Agenda

May 25, 2012
NOTE

This document contains recommendations and reports to the State Regents regarding items on the May 25, 2012 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 May 25, 2012.
AGENDA

Friday, May 25, 2012 – 9 a.m.
State Regents’ Conference Room
655 Research Parkway, Suite 200, Oklahoma City
Chairman Julie K. Carson, 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. Reports.


STUDENTS

6. Student Advisory Board. (SAB).
   a. Recognition of outgoing members and installation of incoming members of the Board. Page 1.

FISCAL

7. E&G Allocation.
   b. Approval of allocation of Brain Gain grant funds for Invitational Summit. Page 17.

9. **Contracts and Purchases.**
   a. Approval of purchases over $100,000 for FY2012. Page 25.
   b. Approval of purchases over $100,000 for FY2013. Page 27.

10. **Investments.** Approval of investment managers and allocation of funds for the endowment trust fund. Page 29.

**ACADEMIC**

11. **New Programs.**
   b. University of Central Oklahoma. Approval of request to offer the Master of Science in Nursing. Page 39.
   c. Rose State College. Approval of requests to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Aerospace Technology. Page 47.

12. **Program Deletions.** Approval of institutional requests for program deletions. Page 55.

13. **Academic Policy.**
   a. Posting of revisions to the *Functions of Public Institutions* policies. Page 57.
   b. Posting of revisions to the *Academic Program Approval* policies. Page 65.
   c. Posting of changes to the *University of Oklahoma’s Admissions Standards and Processes* policy. Page 79.
   d. Approval of policy clarification for the *In-State/Out-Of-State Status of Enrolled Students* policy regarding Oklahoma National Guard members. Page 85.
   e. Approval of the *Institutional Accreditation* policy. Page 89.
   f. Approval of the *Professional Programs* policy. Page 115.

14. **Scholars for Excellence in Child Care.**
   a. Approval of contract and contract modification between the Oklahoma Department of Human Services and the Oklahoma State Regents to continue the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program. Page 137.
   b. Allocation of funds to Oklahoma community colleges participating in the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care Program pursuant to the contract with the Department of Human Services. Page 151.
15. **Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).** Allocation of funds to Oklahoma community colleges participating in the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Program pursuant to the contracts with the Department of Human Services. Page 153.


17. **Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant.** Approval of the award schedule for 2012-2013 Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grants. Page 159.

**EXECUTIVE**

18. **Student Performance Reports.**

19. **Commendations.** Recognition of State Regents’ staff for service and recognitions on state and national projects. Page 173.

20. **Executive Session.** Page 175.
    Possible vote to go into executive session pursuant to Title 25, Oklahoma Statutes, Section 307(B)(4), for confidential communications between a public body and its attorneys concerning pending investigations, claims or actions.

Return to open session.

21. **Personnel.** Discussion and possible action regarding the position of Higher Education Chief Information Officer. Page 177.

**CONSENT DOCKET**

22. **Consent Docket.** Approval/ratification of the following routine requests which are consistent with State Regents' policies and procedures or previous actions.
   b. GEAR UP. Approval of a License Agreement between Aurora Learning Community Association and Oklahoma GEAR UP to provide a longitudinal data system to GEAR UP school districts. Page 187.
   c. ACT. Approval of the 2012-2013 ACT Agreement. Page 191.
d. Electronic Media.
   (1) University of Oklahoma. Approval of request to offer an existing degree program via electronic media. Page 197.
   (2) Oklahoma Panhandle State University. Approval of request to offer an existing degree program via electronic media. Page 199.


g. Agency Operations.
   (1) Ratification of purchases in excess of $25,000. Page 205.

23. Reports. Acceptance of reports listed.
   c. Annual Reports.


   
a. Academic Affairs and Social Justice and Student Services Committees.

b. Budget and Audit Committee.

c. Strategic Planning and Personnel Committee and Technology Committee.

d. Investment Committee.

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

26. **Announcement of Next Regular Meeting** — The next regular meetings are scheduled to be held on Wednesday, June 20, 2012 at 10:30 a.m. and Thursday, June 21 at 9 a.m. at the State Regents’ Office in Oklahoma City.

27. **Adjournment.**
AGENDA ITEM #6-a:

Student Advisory Board.

SUBJECT: Recognition of the outgoing Student Advisory Board and installation of incoming members of the Student Advisory Board.
AGENDA ITEM #6-b:

Student Advisory Board.

SUBJECT: 2012 Annual Report of the Student Advisory Board.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

In 1988, the Oklahoma Legislature passed House Bill 1801, creating the Student Advisory Board (SAB). The purpose of the SAB is to communicate to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) the views and interests of all Oklahoma college and university students on issues that relate to the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of the State Regents. The SAB represents students by researching issues and developing proposals and recommendations through student perspectives for the OSRHE. Seven members are elected annually by delegates to the Oklahoma Student Government Association. Members represent the public tier and independent colleges, and they serve a one-year term (May through April).

The Student Advisory Board policy requires an annual written report of activities to the State Regents.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ Student Advisory Board policy.

ANALYSIS:

The recommendations are listed below. A copy of the report is attached.

- Encourage institutions of higher education to provide a strong academic advisement program to help guide students toward a successful career path. Institutions should be encouraged to evaluate the interest of their students to ensure good placement within an appropriate major.

- Give attention to the review of tenured professors. As Oklahoma looks to continue its pursuit of excellence in higher education, we must be sure that those entrusted with the responsibility of educating Oklahoma’s best and brightest, are the best and brightest.

- Support continued commitment to veteran affairs. These individuals deserve our assistance because of the sacrifices they have made on behalf of our country. Most veterans exhibit talents that are coveted in the workplace, such as dedication, passion, and responsibility. For these reasons the SAB believes that every possible step should be taken in order to insure veterans receive the services they need to complete their education.
• Support an emphasis on improvement in faculty teaching methods with the academic leadership in each institution in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education to ensure the optimal opportunity for learning by students.

• Support the Common Core State Standards Initiative and assist and promote the implementation of the Standards into our state’s common education system.

• Remain exempt from the authority of the State Chief Information Officer in order to protect institutions of higher education from costly changes and to be able to retain the authority on all matters of information technology. Establishing a CIO within the OSRHE is the most likely measure to ensure this exemption.

• Oppose the carrying of handguns or similar weapons on college campuses, whether concealed or not, with the exception of campus police and security officers.

Attachment
ANNUAL REPORT

of the

Student Advisory Board

to the

Oklahoma State Regents
for Higher Education

May 25, 2012
ANNUAL REPORT

Purpose. The purpose of the SAB is to communicate to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) the views and interests of all Oklahoma college and university students on issues that relate to the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of the State Regents. The SAB represents students by researching issues and developing proposals and recommendations through student perspectives for the OSRHE.

Creation. The creation of this board is consistent with provisions of House Bill 1801 of the 1988 session of the Oklahoma Legislature. Seven members are elected annually by delegates to the Oklahoma Student Government Association. Members represent public tier and independent colleges, and they serve a one-year term (May through April).

MEMBERS

Steve Sichterman, Chair, University of Oklahoma

Thomas Schneider, Vice Chair, Oklahoma State University

Jaeton Cary, Rose State College

Sarah Cook, Oklahoma City University

Lynnette Gomez, Seminole State College

John Saluke, Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Molly Tracy, University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma (resigned, February, 2012)
**Student Advisory Board**

*Recommendations and Counsel to the State Regents*

**Improved Teaching Methods for Faculty**

**Recommendation**

To ensure the optimal opportunity for learning by students, the SAB encourages the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) to support an emphasis on improvement in faculty teaching methods with the academic leadership in each institution in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

**Background / Analysis**

Certain instructional methods are more effective than others in imparting knowledge and skills. Faculty with different experiences and longevity in service may continue to use instructional methods first or best learned, regardless of the effectiveness of or results for newer methods. Improvement in faculty instructional methods should include, but not be limited to:

- Assurance that the course evaluation by the students was administered appropriately by the course instructor;
- Assurance that the institutional administration is transmitting the results of the course evaluation to the faculty member and is following through with the faculty member on the feedback, and making use of the results in tenure review and annual evaluations;
- Support for training in instructional technology and methods; and
- Assurance that the institution has a student complaint process with adequate procedures to make students aware of this prerogative.

**Approval:** Cary, Cook, Gomez, Saluke, Sichterman

**Absent:** Schneider
Academic Advising

Recommendation

The OSRHE should encourage all institutions to provide a strong academic advising program to help guide students towards a successful career path. Institutions should be encouraged to evaluate the interest of their students to ensure good placement within an appropriate major.

Background / Analysis

Academic advising is a crucial part of a student’s college career. Incoming freshmen should be aware of what their chosen career path has in store, both in the classroom and after graduation. For one reason or another, between 50 - 80% of college students change their majors. Over half of those that change do so after the second semester of their freshman year. Furthermore, the average student changes their major three times over their college career.

The ratio of students to counselors on the national level is about 450:1. Therefore, burden of attention cannot solely fall upon preparation within the high school system. Higher education institutions must be prepared to guide students according to their interests. Many online programs, quizzes, and surveys have been developed to aid in this process. Sometimes all it takes is an advisor to stop and connect with a student on a more personal level.

