedes all CAPs approved under the previous State Regents' *Guidelines for Approval of Cooperative Agreements between Technology Centers and Colleges (3.6)*. All prior approved CAP's will be grandfathered under this agreement.

2. Through the Cooperative Alliance, the higher education institutions will offer AAS degrees and college-level certificate programs in disciplines in cooperation with technology centers where effectiveness and efficiency can be enhanced and where a student-centered, competency-based approach can be maintained.

3. Consistent with the State Regents' *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy, CAPs offered at technology centers are meeting the educational needs of the community.

4. With the approval of the Cooperative Alliance partners, CAPs may be added to the agreement. If the partners cannot agree, the Chancellor for State System and the State Director for CareerTech will arbitrate.

5. The Cooperative Alliance partners will jointly plan and implement appropriate faculty and staff development activities to benefit the CAPs.

6. The Cooperative Alliance partners will jointly plan and implement a sharing of physical and human resources to support the Alliance, its programs, and related activities.

C. Curriculum

1. The Cooperative Alliance partners will offer high quality, AAS degree and college-level certificate programs as CAPs, conferred by a higher education institution, that comply with applicable policies of the State Regents, CareerTech, and the local governing boards and that meet the certification and training standards of business and industry.

2. All CAPs in place when the Cooperative Alliance agreement is approved are included and will be listed.

3. All continuing and future CAPs included in the Cooperative Alliance shall be subject to the State Regents' *Academic Program Approval* and *Academic Program Review* policies. The Criteria for Evaluation (3.4.6) include centrality to the mission, curriculum, academic standards, faculty, support resources, demand for the program, and complement to existing programs, unnecessary duplication, cost, and review.

4. An advisory committee composed of faculty, staff, employers, and practitioners assists in developing curriculum content, in keeping the curriculum current, and in maintaining contact with the occupational community.

D. Quality Assurance

1. Faculty
   a. All technology center faculty teaching CAP courses must adhere to established higher education institutional adjunct faculty qualifications appropriate to faculty teaching in occupational and technical fields. Credentials must be a degree at the level at which the faculty member is teaching, e.g., at the Certificate level, the faculty must have a certificate in that field; at the Associate Degree level, the faculty must have an Associate Degree. The appropriate academic dean reviews all faculty credentials, and recommends all faculty for approval. Once approved, technology center faculty in approved CAPs becomes listed as adjunct instructors for the higher education institution.

   b. Any exception to the foregoing must be approved by the appropriate designee for Academic Affairs at the higher education institution.

   c. An annual faculty assessment, including student evaluation of instruction, will be conducted in accordance with established guidelines and procedures of the higher education institution.

d.	All adjunct faculty must meet established institutional college adjunct faculty minimum employment standards associated with the academic program/division under which the CAP courses will be offered. Faculty credentials must meet these standards and be approved for adjunct status prior to approval of courses for college credit in the CAP.

2. Program Quality

**a.	Assessment criteria are reviewed and approved by the higher education institution faculty on a course-by-course basis when the curriculum is approved. Assessments are reviewed annually.**

b.	An industry recognized certification relevant to the focus of the overall program content can be used as an additional assessment for the student and program relating to quality and rigor.

c.	A specific full-time or dean-designated faculty liaison with at least a minimal level of content expertise provides annual review and alignment of courses offered for credit in the CAP. Faculty liaisons are members of the program advisory committee.

d.	All CAPs will be included in the annual institutional program assessment activities.

e.	To maintain quality of courses, the higher education institution will designate an appropriate individual to work as liaison between the technology centers and the higher education institution. The liaison will have a presence at the technology centers, will attend advisory committee meetings, counsel students, work with adjunct faculty, and keep the lines of communication open.

f.	When the higher education institution does not employ full-time faculty in an Associate in Applied Science degree which is not taught at the institution, but is active at the technology center, the institution will thoroughly assess the need for it to offer such a program, especially if the program is available at another state system institution. If determined to better meet the needs of the institution's service area if offered through the institution, the institution will designate a full-time faculty member with a minimal level of content expertise to oversee the program. If no internal faculty expertise is available, the institution will engage the expertise of faculty at a higher education institution that employs full-time faculty with expertise in the content area to ensure program quality and the designated faculty liaison as referenced in 3.6.4.D.2.c, will oversee the program, utilizing the outside expertise on a regular basis.

g.	The higher education institution may look to established national accreditations and course specific certifications standards for quality control. For example, programs accredited by CAAHP, FAA or computer industry certifications through CompTIA, Microsoft, ORACLE

and CISCO, provide guidelines and competencies to ensure quality content.

3. Advisory Committees

a. Advisory committees will be representative of industry appropriate to the program, and ensure relevant curricula for job readiness.

b. Full-time institutional faculty will serve on advisory committees, in addition to the technology center faculty.

c. Recommendations for additions, changes, and/or deletions to credit offerings for CAPs which are only offered at the technology center will be based upon recommendations from the advisory committee, faculty liaisons, and accreditation or certification changes. These recommendations are reviewed and approved by the higher education institution's internal curriculum review process and then provided to the OSRHE for final approval.

4. Continuous Improvement

a. Each Cooperative Alliance program will be reviewed in accordance with the higher education institution's annual internal assessment program.

b. The results of the annual internal assessment will be used to ensure the continuous improvement of program/course content.

E. Criteria for admissions

1. College admission requirements approved by the State Regents (see State Regents' *Institutional Admission and Retention* policy) and Academic Procedures Handbook) for admission to the higher education institutions are listed in the institution's catalog and shall apply to recent high school graduates and adults.

2. High school juniors and seniors are admissible as concurrent students to an Oklahoma State System of Higher Education college or university that offers AAS degrees and college-level certificate programs and enroll in only technical courses at the technology center as approved by the State Regents.

3. High school students also must provide a letter of support from the high school counselor and written permission from a parent or legal guardian.

4. High school students concurrently enrolled in college courses, including all courses in the CAP, may continue concurrent enrollment in subsequent semesters if they earn a college cumulative GPA of 2.0 or above on a 4.0 scale (see State Regents' *Institutional Admission and Retention* policy).

F. Student Support Services

1. The higher education institutions and technology centers will provide integrated and comprehensive academic advising and support services to students enrolled

as part of the Cooperative Alliance to insure effectiveness without duplication or redundancy of effort.

2. Counselors and faculty at the higher education institution and the technology center may use the ACT PLAN score and ACT PLAN sub-scores (and other available test scores, such as the ACT, SAT, TABE, ACT Compass, Accuplacer), the student's previous academic record, recommendations from high school administrators/counselors/teachers, high school Plan of Study, and personal knowledge of the student to advise the student.

3. High school students must be advised of the State Regents' *Institutional Admission and Retention* policy (3.10.6.I.1) regarding the workload requirement of enrolling in a total number of credit hours combining college courses, including all courses in the CAP, and high school courses.

G. Financial

1. The primary cost of instruction for technical courses in the CAPs taught at the technology center by the center's faculty will be borne by the technology center. The primary cost of instruction for courses offered by the higher education institution in the CAPs, taught at the technology center or the institution by the institution's faculty, shall be borne by the higher education institution.

2. Cost to Students

   a. High school students, who are admitted to a higher education institution and enrolled in an approved CAP technical or occupational course offered at the technology center, shall not pay college tuition. However, there may be college fees charged that are applicable to all students.

   b. Adult students, who are admitted to a higher education institution and enrolled in an approved CAP technical or occupational course offered at the technology center, shall pay to the technology center only the program tuition established by the center. Adult students shall not pay college tuition. However, there may be college fees charged that are applicable to all students.

   c. College courses, such as general education, may be offered at the technology center by a higher education institution. The direct costs of instruction for these courses are borne by the higher education institution and the enrolled student will be charged the applicable college tuition and fees, payable to the institution.

H. Marketing and Outreach

1. The marketing goals of the Cooperative Alliance are to create an awareness and to promote the advantages to potential students and to the community, including high school teachers, faculty, staff, administrators, governmental agencies, and employers.

2. All publications and advertisements will identify which higher education institution is awarding the credit. Additionally, all publications and advertisements must adhere to the consumer protection requirements listed in the State Regents' _Institutional Accreditation_ policy (3.1.7) that prohibit higher education institutions or technology centers from making misleading, deceptive, and/or inaccurate statements in brochures, Web sites, catalogs, and/or other publications. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the nullification of the Cooperative Alliance and all CAPs under that Cooperative Alliance.

I. Institutional Reporting

An annual summary report on the performance of the Cooperative Alliance during the previous fiscal year is required, including information on enrollment, retention and graduation, assessment reports, financial arrangements, marketing endeavors, cost, and other notable accomplishments and challenges. This report shall be jointly prepared and submitted to the respective local governing boards.

3.6.5 Procedures

A public institution seeking approval for a cooperative agreement with a technology center shall initially have its governing board approve the cooperative agreement proposal prior to the institutional president formally submitting the proposal to the Chancellor for State Regents' consideration. After acknowledging receipt of the proposal, State Regents' staff will review and evaluate the cooperative agreement. Staff will submit the agreement proposal to the State Regents with a recommendation. The institution's president will be informed of the recommendation prior to its formal submission.

An Oklahoma State System institution seeking approval for a CAP with a technology center upon approval by the governing board shall have the president submit the CAP to the Chancellor for State Regents' consideration. The president will be informed of the recommendation prior to its formal submission.

The cooperative agreement proposal shall contain the following information:

A. Names of the participating technology center and the participating higher education institution.

B. Name of degree program toward which credit will be awarded.

C. Titles of modules, courses, or programs for which approval is sought.

D. Amount of academic credit to be awarded in each module, course, or program of instruction and the equivalent college course or courses.