Accurately advising students benefits the student and the institution. A shorter college career typically leads to a lower financial burden upon the student. Less financial burden on the student leads to less financial aid they must ask from the state and financial institutions. Students also become frustrated when college credits do not transfer when changing majors. This requires more funding to retake material already learned.

Shorter college degrees that appear practical and attainable strongly influence the retention of the institution. A caring attitude of college personnel also builds a strong foundation of amity with alumni. This greatly influences the amount of money the institutions request from state funding.

Approval:  Cary, Cook, Gomez, Saluke, Sichterman
Absent:  Schneider
**Chief Information Officer / OneNet**

**Recommendation**

The OSRHE should do everything possible to remain exempt from the authority of the State Chief Information Officer (CIO) in order to protect institutions of higher education from costly changes and to be able to retain the authority on all matters of information technology. Establishing a CIO within the OSRHE is the most likely measure to ensure this exemption.

**Background / Analysis**

In 2011, HB1304 exempted the OSRHE, OneNet and all higher education institutions from the authority of the CIO. This has allowed many institutions to remain members of the National Lambda Rail and the OneNet network. Cost savings of $40 million has been achieved by the OSRHE in information technology expenses that would likely not have been possible under the State CIO.

We encourage the State Regents to continue the Higher Education CIO Initiative proposed by Governor Fallin in January 2012, establishing a Higher Education CIO under the OSRHE by July 1, 2012.

**Approval:** Cary, Cook, Gomez, Saluke, Sichterman  
**Absent:** Schneider
Common Core State Standards Initiative

Recommendation

The OSRHE should actively support the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSS). Moreover, the State Regents should assist and promote the implementation of the CCSS into our state’s common education system.

Background / Analysis

The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers collaborated to create the Common Core State Standards Initiative in order to “provide a clear and consistent framework to prepare our children for college and the work force”. Among several reasons to support these standards is that the CCSS will better equip Oklahoma children for higher education and ultimately graduation. With declining retention rates, solid instruction in common education could positively affect students’ skills and ability enough to slow down and possibly reverse our decline.

Another important reason to support the CCSS is development of “appropriate benchmarks for all students, regardless of where they live”. While this ultimately closes the gap between state systems, it also seems to imply a secondary effect, one that should highly resonate in Oklahoma. The educational advantage between urban, rural, and suburban schools has been discussed to a great extent. The common denominator has been money; however, the CCSS places the power of education into the standards and practices rather than resources.

Finally, this initiative helps prepare today’s students to compete in a global society based upon an expanding knowledge-based, information economy. While the demand for physical labor may exist, students must have a wider breadth of knowledge in multiple disciplines now more than ever before. Career-ready curriculum standards are now the same as college-ready curriculum standards because of advanced technology and the proliferation of research and development. A recent high school graduate entering the work force needs more skills and knowledge than ten or twenty years ago. Therefore, it becomes paramount in our educational goals to instruct students using the best standards and practices.

Approval: Cary, Cook, Gomez, Saluke, Sichterman

Absent: Schneider
Concealed Weapons on Campus

Recommendation

The OSRHE should actively oppose the carrying of handguns or similar weapons on college campuses, whether concealed or not, with the exception of campus police and security officers.

Background / Analysis

State statutes specifically recognize the need to restrict the carrying of handguns in a number of public places, including the State Capitol building, as the potential risks for unintentional misuse of weapons does not outweigh the benefits. The introduction of handguns and similar weapons on college campuses continues to be a risk within the legislature, year after year, and will continue to be a risk into the future. It is imperative that the OSRHE continue to actively oppose any measures granting such privileges.

Approval:  Cook, Gomez, Saluke, Sichterman
Nay: Cary
Absent: Schneider
Review of Tenure

Recommendation

For the purpose of making higher education the best it can be in Oklahoma, the SAB would like to recommend attention be given to the review of tenured professors. As Oklahoma looks to continue its pursuit of excellence in higher education, we must be sure that those entrusted with the responsibility of educating Oklahoma’s best and brightest, are the best and brightest.

Background / Analysis

Few positions are as influential to our future as the professors in our colleges and universities. These are the individuals that have the eyes and ears of the next generation for typically four years. As Oklahoma’s economy expands and companies come to be part of the exciting growth, let us be sure Oklahoma professors are preparing students with the tools they need to part of this growth.

Strong tenure reviews can also be effective in encouraging professors to be at the top of their occupation. The reviews provide incentive for the professors in our state to continually pursue educational excellence. These reviews will help insure that future generations are provided with instructors who are at the top of their field.

It is an exciting time to be in Oklahoma. There are many opportunities for well-educated individuals to succeed. As Oklahoma sets its goals to grow graduation rates and increase the number of Oklahomans in college, the Student Advisory Board believes that having the absolute best professors leading in the classroom is essential to accomplishing that mission.

Approval: Cary, Cook, Gomez, Saluke, Sichterman
Absent: Schneider
Support for Veteran Affairs and Benefits

Recommendation

The 2011-2012 SAB would like to voice its support for continued commitment to veteran affairs. These individuals deserve our assistance because of the sacrifices they have made on behalf of our country. Most veterans exhibit talents that are coveted in the workplace, such as dedication, passion, and responsibility. For these reasons, the SAB believes that every possible step should be taken in order to insure veterans receive the services they need to complete their education.

Background / Analysis

Veterans have many intangibles to offer potential employers. However, in today’s society, higher education is essential to being successful. Many veterans want to pursue a degree but they need advisement in order to know how to proceed.

While special services are needed to get veterans into school, special services are also needed to help veterans work through obstacles to stay in school and complete their education. Such special services include, but are not limited to:

- Counseling services;
- Workshops;
- Career planning; and
- Financial aid services.

It is important for Oklahoma to show its support for veterans and their pursuit of higher education.

Approval: Cary, Cook, Gomez, Saluke, Sichterman
Absent: Schneider
2011-2012 Student Advisory Board Activities

Monthly Meetings. Beginning in May 2011, members of the Board met monthly, with the exception of June, July, and November, to receive orientation, discuss issues, campus visits, and work plans, and prepare and vote on recommendations.

State Regents Tuition Hearing. Chair Steve Sichterman attended and participated in the OSRHE Tuition Hearing in Oklahoma City on April 19, 2012.

Higher Education Day at the State Capitol. Three members of the Board traveled to the State Capitol on February 21, 2012, to work with the state higher education community in representing the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education’s concerns to state legislators and Governor Fallin.

Student Leadership Retreat. Six members of the Board worked in conjunction with the State Regents Council on Student Affairs and the Oklahoma Student Government Association to host and attend the Eleventh Annual Oklahoma Student Leadership Retreat that took place October 6 - 7, 2011 in Midwest City. As Chair of the Board, Steve Sichterman served on the Planning Committee for the 2012 Student Leadership Retreat.

Oklahoma Student Government Association Conferences. Members of the Board attended the annual OSGA Fall Congress at the State Capitol in Oklahoma City, and Spring Congress at Oklahoma City University.

Campus Visits. In addition to representing the students at the institutions in their tier, members of the Student Advisory Board networked with student leaders from other campuses, and visited the following campuses to discuss student concerns on-site:

- Langston University
- Murray State College
- Northeastern State University
- Oklahoma City Community College
- Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Sayre
- Western Oklahoma State College
AGENDA ITEM #7-a:

E&G Allocation.
AGENDA ITEM #7-b:

E&G Allocation.

SUBJECT: Approval of allocation of Brain Gain grant funds to Oklahoma City Community College for the Invitational Summit on Remedial Reform.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the allocation of $2,409.15 to Oklahoma City Community College for the 2012 Invitational Summit on Remedial Reform.

BACKGROUND:

On April 12, 2012, consistent with the Complete College America and Compete to Complete national initiatives, the State Regents facilitated a systemwide Invitational Summit on Remedial Reform contributing to national and state level efforts to address the educational pipeline challenges. The summit consisted of concurrent sessions in which public colleges and universities engaged in reviews of existing remedial education programs in effort to identify remedial reform best practices that promotes more timely completion and improvements to learning outcomes.

POLICY ISSUES:

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

ANALYSIS:

The Invitational Summit on Remedial Reform was held at Oklahoma City Community College on April 12, 2012 with approximately 140 in attendance. Each institution in the State System was invited to bring teams of 5 people from their campus to benefit from presentations by national experts, discussions with other institutions on best practices and concurrent session presentations. This allocation is to fund institutional expenses associated with the conference.