E. Academic credentials of faculty responsible for classroom and laboratory experiences.

F. Clock hours of classroom and laboratory instruction for each credit hour to be awarded.

G.   ~~Financial arrangements between the college and technology center.~~

H.   ~~Student tuition and other charges.~~

I.   ~~Description of classroom and laboratory facilities to be utilized.~~

J.   ~~Arrangements for assessment of student outcomes in each module, course, and program.~~

K.   ~~Description of how student performance records will be maintained and how academic credit will be placed on the college transcript.~~

L.   ~~Colleges shall include the criteria and procedures for an annual evaluation of courses or laboratory experiences offered at a technology center to insure credit is at the collegiate level.~~

3.6.6 Reporting

The State Regents' staff will provide periodic reports to the State Regents summarizing the status of Cooperative ~~programs carried out by colleges in collaboration with technology centers~~ <u>Alliances and CAPs</u>. Such reports shall contain information about ~~the number and kinds of programs, the participating colleges and schools, the number of individuals enrolled, the student credit hours granted, degrees conferred, how academic rigor is achieved, faculty qualifications, employment information, and how institutions publicize the program~~ <u>effectiveness and efficiency of the Cooperative Alliances individually and as a model for offering academic programs. Reporting to the institutions and technology centers will be conducted during regularly scheduled workshops.</u>

~~3.6.7 Publications~~

~~All publications and advertisements regardless of medium will note which college is awarding the credit. Additionally, all publications and advertisements must adhere to the consumer protection requirements listed in the State Regents'~~ *~~Institutional Accreditation Policy~~* ~~that prohibit institutions (higher education or technology centers) from making misleading, deceptive, and/or inaccurate statements in brochures, Web sites, catalogs, and/or other publications. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the nullification of the cooperative agreement.~~

~~3.6.8 Workshops and Standing Committee~~

~~In collaboration with the State Director of Career and Technology Education, the Chancellor shall develop workshops to improve policy implementation, enhance cooperation, inspire innovation, and encourage the use of technology. The workshops shall have systemwide representation of technology centers and higher education institutions to facilitate communication of current policy and additional needs. In addition, a standing committee of the Council on Instruction for cooperative agreement policy will be established.~~

Oklahoma Student Advisory Board
610:1-3-1. Purpose
(a) The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education recognize the value of a formal structure for student input and a strengthened linkage to its most important constituency–students. Consequently, the State Regents have created a Student Advisory Board to assist the State Regents in enhancing their relationship with students. The creation of this board is consistent with provisions of House Bill No. 1801 of the 1988 Oklahoma Legislature [70 O.S., §3205.5 and 3205.6] which became effective November 1, 1988.
(b) The purpose of the Student Advisory Board is to communicate to the State Regents the views and interests of all Oklahoma college and university students on those issues that relate to the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of the State Regents. In representing students, the Student Advisory Board shall combine the opinions of students with good sound research to develop the best proposals and recommendations for ~~the~~ The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

610:1-3-2. Membership
(a) The Student Advisory Board consists of seven members elected by delegates to the Oklahoma Student Government Association (O.S.G.A) at its annual meeting.
(b) Board members will be selected as follows:
        (1) ~~wo~~ Two members will be elected at large to represent the comprehensive universities in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.
        (2) Two members will be elected at large to represent the regional and senior universities in ~~the~~ The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.
        (3) Two members will be elected at large to represent the ~~junior~~ community colleges in ~~the~~ The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.
        (4) One member will be elected at large to represent the accredited independent colleges and universities in the state.
(c) The term of office of the Student Advisory Board is one year. A member may serve a maximum of three terms.
(d) A member must be enrolled in at least 12 semester credit hours at an Oklahoma college or university and must have a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.8 on a 4.0 scale. A member must attend the type of institution that he/she is elected to represent.
(e) Members will take office each year at the State Regents' May meeting.
(f) A member who wishes to resign before his/her term expires must notify in writing the State Regents and the Oklahoma Student Government Association.
(g) Members are required to attend all regularly scheduled Student Advisory Board meetings. Any member absent from three (3) regularly scheduled meetings, excluding meetings in June and July, shall be removed from office.
~~(g)~~ (h) A member may be removed from office if he/she does not continue to meet the requirements as set forth in (d) of this Section during the term of office.
~~(h)~~ (i) The Student Advisory Board members shall have the powers to recommend to the Board of Directors of the O.S.G.A removal of a fellow Student Advisory Board member for violations of duties set forth in 610:1-3-3.
~~(i)~~ (j) The Board of Directors of the O.S.G.A. shall by majority vote have the power to remove a Student Advisory Board member congruent to any such recommendation made from the Student Advisory Board.
(k) A Student Advisory Board member who is removed from office shall not be considered a past member.

610:1-3-3. Duties
(a) So that members of the Student Advisory Board may adequately represent the views of other state students, each member will visit at least two other schools within the State System during his/her term of

office. These other schools may not be under the same governing board as the institution that the member is attending. During these visits, the member should speak with student government leaders on important issues of student concern.

(b) The Student Advisory Board will serve as an avenue for the student community to express its opinions and interests to the State Regents.

(c) The Student Advisory Board will elect a ~~chairman~~ chair at its first meeting following election to serve as its liaison to the State Regents' office.

(d) The ~~chairman~~ chair will work with the State Regents' office through a staff liaison designated by the Chancellor.

(e) The Student Advisory Board will elect a ~~reporter~~ vice-chair at its first meeting following election to take official minutes of the Student Advisory Board meetings, ~~and~~ maintain a file of Student Advisory Board actions, and preside over Student Advisory Board meetings in the absence of the chair.

(f) Members of the Student Advisory Board will be called upon by the Chancellor to provide informal counsel and advice and to make presentations at public hearings, legislative meetings, etc.

(g) The Student Advisory Board will hold eleven (11) regular meetings each term excluding extraordinary, unforeseen circumstances which prevent holding a regular meeting.

~~(g)~~ (h) The Student Advisory Board, by a majority vote of its members, may submit recommendations to the State Regents on matters relating to the duties and responsibilities of the State Regents.

~~(h)~~ (i) Members of the Student Advisory Board are encouraged to attend all regularly scheduled meetings of the State Regents. The board's elected representative has speaking privileges at such meetings in accordance with State Regents' operating policy.

(j) Members of the Student Advisory Board are encouraged to attend student leadership retreats sponsored by the State Regents. Costs related to Student Advisory Board members attending State Regents sponsored student leadership retreats may be paid from the operating budget of the State Regents.

~~(i)~~ (k) The representative at the State Regents' meetings will be responsible for recognizing other members of the Student Advisory Board for the purposes of:

     (1) Speaking on issues that concern students and relate to the State Regents' duties and responsibilities.

     (2) Presenting recommendations that relate to the State Regents' duties and responsibilities.

~~(j)~~ (l) The Student Advisory Board will work with the Chancellor and the designated staff liaison in developing an annual list of priorities and goals for rendering advice to the State Regents.

~~(k)~~ (m) The ~~chairman~~ chair or other designated spokesman of the Student Advisory Board shall have a place on the agenda of regular State Regents' meetings for the purpose of making a report.

~~(l)~~ (n) The Student Advisory Board will submit an annual written report of its activities to the State Regents and the Oklahoma Student Government Association and will also maintain regular contact with the Association to apprise it of significant developments.

~~(m)~~ (o) ~~he~~ The Student Advisory Board will follow the requirements of the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act [25 O.S., § 301 et seq.].

~~(n)~~ (p) Members of the Student Advisory Board shall be reimbursed for travel expenses incurred in the official performance of their duties as members of the Student Advisory Board in accordance with the State ~~travel~~ Travel Law [74 O.S., § 500.1 et seq.]. Reimbursements will be paid from the operating budget of the State Regents and must have the prior approval of the Chancellor's office and the Student Advisory Board ~~chairman~~ chair.

~~(o)~~ (q) Clerical and administrative assistance to the Student Advisory Board will be provided by the Chancellor's office and the designated staff liaison in the conduct of the Student Advisory Board business.

NO CHANGE
610:1-3-4. Guidelines for operation
(a) The Student Advisory Board will operate under the provisions of 70 O.S., §§ 3205.5 and 3205.6.

(b)   The Student Advisory Board will also operate under guidelines established by the Student Advisory Board and approved by the State Regents.

NO CHANGE
610:1-3-5. Meetings
(a)   A schedule of regular meetings of the Student Advisory Board will be filed annually with the Secretary of State and with the State Regents' office.
(b)   A record of the Student Advisory Board meetings shall be kept on official file in the office of the State Regents.
(c)   An individual designated by the Chancellor shall be invited to attend official meetings of the Student Advisory Board.

610:1-3-6. Amendments
The provisions in this Subchapter may be amended by a ~~majority~~ two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Student Advisory Board and approval of the State Regents.

TITLE 610. STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
CHAPTER 25. STUDENT FINANCIAL AID AND SCHOLARSHIPS
SUBCHAPTER 27. TEACHER SHORTAGE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM

610:25-27-1. Purpose

(a) The Teacher Shortage Employment Incentive Program (TSEIP) was created by Senate Bill 1393 during the 2000 legislative session.
(b) The bill, as amended by Section 5, Chapter 201, O.S.L. 2001, expressed the legislative intent that beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) establish a teacher shortage employment incentive program providing *for students enrolled in a major course of study in mathematics or science at the undergraduate level or graduate level who declare an intention to serve and who subsequently serve this state by teaching in a secondary level public school of this state for a minimum of five (5) years in the subject areas of mathematics or science.* [70 O.S. §698.3(A)].
(c) The implied purpose of this legislation is to provide an incentive for students who major in mathematics or science to serve as teachers of mathematics and science in Oklahoma public secondary schools for at least five (5) years.