Attachment
INVITATIONAL SUMMIT ON REMEDIAL REFORM
April 12, 2012

Agenda

8:00 to 8:30 a.m.  Registration

8:30 to 9:00 a.m.  Welcome - President Paul Sechrist
Opening Remarks - Chancellor Glen D. Johnson

9:00 to 10:00 a.m.  Opening Session - Current Issues, Research, and Practices
Dr. Bruce Vandal, Vice President of Development and Outreach,
Education Commission of the States

10:15 to 11:15 a.m.  Concurrent Sessions 1

One-on-One Tutoring and Supplemental Instruction: Improving the Success of Students Enrolled in Developmental Mathematics and English Courses
Dr. John McArthur and Dr. Karla Oty - Cameron University

College Prep Math: Paving the Way for Student Success
Dr. Tamara Carter - Oklahoma City Community College

ALEKS: Individualizing Instruction for Assessment and Learning
Dr. Jeremy Penn - Oklahoma State University

11:30 to 12:30 p.m.  Concurrent Sessions 2

Assisting Students in Fulfilling the Promise of Their Potential: Community Learning in Critical Knowledge (CLICK)
Ms. Chris Knox, Ms. Dianne Krob, and Ms. Lori Morrow – Rose State College

Assessing Student’s Basic Skills and Improving Student Success in College Level Mathematics
Ms. Dena Walker and Dr. Sheila Brintnall - Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Apps and Academics: Utilizing iPads for Increased Learning Opportunities
Mr. Luke Foster - Northeastern State University

12:30 to 2:00 p.m.  Lunch Session - Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST)
Ms. Louisa Erickson
Program Administrator, Workforce Education
Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

2:15 to 3:30 p.m.  Concurrent Sessions 3
Enhancing Student Learning Experiences: Is the iPad the Silver Bullet?
Ms. Kendra Haggard and Ms. Shari Clevenger - Northeastern State University

Rigorous Writing in Basic Writing
Dr. Brenda Tuberville - Rogers State University

Eliminating Learning Barriers: Actively Engaging Students and Promoting Peer-to-Peer Interaction
Ms. Anne A. Fischer - Tulsa Community College
AGENDA ITEM #8:

Tuition and Fee Guidelines.

SUBJECT: Approval of FY13 Tuition and Fee Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve FY13 Tuition and Fee Approval Guidelines for dissemination to state system presidents and governing boards.

BACKGROUND:

State Regents annually approve budget principles and guidelines for institutions to use in preparing their annual budgets. State Regents approved a similar document related to the preparation of each institution’s tuition and fee request in accordance with 70 O. S. 2004 Supp., Section 3218.14, which conferred additional responsibility on institutional leadership and governing boards. The FY13 Tuition and Fee Approval Guidelines serve to define those responsibilities and to outline Regents’ expectations concerning the process.

POLICY ISSUES:

The proposed FY13 Tuition and Fee Guidelines are consistent with Regents’ responsibilities and the State Regents’ tuition policy.

ANALYSIS:

The guidelines address six issues related to tuition and fees: 1) the responsibilities of various parties in the establishment of tuition and fees; 2) the State Regents’ publication of peer information for planning purposes; 3) institutional compliance with legislative peer limits, 4) State Regents’ communication of pertinent information to students; 5) documentation required of institutions; and 6) use of revenue from dedicated fees. These core issues which the guidelines address remain unchanged from the previous four years with the exception that an additional requirement was added in FY06 requiring documentation of institutions and governing boards to justify tuition and mandatory fee increases in excess of seven percent (7%) at any institution. Institutional requests for new fees and for increases to existing fees are scrutinized closely to ensure the revenue from these dedicated fees are required to meet specific costs and are not being requested, in essence, to obscure a tuition increase. These guidelines provide guidance in an effort to ensure access to higher education and to minimize the financial burden on students and their families.

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the following FY13 Tuition and Fee Approval Guidelines for dissemination to state system presidents and governing boards.
Responsibility to Establish Tuition and Fees. The Oklahoma Constitution, statutes, and State Regents for Higher Education policy confer responsibility for the establishment of tuition and fees at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education at four levels: 1) Presidents of institutions analyze the need for resources to ensure the quality and availability of higher education offerings, balanced by students’ needs and ability to pay, and propose tuition and fees to their respective governing board; 2) Governing boards review presidents’ proposals and make a recommendation to the State Regents for Higher Education; 3) the State Regents for Higher Education review governing boards’ recommendations, approve tuition and fees within legislatively prescribed statutory limits, and report to the Legislature annually their actions; and 4) the Legislature reviews State Regents for Higher Education actions.

Publication of Peer Information for Planning Purposes. Pursuant to 70 O. S. 2004 Supp., Section 3218.8, tuition and mandatory fees at public higher education institutions in Oklahoma will be compared to tuition and mandatory fees at peer (i.e., like-type) institutions in other states. State Regents will annually monitor and publish tuition and mandatory fees at peer institutions. Published in a timely fashion, the information will show the level of tuition and mandatory fees at each institution in Oklahoma compared to the legislative peer limit and the maximum possible dollar and percentage increase for the next academic year.

Compliance with Legislative Peer Limits. The Oklahoma Constitution authorizes the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to establish tuition and mandatory fees within limits prescribed by the Legislature. At the research institutions, resident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees must be at levels less than the average resident tuition and mandatory fee rates charged at public institutions in the Big Twelve Conference. At the regional and community colleges, resident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fee rates must be at levels less than the average tuition and mandatory fee rates charged at like-type institutions in surrounding and other states. Nonresident undergraduate tuition and mandatory fee rates must be at levels less than 105 percent of the average nonresident tuition and mandatory fee rates charged at their respective peer institutions. For graduate and professional programs, resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fee rates shall remain less than the average tuition and mandatory fee rates at like-type graduate and professional programs.

Establishment of Guaranteed Tuition Rates. House Bill 2103 passed during the 2007 legislative session authorized the State Regents to establish a guaranteed tuition rate program for first-time, full-time resident students beginning with the FY2008-09 academic year. Students will have the option to participate in the guaranteed tuition rate or the non-guaranteed tuition rate at the time of first enrollment and will be guaranteed this rate for four years, or the normal time-to-completion of the program as determined by the institution. Each institution shall provide students with the annual non-guaranteed tuition rate charged and the percentage increase that it would have to increase to equal or exceed the guaranteed tuition rate for the succeeding four years. The guaranteed rate shall not exceed 115 percent of the non-guaranteed tuition rate charged to students at the same institution.

Communication Between State Regents and Students. Staff of the State Regents for Higher Education will assist in the preparation and dissemination of guidelines for students and student groups to inform themselves about the process and issues and to provide input both at the campus level and to the State Regents for Higher Education. The State Regents for Higher Education will hold a public hearing on proposed changes in tuition and fees at least 20 days prior to the date the change becomes effective. For changes effective for the 2012 fall semester, the hearing took place at the State Regents for Higher
Education office in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma on Thursday, April 19, 2012. The State Regents for Higher Education will maintain and publish a record of testimony by students and other participants who appeared at this public hearing.

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

1) Communication of the tuition and mandatory fee request to student government organizations, other student groups, and students at large;
2) Efforts to increase need-based financial aid proportionately to tuition and fee increases;
3) Analysis of the expected effect of tuition and mandatory fee increases on the ability of students to meet the cost of attendance;
4) Analysis of the expected effect of tuition and mandatory fee increases on enrollment;
5) Detailed justification for all tuition and mandatory fee increases in excess of seven percent (7%); and
6) Dedication to cost-effectiveness in institutional operations.

**Use of Revenue from Dedicated Fees.** Institutions that charge students academic services fees, i.e. special fees for library materials and services, classroom and laboratory materials, technology, etc., must ensure that 1) the revenues are spent for the approved purpose of the fee and 2) that these fees must not exceed the cost of providing the service. Likewise, to the extent possible, traditional E&G support for the above and similar purposes should not be diminished as a result of student fee revenue. Requests for new fees or increases to existing fees will be thoroughly reviewed to ensure 1) that the fees are required to meet specific costs and 2) that they are not requested to obscure, in essence, a tuition increase. According to existing policy, institutions submit requests related to academic services fees to the State Regents for Higher Education by February 1 of the year prior to the effective date of the fee request.
AGENDA ITEM #9-a:

Contracts and Purchases.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve purchases for amounts that are in excess of $100,000.

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.

ANALYSIS:

The items below are in excess of $100,000 and require State Regents’ approval prior to issuing a purchase order.

Purchases Over $100,000

OneNet

1) In January, the State Regents’ approved the expenditure of $8,667,100.00 in federal grant funds provided to build the optical networking components of the Oklahoma Community Anchor Network (OCAN). In April, the State Regents’ approved an additional $481,260 which was allocated by the Office of State Finance to these activities bringing the total to 9,158,360. Since the April 19th Regents Meeting the Office of State Finance has allocated an additional $1,600,000. OneNet, as one of the partners within OCAN, seeks approval to expend these additional dollars on components required to route data over the optical network. The total amount provided to OneNet is $10,758,360.
AGENDA ITEM #9-b:

Contracts and Purchases.

SUBJECT: Approval of FY-2013 Purchases in excess of $100,000.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve FY-2013 purchases for amounts that are in excess of $100,000 that need to be effective July 1, 2012.

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.

ANALYSIS:

A number of agency purchases for equipment maintenance, network circuits, lease of office space, memberships, professional services, postage etc. must be in place on July 1st of each year due to vendor requirements for renewal or payments that must be made in July. Many of these purchases will be in excess of $100,000 and require State Regents’ approval prior to issuing a purchase order.

Purchases Over $100,000

Core

1) Presbyterian Health Foundation in the amount of $771,564.00. The Oklahoma State Regents will exercise their option to renew the lease for year two (2) for the office space occupied by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education located at 655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City. (Funded from 210-Core).