610:25-27-2. Eligible student loans

(a) Eligible student loans under the TSEIP are those educational loans that were obtained by the participant to defray the cost of obtaining a baccalaureate degree or graduate degree in a science or mathematics teacher education program. The specific loans include:
    (1) Stafford Student Loans/Guaranteed Student Loans
    (2) Perkins/National Direct Student Loans
    (3) Loans made to students made pursuant to the federal Supplemental Loans for Students program including CLAS
    (4) Consolidation Loan Program loans
    (5) Privately funded educational loans issued to students through institutions of higher education
    (6) Graduate PLUS Loan
(b) Ineligible student loans include Parent loans for students (PLUS).

610:25-27-3. Application procedure

(a) OSRHE is authorized to distribute TSEIP Participation Agreement forms to postsecondary institutions in the State System of Higher Education that are eligible to participate in state and federal financial aid programs and have an approved program of professional teacher preparation.
(b) TSEIP Participation Agreement forms may be obtained from TSEIP coordinator in each post-secondary institution or from the OSRHE. The student is responsible for the completeness of the application.
(c) A Participation Agreement must be signed by a student while enrolled in a mathematics or science major course of study at the undergraduate or graduate level.
(d) The completed Participation Agreement must be submitted to the TSEIP coordinator no later than the date of their graduation.
(e) Post-secondary institutions TSEIP coordinators will submit copies of the TSEIP Participation Agreements to the State Regents' office within 10 days of their submission.

(f) The State Regents will notify each applicant of the receipt of his/her application in the program, the educational loan obligation, and the disbursement benefits under the TSEIP.

(g) If an eligible student failed to enroll in TSEIP before graduation, he/she can file for late enrollment into the program within one year from date of graduation. The late enrollment process is as follows:

(1) A candidate must obtain a TSEIP Participation Late Agreement Form from the college of education (COE) which recommended licensure in undergraduate or graduate education degree in secondary mathematics or science. The participant must provide explanation for the late enrollment.

(2) The form must be signed by the TSEIP coordinator of the respective COE.

(3) All documents must be submitted to the OSRHE for consideration as soon as the candidate learns about TSEIP but no later than **one year** from his/her graduation date.

(4) Additional documentation may be requested by the OSRHE before determining the eligibility of the late enrollees.

610:25-27-4. Coursework requirements for participant eligibility

In order to satisfy the coursework requirements of the program, the participant must:

(1) Declare an intention to teach in Oklahoma and graduate from an Oklahoma teacher education program.

(2) Maintain satisfactory progress in an academic program leading to an undergraduate or graduate degree with a major in a mathematics or science teacher education program.

(3) Complete coursework and training necessary to obtain a teaching certificate, which requires a baccalaureate degree or graduate degree and completion of an approved program of professional teacher preparation. The teacher preparation program shall include a student teaching requirement and authorize service for the secondary level.

(4) Participant must not have been certified to teach mathematics or science prior to signing the Participation Agreement.

610:25-27-5. Educational loan obligations for participant(s) with outstanding student loan debt

In order to satisfy the educational loan obligation of the program, the Participant with outstanding student loan debt must:

(1) Not rely on any TSEIP benefit disbursement to replace any scheduled student loan payment that is due and owing to any student loan holder.

(2) Provide written notification to OSRHE ~~within 10 days of any written notification~~ of change of status on student loans, including notice of delinquency/default and the sale, transfer or consolidation of student loans to another lender or servicer.

(3) Be free of any obligation to repay any state or federal educational grant and not be delinquent or in default on any state or federally insured educational loan. If, at any time, it is determined that a participant owes a grant refund or is in default on a loan, and has not made satisfactory payment arrangements, Participant ~~will~~ may be withdrawn from the TSEIP.

(4) Secure employment to teach in either a science or mathematics subject areas within sixteen months of graduating from a four-year institution in Oklahoma.

(5) Participant must not have been certified to teach mathematics or science prior to signing the Participation Agreement.