2) Ellucian Company LP in the amount of $106,987.00. For maintenance to provide telephone support and upgrades to our Banner software. Banner is the agency accounting and Human Resources system. (Funded from 210-Core).

3) University of Missouri in the amount of $222,460.00. To provide membership and Internet II connectivity for University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (Funded from 210-Core).
4) Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System in the amount of $419,715.00. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education will exercise their option to renew the lease on office space occupied by the Oklahoma College Assistance Program located at 421 NW 13th Street, Oklahoma City. (Funded from 701-OCAP).

5) University of Oklahoma for $170,000.00 in the amount 24/7 Help Desk services. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

6) Qwest Communications in the amount $150,000.00 for Commodity Internet. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

7) Chickasaw Telecom in the amount of $240,000.00 Maintenance of Cisco equipment. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

8) Oracle in the amount of $170,000.00 for maintenance of Oracle equipment. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

9) AT&T in the amount of $7,528,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuits. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

10) Cox Communications in the amount of $1,443,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

11) Windstream Communications in the amount of $198,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

12) Chickasaw Holding in the amount of $250,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

13) Indian Nations Fiber Optic in the amount of $610,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

14) Intelleq Communications in the amount of $220,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

15) MBO Corporation in the amount of $765,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

16) Oklahoma Western Telephone In the amount off $111,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

17) Pioneer Telephone in the amount of $183,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

18) Panhandle Telephone Communications in the amount of $215,000.00 for customer and network infrastructure circuit cost. (Funded from 718-OneNet).
AGENDA ITEM #10:

Investments.

SUBJECT: Approval of investment manager.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve a new investment manager and allocation of funds for the endowment trust fund.

BACKGROUND:

Mercer LLC (formerly known as Hammond Associates,) investment consultants for the fund, have suggested new manager recommendations for consideration. This manager will continue to diversify our fund portfolio and meet the objectives of realignment to the policy asset class targets.

POLICY ISSUES: This action is consistent with Regents’ asset allocation policy.

ANALYSIS:

EnCap Flatrock Midstream II ($5,000,000) EnCap Flatrock Midstream Fund II is a private equity firm which has a long history advising oil & gas companies. The fund will focus on partnering with proven management teams to form new companies in the midstream sector of the North American oil & gas drilling industry. This fund will primarily provide growth equity capital to fund new development projects and/or acquisition and exploitation/expansion of existing midstream companies. The fund has a growth strategy with the goal of appreciation and return on investment as its return component. It is recommended that this commitment of $5,000,000 be funded from cash.

Oaktree Opportunities IX ($2,000,000 additional) Oaktree focuses predominantly on non-control distressed investing in global markets. The Fund’s portfolio management team has a long history of creating value by identifying distressed credits and navigating restructuring processes successfully. Oaktree has tended to build portfolios that are well diversified by underlying portfolio company and industry. It is recommended that a commitment of $2 million in the endowment portfolio be committed to this manager from cash for a total of $4 million when combined with action taken at the January 28, 2012, meeting.
AGENDA ITEM #11-a:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: Northwestern Oklahoma State University. Approval of request to offer the Master of Arts in American Studies.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve Northwestern Oklahoma State University’s request to offer the Master of Arts in American Studies 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.

- **Master of Arts in American Studies.** Continuation beyond Fall 2016 will depend upon:
  - Majors enrolled: a minimum of 7 students in Fall 2015; and
  - Graduates: a minimum of 3 students in 2015-2016.

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU)’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.
- 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, NWOSU has taken the following program actions in response to APRA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees and/or certificate programs deleted</th>
<th>Degrees and/or certificate programs added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Review**
NWOSU offers 41 degree and/or certificate programs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificates</th>
<th>Associate in Arts or Sciences Degrees</th>
<th>Associate in Applied Science Degrees</th>
<th>Baccalaureate Degrees</th>
<th>Master’s Degrees</th>
<th>Doctoral Degrees</th>
<th>First Professional Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 NWOSU’s program review schedule as appropriate. Thus, if a professional program received a ten-year accreditation, it would not be reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents’ policy.

**Program Development Process**
NWOSU’s faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials. NWOSU’s governing board approved delivery of the Master of Arts in American Studies at the January 20, 2012 meeting. NWOSU requests authorization to offer this degree, as outlined below.

**POLICY ISSUES:**
This action is consistent with the State Regents’ *Academic Program Approval* policy.

**ANALYSIS:**

*Master of Arts in American Studies*

**Program purpose.** The purpose of the proposed program is to prepare students with integrated and critical knowledge of American culture and society through interdisciplinary studies in agriculture, English, history, political science, sociology, mass communication, and education.

**Program rationale and background.** NWOSU is the only university in Northwestern Oklahoma, however, with only two graduate programs, the current offerings at NWOSU fall short of meeting the diverse needs of its learners. The American Studies discipline is approximately 80 years old and provides graduates with a holistic understanding of the historical, social, and cultural underpinnings of American culture. The curriculum will attract students from a wide variety of undergraduate majors such as English, history, sociology, and political science.

**Employment opportunities.** The greatest value of an American Studies degree is the exposure to critical thinking in diverse academic disciplines that will prepare graduates for a diverse number of occupational areas. Graduates of this proposed program may utilize their knowledge and skills in careers in museums, government, law, communication, or higher education. Additionally, many business organizations have
positions requiring American Studies backgrounds for public relations, art management, and tourism. Public sector jobs, government agencies, and publicly-supported institutions often seek American Studies graduates to explain an agency’s or institution’s function, projects, activities, or history to the public. According to the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission employment in careers utilizing American Studies graduates is expected to increase as much as 13 percent from 2008 to 2018. NWOSU is confident graduates of this program will find employment within the discipline.

**Student demand.** The new degree program is expected to meet the enrollment and graduate standards by the established deadline prior to final approval by the State Regents as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Enrollment of majors in the program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Graduates from the program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Existing Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern State University</td>
<td>Master of Arts in American Studies (112)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A system wide letter of intent was communicated by email on February 10, 2012. Northeastern State University did not notify the State Regents’ office of a protest to the proposed program. Due to the distance between institutions, anticipated workforce opportunities, and increasing student demand, approval will not constitute unnecessary duplication.

**Curriculum.** The proposed degree program will consist of 35 total credit hours as shown in the following table. One new course will be added (Attachment A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Core</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Electives</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Financing.** The proposed degree program will be offered on a self-supporting basis and the current tuition and fee structure is sufficient to adequately fund the program. No additional funding is requested from the State Regents to support the program.
Program resource requirements. Program resource requirements for the Master of Arts in American Studies are shown in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Program</th>
<th>A. Funding Sources</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Sources</td>
<td>Total Resources Available from Federal Sources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State Sources</td>
<td>Total Resources Available from Other Non-State Sources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Resources</td>
<td>Existing State Resources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Resources Available through Internal Allocation and Reallocation</td>
<td>State Resources Available through Internal Allocation and Reallocation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition</td>
<td>Student Tuition</td>
<td>$15,660</td>
<td>$18,270</td>
<td>$18,270</td>
<td>$20,880</td>
<td>$20,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative/Explanation and Calculations: Tuition estimates are based on 2011 rates. Graduate students currently pay $174 per credit hour. Subsequently, the tuition totals above are estimates based on the number of projected majors per year who are estimated to enroll in approximately 15 credit hours of coursework per year. For example, during the first year, 6 students enrolled multiplied by 15 credit hours multiplied by $174 totals $15,660.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Program</th>
<th>B. Breakdown of Budget Expenses/Requirements</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Other Professional Staff</td>
<td>Administrative/Other Professional Staff</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative/Explanation: Since only one additional course will be added to the American Studies curriculum, adjunct/overload pay will be offered to the faculty member who teaches the course each year.

| Graduate Assistants | Graduate Assistants | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Student Employees | Student Employees | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Equipment and Instructional Materials | Equipment and Instructional Materials | $75 | $75 | $75 | $100 | $100 |

Narrative/Explanation: Faculty may need additional instructional materials.

| Library | Library | $250 | $250 | $225 | $225 | $225 |

Narrative/Explanation: Additional books, journals, and library materials may be needed to cover topics in American Studies.

| Contractual Services | Contractual Services | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Other Support Services | Other Support Services | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Commodities | Commodities | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Printing | Printing | $125 | $125 | $150 | $150 | $175 |

Narrative/Explanation: Additional Course syllabi, additions to the graduate catalog, publicity materials and Graduate Office paperwork will account for an increase in printing costs.

| Telecommunications | Telecommunications | $600 | $600 | $900 | $1,200 | $1,200 |

Narrative/Explanation: As more graduate students enroll in the American Studies program, more classes may be needed to be offered via ITV to the Enid, Woodward, and Ponca City University Center campuses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>$650</th>
<th>$800</th>
<th>$800</th>
<th>$1,100</th>
<th>$1,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narrative/Explanation:</strong> An integral part of the American Studies program will consist of professors taking students on field trips to regional museums, historical sites, etc. Trip costs will come from the travel budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and Grants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,875</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment
### NORTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
**MASTER OF ARTS IN AMERICAN STUDIES**

#### Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Core</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Core</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 5010 Graduate Study Seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5433 Historiography and Historical Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AMST 5103 Introduction to American Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5402 OR Historic Preservations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5412 OR Museum Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5422 Public History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select 9 hours from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 5413</td>
<td>Popular Literature: Popular Culture – The Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5123</td>
<td>Oklahoma History and Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5203</td>
<td>The American West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 5133</td>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select 3 hours from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC 5263</td>
<td>Public Service Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD 5180</td>
<td>Leadership Northwest Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD 5180</td>
<td>American Legacy and Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Electives (Select 15 hours from at least three disciplines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 5153</td>
<td>Agricultural Economics of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 5763</td>
<td>Public School Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 5903</td>
<td>Higher Education Philosophy and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 5943</td>
<td>Leadership in Adult Education Venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 5953</td>
<td>Institutional Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 5203</td>
<td>Contemporary Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 5273</td>
<td>Recent American Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 5433</td>
<td>Nineteenth Century American Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 5463</td>
<td>American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5113</td>
<td>U.S. Diplomatic History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5213</td>
<td>American Colonial Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5223</td>
<td>The United States: 1783-1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5233</td>
<td>The United States: 1841-1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5313</td>
<td>The United States: 1933-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5553</td>
<td>History of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5603</td>
<td>History of Economics in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5613</td>
<td>Native American History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5623</td>
<td>The United States: 1877-1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 5723</td>
<td>African American History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOM 5123</td>
<td>Advanced Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOM 5212</td>
<td>Mass Communication Law and Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOM 5213</td>
<td>Oral Communications for the Business Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 5113</td>
<td>Constitutional Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 5123</td>
<td>Advanced Political Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 5213</td>
<td>Public Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 5223</td>
<td>Elements of Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 5253</td>
<td>Federal, State, and Local Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 5303</td>
<td>The Federal Legislative Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 5313</td>
<td>The Federal Executive Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 5123</td>
<td>Social Gerontology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thesis (5330)** (students must enroll in thesis hours within one of the following disciplines: AGRI, MCOM, EDUC, ENGL, HIST, POLS, or SOC) With permission from the Graduate Advisory Committee, students may select a maximum of six credit hours may be taken from Individual Study (5170), Seminar (5180), Readings (5190), and/or Short Courses (5300) 3-6

**Total** 35

*Asterisks denote new courses*
AGENDA ITEM #11-b:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: University of Central Oklahoma. Approval of request to offer the Master of Science in Nursing.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the University of Central Oklahoma’s request to offer the Master of Science in Nursing 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.

• Master of Science in Nursing. Continuation beyond Fall 2014 will depend upon:
  Majors enrolled: a minimum of 40 students in Fall 2014; and

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

The University of Central Oklahoma (UCO)’s Academic Plan lists the following institutional priorities:

Academic Long-Term Goals
  • Engage students in transformative learning through a) leadership, b) research, scholarly and creative activities, c) service learning and civic engagement activities, d) global and cultural competencies, and e) self awareness and healthy lifestyles.
  • Improve student outcomes through a) persistence towards academic goals, b) academic performance, and c) post-graduate success.
  • Enhance the learning environment through a) student-faculty ratio, b) integration of part-time faculty, c) learning spaces, and d) learning technologies.
  • Support learning collaborations a) on the UCO Campus, b) among institutions, and c) with metropolitan, regional and global communities.

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, UCO has taken the following program actions in response to APRA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees and/or certificate programs deleted</th>
<th>Degrees and/or certificate programs added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Review**

UCO offers 101 degree and/or certificate programs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Associate of Arts or Sciences Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Associate of Applied Science Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Baccalaureate Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Master’s Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Doctoral Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 First Professional Degrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 UCO’s program review schedule as appropriate. Thus, if a professional program received a ten-year accreditation, it would not be reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents’ policy.

**Program Development Process**

UCO’s faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials. UCO’s governing board approved delivery of the Master of Science in Nursing (MSN) at the January 21, 2011 meeting. UCO requests authorization to offer this degree as outlined below.

**POLICY ISSUES:**

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

**ANALYSIS:**

*Master of Science in Nursing*

**Program purpose.** The purpose of this new graduate program is to address the increasing global need of healthcare practitioners with advanced nursing credentials and prepare graduates for employment in educational and practice fields, and pursuit of a doctoral degree.

**Program rationale and background.** In an era of healthcare reform and an aging population, the need for nurses prepared at both the bachelor’s and master’s level is expected to grow. UCO conducted a survey of current UCO nursing students and metro area health care facilities and results indicate that 77 percent were interested in obtaining a master’s degree in nursing and almost 70 percent were interested in applying for admission at UCO. The Oklahoma Board of Nursing 2009 Annual Report states that the shortage of qualified nursing faculty continues to limit expansion of educational services to meet current and anticipated nursing shortages.

The October 2011 Oklahoma Hospital Association (OHA) Staffing Needs Assessment Survey indicates the statewide vacancy rate is 16 percent for Advanced Nurse Practitioners and 30 percent for Certified Nurse Specialists. These specialty areas are strengths of the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center’s (OUHSC) MSN program, yet workforce shortages remain. Additionally, there are three other
MSN programs offered at private institutions located in the Oklahoma City metropolitan area. Enrollment is strong at the private institutions; however, the completion rates at these institutions are low and are not meeting workforce shortages.

The National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) requires all nursing faculty at all levels to hold a Master’s degree. Currently, Oklahoma has a shortage of MSN prepared faculty, especially in the technology center’s Licensed Practical Nurse (LPN) programs. The curriculum in UCO’s proposed MSN program primarily focuses on nursing education, while also allowing flexibility in electives to meet the needs of students with specialized interests. By focusing on nursing education, UCO’s proposed MSN program will address the shortage of nursing faculty by preparing students to fill teaching positions at the technology centers with qualified faculty, and address faculty needs at colleges and universities in Oklahoma.

UCO’s proposed MSN program will also provide an affordable option for students interested in pursuing graduate level training in the nursing field. Currently, the Oklahoma City metropolitan area has MSN programs offered at the OUHSC, Oklahoma City University (OCU), Southern Nazarene University (SNU), and Oklahoma Baptist University (OBU). The cost for tuition and fees for students to attend UCO will be slightly less than at the OUHSC and significantly less than at OCU, SNU, and OBU. Additionally, both UCO and OUHSC have strong and growing enrollments in their Bachelor of Science in Nursing programs to adequately support the pipeline into both OUHSC’s MSN program and the proposed MSN program at UCO. No significant impact to enrollment in OUHSC’s MSN program is expected.

Employment opportunities. Nursing degree programs are a major employer of master’s prepared registered nurses. The NLNAC and the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) require full-time and adjunct faculty in LPN, associate degree and baccalaureate degree nursing programs to have a minimum credential of a master’s degree in nursing. According to the American Association of Colleges of Nursing’s 2009 survey, United States nursing schools have turned away 54,991 qualified applicants from baccalaureate and graduate nursing programs due to an insufficient number of faculty to teach in the programs. A National League for Nursing 2006-2007 study showed that nationwide there were more than 1,900 unfilled full-time faculty positions. Additionally, a survey conducted by UCO of potential employers in the Oklahoma City metro area reports that 75 percent of the agencies indicated a need for additional master’s prepared registered nurses. UCO is confident graduates of this program will be able to find employment within the discipline or gain admission into further graduate study.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Enrollment of majors in the program</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Graduates from the program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duplication and impact on existing programs. The proposed graduate program would duplicate the existing programs shown in the following table.
A system wide letter of intent was distributed by email December 29, 2010. The University of Oklahoma (OU) requested a copy of the proposal to be sent to the OUHSC, which was sent February 7, 2011. OU submitted a letter of protest citing the following areas of concern: 1) student/employer demand, 2) faculty preparation, and 3) cost of the program. Through subsequent written communication, OU and UCO submitted further information for this review. Additionally, representatives from both OUHSC and UCO met in person to discuss the issues of concern. Included in this meeting were State Regents’ staff, OUHSC’s Senior Vice President and Provost, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Development, the Associate Dean of Nursing, and the Assistant Dean of Nursing. Representing UCO, the Vice Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Mathematics and Science, and the Chair of the Department of Nursing attended. UCO addressed OU’s concerns, indicating 1) there was sufficient student demand and employer vacancies to support an additional public MSN program in the state, and UCO’s curriculum focus is primarily on preparing nursing faculty to meet the statewide demands, 2) UCO has adequate faculty to support the program and meet accreditation requirements for a quality program, and 3) and UCO’s Department of Nursing supports the program financially through existing funds, although UCO will seek additional grant funding as appropriate. Based on all information available, staff recommend moving forward with the program proposal.

Curriculum. The proposed graduate program will consist of 34 total credit hours as shown in the following table. Ten new courses will be added (Attachment A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Courses</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Approved Coursework</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and staff. Existing faculty will teach the proposed MSN program. Additional adjunct faculty may be required as enrollment increases in the program.

Support services. The library, facilities and equipment are adequate to support the program.

Financing. The proposed graduate program will be offered on a self-supporting basis and the current tuition and fee structure will be sufficient to adequately fund the program. No additional funding is requested from the State Regents to support the program.

Program resource requirements. Program resource requirements for the Master of Science in Nursing are shown in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Funding Sources</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Available from Federal Sources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative/Explanation: With approval of the program, federal grants can be pursued from the Department of Health and...
### A. Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Program</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Available from Other Non-State Sources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: With approval of the program, funds can be sought for program needs and student scholarships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing State Resources</td>
<td>$74,564</td>
<td>$109,350</td>
<td>$149,128</td>
<td>$165,698</td>
<td>$165,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Amounts reflect current salary and benefits for one faculty to begin program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Resources Available through Internal Allocation and Reallocation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition</td>
<td>$46,940</td>
<td>$93,881</td>
<td>$187,762</td>
<td>$234,702</td>
<td>$234,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Tuition is based on projected enrollment of each student in 18 credits per academic year and a per graduate credit cost of $260.78 ($183.20 per credit graduate tuition, $18.05 per credit enrollment fee, and $29.53 per credit College of Math and Science fee and $30 per credit hour Nursing Course Fee).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$121,504</td>
<td>$203,231</td>
<td>$336,890</td>
<td>$400,400</td>
<td>$400,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Breakdown of Budget Expenses/Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Program</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Other Professional Staff</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$12,240</td>
<td>$16,320</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>$23,120</td>
<td>$23,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: The amount reflects the costs needed for additional adjunct salary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Funds will be used for graduate assistant salaries. Graduate assistants will help faculty with teaching classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Instructional Materials</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Office computer and equipment for one faculty each of the first three years. Subsequent years estimate cost for repair/replacement of supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Existing resources for the baccalaureate are sufficient for the master’s degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Accreditation: The Department of Nursing will apply for accreditation for either NLNAC or CCNE. CCNE annual fee of $2,800 for 2 programs, new application fee of $5,500, and on-site evaluation fee of $1,750 per person/3-5 person team. NLNAC $2,825 for 2 programs, candidacy fee of $2,500, and accreditation review fee of $1,000 application and site visit fee of $835 per evaluator, per day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Support Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Cost reflects amount needed for marketing brochures and instructional materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and Grants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49,120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment
# University of Central Oklahoma
## Master of Science in Nursing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Core</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 5xx3 Advanced Pathophysiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURS 5xx3 Advanced Pharmacology</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURS 5xx3 Advanced Health Assessment</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURS 5xx3 Advanced Research/Evidence Based Practice</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURS 5xx3 Organizational and Systems Leadership</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURS 5xx2 Healthcare Informatics</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURS 5xx2 Clinical Nursing Course (100 clock hours)</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NURS 5xx3 Teaching, Learning, and Nursing Theories</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Approved Coursework (selected from the following)</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*NURS 5xx3 Curriculum Development: Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NURS 5xx3 Tests and Evaluation Procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NURS 5xx3 Educational Strategies/Practicum: Classroom and Clinical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 5990 Thesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 5900 Practicum in Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 4930 Individual Study in Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives approved by the Chairperson in Nursing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 34

*Asterisks denote new courses*
AGENDA ITEM #11-c:

New Programs.

SUBJECT: Rose State College. Approval of request to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Aerospace Technology.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve Rose State College’s request to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Aerospace Technology 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.

- **Associate in Applied Science in Aerospace Technology.** Continuation beyond Fall 2016 will depend upon:
  - Majors enrolled: a minimum of 20 students in Fall 2015; and
  - Graduates: a minimum of 7 students in 2015-2016.

BACKGROUND:

Academic Plan

Rose State College (RSC)’s Academic Plan lists the following institutional priorities and new funding initiatives:

- Provide quality programs to maintain optimum enrollments.
  - Use the program review procedures to evaluate the existing curriculum and revitalize as necessary to meet the needs of students and community.
- Improve the success rate of students so that they can progress toward academic goals.
  - Accelerate progress toward a learning-centered institution wherein student assessment, support services, teaching methodologies, institutional policies, and course delivery are focused on improved student success, learning outcomes, goal attainment, and degree completion.
- Acquire and effectively use state-of-the-art equipment and information technologies.
  - Support acquisition of and training in modern technology to allow for innovative development and revision of instructional, administrative, and student support programs that keep pace with a modern technology-intensive workplace and the competitive arena of educational service delivery.
- Enhance financial and physical resources.
  - Identify and secure new sources of funds, protect financial resources, and create mutually beneficial cooperative ventures with external groups and organizations.
- Improve institutional effectiveness and efficiency.
  - Engage in scenario analysis, environmental scanning, identification of best practices, an ongoing assessment of College operations and student outcomes, extensive staff development and internal
communication initiatives, constant improvement of College operations and procedures, and other
techniques to keep the College moving toward realization of its vision and mission.

**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, RSC has taken the following program actions in response to APRA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees and/or certificate programs deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees and/or certificate programs added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Review**

RSC offers 52 degree and/or certificate programs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Arts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences Degrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Applied Science Degrees</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Professional Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 RSC’s program review
schedule as appropriate. Thus, if a professional program received a ten-year accreditation, it would not be
reviewed for ten years, which is an approved exception to State Regents’ policy.

**Program Development Process**

RSC’s faculty developed the proposal, which was reviewed and approved by institutional officials.
RSC’s governing board approved delivery of the Associate in Applied Science in Aerospace Technology
at the April 19, 2012 meeting. RSC requests authorization to offer this degree, as outlined below.

**POLICY ISSUES:**

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

**ANALYSIS:**

*Associate in Applied Science in Aerospace Technology*

**Program purpose.** The purpose of the proposed program is to provide students with the fundamental
knowledge of the principles and practices of electronics, mechanical, or general aerospace applications
needed to support design, build, repair and modify electronic, mechanical, or electro-mechanical airborne
equipment.
Program rationale and background. Competitive pressures will force companies to improve and update manufacturing facilities and product designs, resulting in more jobs for engineering technicians. Rose State College, in its proximity to Tinker Air Force Base (TAFB) and its contractors, strives to be of service to the 27,000 military and civilian employees as they pursue higher education. As technology becomes more sophisticated, employers will continue to look for technicians who are skilled in new technology and require minimal on-the-job training. Representatives of Pratt and Whitney, the Federal Aviation Administration, Northrop Grumman, Southwest Research Institute, Oklahoma City-Air Logistics Center at TAFB, Boeing, and the Tinker Business and Industry Park voiced support of the proposed program at an advisory committee meeting held in November 2011. RSC also intends to continue the advisory committee through partnerships with local aerospace companies, such as ARINC, Boeing, AAR Aircraft Services, and TAFB, as well as educational partnerships with the University of Central Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, the University of Oklahoma, and career technology centers to ensure the needs of the aerospace industry are being met.

Employment opportunities. Overall employment of aerospace technicians is expected to increase through the next several years. In addition to industry growth, many job openings will stem from the need to replace technicians who retire from the labor force. According to the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission, positions as engineering technicians, electrical and electronic technicians, mechanical engineering technicians, and electro-mechanical technicians in the Central Region of Oklahoma are expected to increase approximately 3 – 7 percent between 2008 and 2018, depending on the career field. Statewide, these positions are expected to increase 6 – 27 percent during the same time period. RSC is confident graduates of this program will find employment within the career field and meet the needs of the local aerospace industry.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Enrollment of majors in the program</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Graduates from the program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duplication and impact on existing programs. The proposed degree program does not duplicate any existing program, but shares some content with the following existing programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Existing Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Aviation Maintenance Technology (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Community College</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Aviation Sciences Technology (199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Aviation (003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands Community College</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Applied Technology (081) with an option in Aviation Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole State College</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Applied Technology (120) with an option in Aviation Maintenance Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City</td>
<td>Associate in Applied Science in Engineering Technology in Electronics Engineering (006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A system wide letter of intent was communicated by email on February 10, 2012. None of the State System institutions notified the State Regents’ office of a protest to the proposed degree program. Approval will not constitute unnecessary duplication.

**Curriculum.** The proposed degree program will consist of 62 total credit hours as shown in the following table. No new courses will be added (Attachment A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Related Requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Requirements</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Financing.** The proposed degree program will be offered on a self-supporting basis and the current tuition and fee structure will be sufficient to adequately fund the program. No additional funding is requested from the State Regents to support the program.