610:25-27-6. Participant eligibility for benefits of the TSEIP

In order to qualify to receive disbursement benefits under the TSEIP, the Participant must have:
(1) Obtained an initial teaching license and then a certificate and provided eligible full-time teaching service under a regular teaching contract at an Oklahoma public school:
>   (A) at the secondary level,
>   (B) for five (5) consecutive school years,
>   (C) in the mathematics or science subject areas.
(2) Completed the five years of teaching, as required, with not less than seventy-five percent (75%) of the teaching assignment meeting the criteria~~, as described in (A) of this subparagraph~~ set forth in paragraph (1) herein.
(3) Completed the first full year of eligible full-time teaching service, as described above, within twenty-five (25) months from the date of graduation from a four-year institution in Oklahoma.
(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of this subparagraph, Participants may apply to the employing school for a leave of absence when a serious illness, pregnancy or other natural cause prevents the Participant from continuing the coursework requirements or from providing consecutive full-time teaching service.
>   (A) Leaves of absence may not exceed more than one academic year and will not be included for the purpose of calculating the consecutive five (5) years of teaching service.
>   (B) Participants must present official school documentation to the OSRHE that a leave of absence ~~has been~~ was granted which meets the provisions of these rules. Official notification must be given within one year that the teacher has resumed the teaching duties or Participant ~~will~~ may be withdrawn from the program.
(5) A Reduction in Force will not eliminate a Participant from fulfilling the consecutive five-year obligation if the following provisions are met:
>   (A) Participant must provide to the OSRHE official documentation of the Reduction in Force.
>   (B) Participant must resume teaching mathematics or science at the secondary level at an Oklahoma public school within eighteen (18) months after the Reduction in Force.

610:25-27-7. Benefits to be disbursed under the program

(a) Under the provisions of the TSEIP, the OSRHE, *are authorized to make the employment incentive payments to persons who actually render a minimum of five (5) years of service as teachers in the public schools of this state if not less than seventy-five percent (75%) of the teaching assignment meets the criteria* [70 O.S. §698.3(B)], specified above.
(b) An Employment Compliance Form must be submitted to OSRHE upon completion of the 5th year of eligible teaching service. An authorized school official must complete the form.
(c) Depending on the June 30 student loan balance of any qualifying ~~student~~ Participant, as of the year that all program requirements are satisfied, and contingent upon the availability of funds, OSRHE will issue disbursements of program benefits directly to the ~~lenders/services of~~ qualifying ~~students~~ participants for the repayment of eligible student loans.
(d) *The total amount of employment incentive payments for any qualified person shall not exceed an amount equal to three times the average annual cost of undergraduate resident tuition and fees for full-time enrollment at institutions which offer teacher education programs within The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, as defined by the State Regents.* [70 O.S. § 698.3(B)]
(e) Eligible loans will be repaid by the Participant in the following priority:
>   (1) First, all loans guaranteed by OSRHE, ranked first by rate of interest (highest to lowest) and secondly, by loan disbursement date (oldest to newest).

(2) Second, all other eligible loans ranked first by rate of interest (highest to lowest) and secondly, by loan disbursement date (oldest to newest).

(f) Any amount of excess of the Participant's outstanding student loan balance, or the entire benefit amount for the participants with no outstanding student loan balance, shall be paid directly to any person otherwise eligible for employment incentive payments pursuant to this section.

(g) If OSRHE determines that any TSEIP disbursement was authorized based on misleading or incorrect information, the Participant must reimburse such payment to OSRHE.

610:25-27-8. Fiscal limitations of the program

(a) *If insufficient funds are available for employment incentive payments to qualified persons during any fiscal year; the Chancellor may make reductions in the payments made to those qualifying*. [70 O.S. §698.3(d)].

(b) Each year the benefit to all eligible teachers will be determined on, or as of June 30, for the group of teachers that achieved eligibility for TSEIP benefits (having satisfied all program requirements) by the end of that school year. If, in any given year, funds are not available for employment incentive payments at the maximum amount, due to a reduction in employment incentive payments as determined by the Chancellor, the amount to be disbursed to all eligible participants will be reduced uniformly. Upon distribution of that amount, the obligation of the program to those eligible teachers shall be satisfied. The foregoing is true even if no funds are available for disbursement.

610:25-27-9. Verification and notification requirements

(a) Verification requirements which must be satisfied prior to disbursement of program benefits include:

(1) An Employment Compliance Form submitted to OSRHE ~~by June 30th~~ after the fifth year of eligible teaching service. An authorized school official must complete the form.

(2) The Loan Balance Verification Form must be submitted to OSRHE ~~by June 30 of~~ in the fifth year. The lender(s) must certify that the loans are in good standing and provide a June 30 balance.

(b) Until all mutual obligations of the Participation Agreement are satisfied, Participant must respond to all communications and requests from OSRHE within the time indicated.

(c) Until all mutual obligations of the Participation Agreement are satisfied, Participant must provide written notification to OSRHE ~~within 10 days~~ of any change in legal name or address of any change in status, which affects TSEIP eligibility.