**Program resource requirements.** Program resource requirements for the Associate in Applied Science in Aerospace Technology are shown in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Program</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Available from Federal Sources</td>
<td>$119,127</td>
<td>$22,839</td>
<td>$22,839</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: The Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training Grant (TAACCCT) has been secured for three years. Initially, a full-time faculty position (subject to funding) will be funded under the grant. The grant currently runs for three years. This faculty member will also be charged with program development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Available from Other Non-State Sources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing State Resources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Resources Available through Internal Allocation and Reassignment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,288</td>
<td>$46,288</td>
<td>$121,060</td>
<td>$121,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation: Equipment will be purchased during the first year through the TAACCCT Grant. In the second and third year, the grant will still support $22,839 of the faculty salary and benefits. RSC will be responsible for $46,288 in the second and third year. Reallocation of internal budget will allow RSC to fund its share of the program. By year four, RSC will evaluate whether the program has the potential to sustain itself. It is believed that RSC will be able to sustain the program through enrollment and industry support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tuition</td>
<td>$11,340</td>
<td>$22,680</td>
<td>$34,020</td>
<td>$45,360</td>
<td>$56,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation and Calculations: Tuition calculations are based on the current tuition rate and student enrollment in years 1-5 of 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 with each student completing 24 credit hours per academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,467</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>$103,147</strong></td>
<td><strong>$166,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>$177,760</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Funding Sources</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>5th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Breakdown of Budget</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>5th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses/Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation:</td>
<td>Faculty administrative support is handled on the division level. No professional staffing is planned for this program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$69,127</td>
<td>$69,127</td>
<td>$69,127</td>
<td>$86,137</td>
<td>$86,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation:</td>
<td>Current faculty salaries are $44,650 for an entry level faculty member and $22,477 in benefits. If the program grows as anticipated, the fourth and fifth year will have a potential need for adjunct faculty teaching. The estimate is for adjunct faculty assignment at nine credit hours for each of three semesters. At the current rate credit hour rate of $630, an additional $5,670 will be allocated to personnel costs. Full-time faculty teach a 15 credit hour load at RSC. With the adjunct estimate, the College would be able to offer 24 credit hours in the program per semester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Instructional Materials</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$17,913</td>
<td>$17,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation:</td>
<td>Equipment will be secured at the beginning of the grant. In the fourth and fifth year, the College has allowed for a 10% increase in costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Explanation:</td>
<td>Reference material for this program will be garnered through the RSC’s electronic database and inter-library loan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and Grants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$119,127</td>
<td>$79,127</td>
<td>$79,127</td>
<td>$104,050</td>
<td>$104,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment
# ROSE STATE COLLEGE
## ASSOCIATE IN APPLIED SCIENCE IN AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Education</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1113 English Composition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1213 English Composition II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 1483 US History To 1877 OR HIST 1493 US History Since 1877</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 1113 American Federal Government</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (see catalog for complete list)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPER course or activity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Elective selected from Psychology, Social Sciences, Economics, Foreign Languages, or Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support and Related Requirements</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFC One course at the 1000 level or higher with a LFSC prefix</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Requirements</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1513 College Algebra OR MATH 1613 Trigonometry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 1115 General Chemistry I</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 2114 General Physics I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 2401 General Physics I Lab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select a minimum of 20 credit hours from the following</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1214 Introduction to Mechanisms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1224 Mechanisms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1304 Introduction to Electronics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1314 Fundamentals of Electricity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1324 Circuit Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1333 Electronic Devices and Amplifiers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1343 Introduction to Digital Electronics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1813 Programming for Engineering Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1833 Introduction to Quality Assurance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 1842 Dimensional Metrology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 2123 Electromechanical Devices and Controls</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 2214 Manufacturing Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 2224</td>
<td>Computer Aided Design/Computer Aided Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGT 2823</td>
<td>Non-destructive Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Asterisks denote new courses*
AGENDA ITEM #12:

Program Deletions.

SUBJECT: Approval of institutional requests.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

BACKGROUND:

University of Central Oklahoma (UCO) requests authorization to delete the program listed below.

- Master of Education in Education (165)

POLICY ISSUES:

These actions are consistent with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education’s Academic Program Review policy.

ANALYSIS:

UCO requests authorization to delete the Master of Education in Education (165). This program was approved in the 1982-83 academic year. Reasons for requesting the deletion include:

- The deletion of this program is part of a program realignment which either establishes the program’s options as independent, stand alone programs or moves them to another program.
- The options Bilingual Education/TESL and Secondary Education were approved as new programs at the April 19, 2012 meeting, as the Master of Education in Bilingual Education/TESL and the Master of Education in Secondary Education, respectively.
- The option General Education was approved at the March 1, 2012 meeting to be added to the existing Master of Education in Adult and Higher Education (156) program and renamed Interdisciplinary Studies.
- No courses will be deleted or altered and will all be offered under their new programs/options.
- No funds for reallocation are anticipated.
- There are currently 294 students in the program with an expected graduation date of Spring 2015. Students will continue to take the classes identified on their plans of study.
AGENDA ITEM #13-a:

Academic Policy.

SUBJECT: Posting of the revised Function of Public Institutions policy.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents post the revised Functions of Public Institutions policy, as described below.

BACKGROUND:

Over the past three years, program requests from technical and community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees and expansion of both associate and doctoral degrees by the regional universities were forwarded to the State Regents for consideration. Due to concerns about severe budget constraints and limited resources, the State Regents declared a moratorium at the March 11, 2010 meeting to defer consideration of any requests for changes or exceptions to community college and university functions through the 2010-2011 year and indicated further study was needed. However, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) stipulated that institutions could request a program if the following was documented (in addition to current requirements in the Academic Program Approval policy): significant demand for the program (i.e., beyond typical state and national labor statistics), the program is outside the capacity and expertise of colleges and universities within the same service area; joint or consortial approaches are not feasible, and full funding resources are procured and documented.

Subsequently, OSRHE staff engaged in discussions with presidents and chief academic officers. The Council of Presidents Academic and Systems Initiatives Committee and the Council on Instruction (COI) reviewed and discussed the governance, institutional, quality assurance, financial resources, and State System implications of changes to the function policy. Materials from other states related to associate degree granting institutions offering baccalaureate degrees, baccalaureate institutions offering associate degrees, expansion of doctoral or professional programs, and development of joint degrees were provided to deepen the discussion. Additionally, topics related to the role of joint degrees; the importance of meeting economic development needs; the role of certificate programs; the differentiation of applied baccalaureate degrees from traditional degrees; and the differentiation of Associate in Applied Science degrees from Associate in Arts/Associate in Science degrees; and concerns for institutional capacity and quality assurance were discussed.

At the June 2011 State Regents’ meeting, the State Regents reiterated concerns about budget constraints and stressed the importance of limiting further expansion of institutional functions without careful consideration. The moratorium was lifted and State Regents’ staff was directed to draft changes to the Function of Public Institutions policy to incorporate State Regents’ intent as outlined in the June 2011 agenda item.
Proposed changes to the *Function of Public Institutions* policy are outlined and described below. To incorporate the intent of the OSRHE, definitions and policy language have been added to the *Academic Program Approval* policy (separate agenda item) as described below.

**POLICY ISSUES:**

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma states the OSRHE, “…shall constitute a coordinating board of control for all State institutions described in Section 1 hereof, with the following specific powers: (1) it shall prescribe standards of higher education applicable to each institution; (2) it shall determine the functions and courses of study in each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed…” The *Functions of Public Institutions* policy outlines and describes the functions set by the OSRHE within the constitutional authority noted above. Institutional functions designate the level at which an institution operates; the spectrum of educational offerings; the geographic area of institutional responsibility; and the extent to which the institution is engaged in research, public service and extension activities. The policy was last revised in June 2006. Changes were not substantive and included reformatting the policy numbering scheme and moving procedural information to the procedures manual.

During the function policy discussion and moratorium, the COI Academic Programs Committee was working on the *Academic Program Approval* policy to incorporate changes from a related revised policy (*Academic Program Review*). Criteria for requesting programs outside an institution’s programmatic function were recommended to formalize the process according to OSRHE intent. The COI approved the *Academic Program Approval* policy draft that includes the function-related changes at the April 12, 2012 meeting. The Presidents Council Academic Initiatives and Systems Initiatives Committee approved the same policy draft at the May 2, 2012 meeting.

A related policy, *Institutional Admission and Retention* lists regional universities currently authorized by the State Regents to offer two-year degree programs. Those regional universities currently include Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Cameron University, Rogers State University, Langston University, Southwestern Oklahoma State University and the University of Central Oklahoma. Some of these authorizations are historic from the evolution of the institution from a two-year college into a university and some authorizations have been more recent to meet needs of the institution and the area served.

**ANALYSIS:**

Proposed policy changes include deletion of general language regarding programmatic responsibilities in the regional and community college sections, the addition of a reference to the *Academic Program Approval* policy, and an editorial change to the community college section regarding remedial and developmental education. A summary of proposed changes is provided below. The draft policy that includes strikeouts for deleted language and underscores for added language is attached.

3.2.4 – Regional Universities

A statement referring institutions to criteria in the *Academic Program Approval* policy for program requests outside an institution’s programmatic function was added.

3.2.5 – Community Colleges

An editorial change was added to the statement regarding remedial and developmental education and a statement referring institutions to criteria in the *Academic Program Approval* policy was added for...
program requests outside an institution’s programmatic function.

Certain changes to the *Academic Program Approval* policy are related to the *Functions of Public Institutions* policy revision and are designed to implement OSRHE intent (section 3.4.5 – New Program Request Criteria – Centrality of the Proposed Program to the Institution’s Mission and Approved Function). The rationale for the revised policy language is to ensure that during times of severe fiscal and budget constraints, programs requested outside an institutions’ programmatic function meet particular criteria and requirements to justify offering programs outside the approved function. These criteria are similar to the current new program approval process, but require more detailed documentation related to demand; evidence that collaboration with institutions with related programs to meet the demand are not feasible; community colleges and technical branches must address capacity and infrastructure if requesting a baccalaureate degree; and full and sustained funding resources must be demonstrated and documented.