SUBCHAPTER 23. OKLAHOMA HIGHER LEARNING ACCESS PROGRAM

610:25-23-1. Purpose (no change)

610:25-23-2. Eligibility of participants

   Eligibility to participate in the program must be established by both the student and his/her parent(s), custodial parent(s), or guardian(s). Students enrolled in the eighth, ninth or tenth grade at a public or private school and whose parents' income meets the financial need criteria are eligible to apply to become a program participant. Students educated by other means who are between the ages of thirteen (13) and fifteen (15) are eligible to apply to become a program participant. Eligibility requirements to participate in the program include the following:

> (1)   The student must be a resident of the state of Oklahoma or be enrolled in a school district located in this state that serves students who reside in both this state and an adjacent state pursuant to a contract as authorized in Section 5-117.1 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes; and
>
> (2)   The student's parent(s), custodial parent(s), or guardian(s) must establish financial need.
>
>> (A)   To meet the program's financial need criteria, the income of the student's parent(s) from taxable and nontaxable sources shall not exceed $50,000 per year at the time the student applies for participation in the program. <u>A student who was adopted while in the permanent custody of the Department of Human Services, in the court-ordered custody of a licensed private nonprofit child-placing agency, or federally recognized Indian tribe, as defined by the federal Indian Child Welfare Act, shall not be subject to the determination of financial qualification at the time the student applies for participation in the program.</u> [70 O.S. § 2603]
>>
>> (B)   Parents of students making application to the program must use their most recent calendar (tax) year income to establish financial need eligibility. Parents of tenth-grade applicants may use the calendar (tax) year income that coincides with the spring semester of the tenth-grade if the parents' income is expected to be significantly less than the previous year.
>>
>> (C)   The OSRHE shall use guidelines consistent with regulations for federal Title IV student financial aid programs to determine a student's custodial parent(s).

610:25-23-3. Applications (no changes)

610:25-23-4. Program requirements (no changes)

610:25-23-5. Securing Program benefits

(a)   To qualify for the program benefits for the first semester or other academic unit of postsecondary enrollment, the participant must:

> (1)   Be a resident of this state both at the time of application to the program and at the time the student graduates from high school, or have been enrolled in a school district located in this state that serves students who reside in both this state and an adjacent state pursuant to a contract as authorized in Section 5-117.1 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes.
>
> (2)   Have graduated within the previous three years from a high school or other educational program if homeschooled. <u>The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education may award benefits for a student's first semester or other academic unit of postsecondary enrollment taken more than three (3) years after the student graduates from high school, or other educational</u>

program if homeschooled, if the student is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, the Reserve Corps of the Armed Forces of the United States, or the Oklahoma National Guard, and is ordered to active duty or active duty for special work or training and due to the duty commitment the student is unable to enroll prior to the end of the three-year period. Such three-year period shall be extended by the length of the term of duty.

(3)   Have a record of satisfactory compliance with the agreements and program requirements described in 610:25-23-4. Students failing to comply with the agreement and program requirements shall not be eligible for awards. Compliance shall be verified by the local contact person upon a form provided by the OSRHE. Final verification of compliance shall be determined by the OSRHE. A copy of the student's final high school transcript shall be submitted by the local contact person with the student's verification form.

(4)   Have satisfied admission standards as established by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for first-time-entering students for the appropriate type of institution (OSRHE Policy Statement on Admission to, Retention in and Transfer Among Colleges and Universities of the State System) or, if attending a private institution, satisfy the admission standards determined by the private institution; provided, that no student participating in the program shall be admitted into an institution of higher education by special admission standards.

(5)   Have secured admission to, and enrolled in, an institution which is a member of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, a postsecondary program offered pursuant to a duly approved cooperative agreement between a public technology center and an institution of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, or a private institution of higher learning located within this state and accredited pursuant to Section 4103 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes.

(6)   Be a United States citizen or lawfully present in the United States. This provision shall not apply to any student that was enrolled in the program prior to the end of 2006-07 school year.

(b)   For students receiving the program benefit award for the first time in ~~2009-10~~ 2010-11 and thereafter, at the time the student begins postsecondary education and prior to receiving any program benefit award, the income from taxable and nontaxable sources of the student's parent(s) shall not exceed $100,000 per year. The determination of financial qualification as set forth in this paragraph shall be based on the income of the student, not the income of the parent(s), if the student:

(1)   is determined to be independent of the student's parents for federal financial aid purposes,

(2)   was in the permanent custody of the Department of Human Services at the time the student enrolled it the program, or

(3)   was in the court-ordered custody of a federally-recognized Indian tribe, as defined by the federal Indian Child Welfare Act, at the time the student enrolled in the program.

(c)   A student who was adopted while in the permanent custody of the Department of Human Services, in the court-ordered custody of a licensed private nonprofit child-placing agency, or federally recognized Indian tribe, as defined by the federal Indian Child Welfare Act, shall be subject to the following financial qualification at the time the student begins postsecondary education and prior to receiving any program benefit award:

(1)   For a student adopted between birth and twelve (12) years of age, the income from taxable and nontaxable sources of the student's parent(s) may not exceed $150,000 per year.

(2)   For a student adopted between thirteen (13) and seventeen (17) years of age, the income from taxable and nontaxable sources of the student's parent(s) may not exceed $200,000 per year.

(3)   If the student is determined to be independent of the student's parents for federal financial aid purposes, the determination of financial qualification shall be based on the income of the student, not the income of the parent(s).

(d)   Award recipients shall apply for financial aid at the institution in which they enroll.

(~~d~~e)   All students eligible to receive the program benefit award for the first time in ~~2009-10~~ 2010-11 and thereafter must complete an application for federal financial aid (Free Application for Federal Student Aid or FAFSA) or its equivalent. Students not eligible to complete the FAFSA will be provided an alternate method by the OSRHE.

(ef)Any person incarcerated in a state, federal, or private correctional facility shall not be eligible to receive program benefits.

610:25-23-6. Retaining eligibility in postsecondary education
(a)   To retain eligibility for program benefits while pursuing a program of higher learning in an institution of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, the student shall maintain good academic standing and satisfactory academic progress according to standards of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Students attending an eligible private institution shall maintain good academic standing and satisfactory academic progress according to the standards of the institution in which they are enrolled. [70 O.S. § 2603; OSRHE Policy II-2-46.3]
(b)   Effective January 1, 2008, any student receiving the program benefit award that is expelled or suspended for more than one semester from an institution of higher education for conduct reasons shall permanently lose eligibility for program benefits.
(c)   For students receiving the program benefit award for the first time in ~~2009-10~~ 2010-11 and thereafter, the student must achieve a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale or its equivalent for courses taken ~~during~~ through the student's sophomore year and achieve a minimum grade point average of 2.5 on a 4.0 scale or its equivalent for courses taken during the student's junior year and thereafter.

610:25-23-7. Payment of awards; policies and limitations (no changes)

610:25-23-8. Administrative responsibilities (no changes)

TITLE 610. STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
CHAPTER 25. STUDENT FINANCIAL AID AND SCHOLARSHIPS
SUBCHAPTER 31. OKLAHOMA TUITION EQUALIZATION GRANT PROGRAM

610:25-31-1. Program purpose [no changes]

610:25-31-2. Definitions
The following words or terms, when used in this Subchapter, shall have the following meaning, unless the concept clearly indicates otherwise:
 *"**Private or Independent institution**", means an institution of higher learning that is not a public institution within the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. The institution must be a not-for-profit entity, domiciled within Oklahoma, accredited by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, and fully accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools <u>or a national accrediting body recognized by the United States Department of Education.</u>* [70 O.S., § 2632]

610:25-31-3. Eligibility Requirements [no changes]

610:25-31-4. Fiscal Policies
(a) The enrolling private or independent institution shall forward a completed student application, documentation of full-time enrollment status, and certification of resident status to the State Regents no later than October 15 for the fall semester and March 15 for the spring semester of each academic year.
(b) Subject to the availability of funds in the Oklahoma Tuition Equalization Grant Trust Fund, an applicant is eligible to receive an award up to $2,000 per academic year, or $1,000 per academic semester.
(c) Students receiving this grant may also receive additional state-supported financial aid, but not in excess of the student's cost of attendance as determined by the institution consistent with regulations for federal financial aid.
(d) Grants are not approved for summer or intersession enrollments.
(e) A student may be awarded a grant for a period of five (5) consecutive years of study in a baccalaureate program beginning ~~with~~ <u>when</u> the student~~'s~~ first ~~semester of postsecondary enrollment~~ <u>receives the grant</u>, or until the student is granted a baccalaureate degree, whichever occurs first. Exceptions to this requirement may be considered for hardship circumstances; however, no recipient may receive benefits beyond a cumulative period of five (5) years.
(f) If funds are not sufficient in the Oklahoma Tuition Equalization Grant Trust Fund to provide grants for all eligible applicants, the State Regents shall award grants on the basis of need. If necessary, the private or independent institution shall provide to the State Regents the Expect Family Contribution (EFC) calculated for each eligible student for federal financial aid purposes. Institutions may also be required to provide the amount of unmet financial need calculated for each student's financial aid package. Students who have previously received a grant and who continue to meet the requirements for eligibility shall have absolute priority over any student who is applying for a grant for the first time.

<u>610:25-31-5. Refunds and institutional liability</u>
<u>Institutions will report to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education any awards that the institution is aware are based on inaccurate application data. If funds have been disbursed to a student, and the student reported incorrect data unknown to the institution at the time of eligibility certification, the student is responsible for the return of any funds for which he/she is not eligible to receive. All refunds will be coordinated by the institution for return to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The institution will place holds as allowed on other financial aid disbursements, future</u>

enrollments, release of transcripts, etc. in an effort to collect refunds if necessary. In the event Oklahoma Tuition Equalization Grant funds are disbursed to a student as a result of erroneous action by the institution, the institution is financially liable for the return of the ineligible funds. An institution's failure to submit refunds for which the institution is liable within a reasonable period of time could result in suspension or termination of the institution's eligibility for participation in the Oklahoma Tuition Equalization Grant program. Thirty days is considered to be a reasonable period of time. The institution may appeal a finding of institutional liability.