It is recommended that OSRHE post the proposed policy changes for review and action at the June 2012 meeting.

Attachment
3.1 FUNCTIONS OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

3.1.1 Purpose

The Constitution of Oklahoma (Article XIII-A, Section 2) directs the State Regents to determine the functions and courses of study in each of the institutions of the State System. There are currently 25 institutions in the State System, including 2 research universities, 11 regional universities, and 12 community colleges.

3.1.2 Definitions

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

“Course of Study” is a sequentially organized series of educational experiences designed to culminate in the awarding of an academic degree or certificate.

“Function” is the allocation of responsibility which commits an institution or agency over a broad sphere of activity for a considerable length of time. Functions encompass such objects as (1) the level at which an institution shall operate, (2) the broad kinds of educational programs to be undertaken, (3) the geographic area for which the institution is to be responsible, and the extent to which it is to engage in (4) research, (5) public service, (6) extension activities, etc.

“Remedial/Developmental Courses” are zero-level courses that do not carry college credit and are designed to raise students’ competency in the subject area to the collegiate level.

3.1.3 Research Universities

University of Oklahoma (OU)

Oklahoma State University (OSU)

The function of the two research universities include:

A. Both lower-division and upper-division undergraduate study in a number of fields leading to the baccalaureate or first-professional degree.

B. Graduate study in several fields of advanced learning leading to the master's degree.

C. Graduate study in selected fields leading toward the doctor's degree.

D. Organized basic and applied research.
E. Statewide programs of extension study and public service.

F. Statewide programs designed to promote the economic development of Oklahoma.

G. To the extent resources are available, to carry out limited programs and projects on a national and international scale.

H. Among the specific areas of responsibility to be undertaken by OU is the provision of quality programs in the fields of fine and performing arts, whereas OSU has a unique responsibility in the fields of agriculture and technical education.

3.1.4 Regional Universities

Cameron University (CU)
East Central University (ECU)
Langston University (LU)
Northeastern State University (NSU)
Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU)
Oklahoma Panhandle State University (OPSU)
Rogers State University (RSU)
Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SEOSU)
Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU)
University of Central Oklahoma (UCO)
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma (USAO)

The functions of the 11 regional universities include:

A. Both lower-division and upper-division undergraduate study in several fields leading to the baccalaureate degree.

B. A limited number of programs leading toward the first-professional degree when appropriate to an institution's strengths and the needs of the state.

C. Graduate study below the doctor's level, primarily in teacher education but moving toward limited comprehensiveness in fields related to Oklahoma's manpower needs.

D. Extension and public service responsibilities in the geographic regions in which they are located.

E. Responsibility for institutional and applied research in those areas related closely to their program assignments.

F. Responsibility for regional programs of economic development.

G. Associate and certificate programs as authorized. Perform other functional or programmatic responsibilities as authorized by the State
Regents. Criteria for consideration of programs outside of the function described herein are outlined in the *Academic Program Approval* policy.

Three regional institutions currently offer programs leading to the first-professional degree: SWOSU offers a Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.); NSU offers a Doctor of Optometry (O.D.); and LU offers a Doctor of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.).

USAO has the special function as the state’s public liberal arts and sciences college.

### 3.1.5 Community Colleges

Carl Albert State College (CASC)  
Connors State College (CSC)  
Eastern Oklahoma State College (EOSC)  
Murray State College (MSC)  
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College (NEOAMC)  
Northern Oklahoma College (NOC)  
Oklahoma City Community College (OCCC)  
Redlands Community College (RCC)  
Rose State College (RSC)  
Seminole State College (SSC)  
Tulsa Community College (TCC)  
Western Oklahoma State College (WOSC)

The function of the 12 public community colleges include:

A. Provide general education for all students.

B. Provide education in several basic fields of study for those students who plan to transfer to a university and complete a baccalaureate degree.

C. Provide one- and two-year programs of technical and occupational education to prepare individuals to enter the labor market.

D. Provide programs of remedial and developmental education for those whose previous education may not have prepared them for college students who lack required high school academic requirements for college admission or competency in the basic academic skills areas, consistent with the remediation policy.

E. Provide both formal and informal programs of study especially designed for adults and out-of-school youth in order to serve the community generally with a continuing education opportunity.

F. Carry out programs of institutional research designed to improve the institutions' efficiency and effectiveness of operation.
G. Participate in programs of economic development independently or with universities to meet the needs of each institution's geographic service area.

H. Perform other special or programmatic responsibilities as authorized by the State Regents. Criteria for consideration of programs outside of the function described herein are outlined in the Academic Program Approval policy.

3.1.6 Constituent Agencies

OU Health Sciences Center
OU Law Center
OU Geological Survey
OU Tulsa
OSU College of Veterinary Medicine
OSU Agricultural Experiment Station
OSU Agricultural Extension Division
OSU Technical Branch, Institute of Technology - Okmulgee
OSU Oklahoma City
OSU Center for Health Sciences

In addition to the statements of functions set forth by the State Regents for the 25 institutions of the State System, each constituent agency also has been authorized by law and by State Regents' action to carry out certain programs and projects. Copies of these statements may be found in the official files of OU and OSU, under whose administrative jurisdictions the constituent agencies operate.
AGENDA ITEM #13-b:

Academic Policy.

SUBJECT: Posting of the revised Academic Program Approval policy.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents’ post the revised Academic Program Approval policy, as described below.

BACKGROUND:

Revisions to the Academic Program Approval policy adopted by the State Regents in previous years are summarized below:

- September 5, 1997 – Revisions included provisions to raise the visibility and importance of integrating technology into program delivery and also provisions for criteria designed to avoid unnecessary duplication.
- January 29, 1999 – Revisions included a new section on program suspension. The revisions were designed to allow an institution to recommend an academic program be placed on suspension, but be reinstated with State Regents’ re-approval as was current practice. Additionally, certificates were better defined and eliminated the requirement of course modification reporting.
- June 29, 2006 – Moved some procedural information to the Procedures Handbook.
- February 7, 2008 – Revisions included increased guidance to better inform State System institutions and provide consistent practices relative to comments, questions, protests regarding new programs, and sequence of steps were specified with timelines. These efforts provided appropriate time and process for institutions to voice and resolve issues prior to the consideration of a new program by the State Regents.

In Fall 2011, a committee of internal staff crafted the first draft of the Academic Program Approval policy to incorporate necessary changes due to the June 2011 changes to the related Academic Program Review policy. Subsequently, the Council on Instruction (COI) Academic Programs Committee continued work on revisions to the policy over the following months and made other changes as described below.

The Academic Program Approval draft policy was approved by COI at the April 12, 2012 meeting and by the Council of Presidents on May 2, 2012.

POLICY ISSUES:

The primary purpose of the Academic Program Approval policy is to provide guidance to State System institutions when submitting requests for new program/s and provide guidance in linking academic planning with resource allocation. The policy requirements are designed to match the internal
institutional processes where possible, so that institutions are not required to duplicate effort. Specific changes to the policy are summarized below.

Related policies include the *Academic Program Approval* policy and the *Functions of Public Institutions* policy.

**ANALYSIS:**

Proposed policy changes include updating, restructuring, and expanding sections of policy to align with recent changes made to the *Academic Program Review* policy. Other changes include adding definitions and a process for requesting programs outside an institution’s approved programmatic function. A summary of proposed changes is provided below. The draft policy that includes underscores for added language and strikeouts for proposed deletions is attached.

3.4.1 – Purpose
Non-substantive editorial changes.

3.4.2 – Definitions
Definitions for academic plan, consortial agreement, dual degree program, joint degree program, reverse transfer, and substantive change were added to guide institutions seeking to establish collaborative efforts regarding alternative forms of program delivery.

3.4.3 – Instructional Programs and Courses
Non-substantive editorial revisions and language regarding certificates were added to provide greater guidance to State System institutions regarding levels of instructional programs when submitting new program requests.

3.4.4 – Program Request Procedures
Non-substantive editorial revisions and language regarding an institution’s letter of intent (LOI) were added. The new LOI language provides institutions with 45 days from the date of the systemwide LOI to request a copy of the new program request for review.

3.4.5 – New Program Request Criteria
There are ten criteria that institutions must address in the program request proposal (A-J). In section A, policy language was added to the “Centrality of the Proposed Program to the Institution’s Mission and Approved Function(s)” which specifies information required for State System institutions when submitting new program requests that are outside their current approved programmatic function.

It is recommended that the State Regents post the proposed policy revisions to the *Academic Program Approval* policy.

Attachment
3.2 Academic Program Approval Policy

3.2.1 Purpose

Policies regulating the criteria and procedures for program approval detail the State Regents’ and the institutions' respective roles in the process. These roles are successive and complementary. In carrying out their constitutional responsibilities, the State Regents recognize the primary role of institutional faculty, administrators, and governing boards in initiating and recommending needed changes in educational programs. The institutional faculty are the discipline experts responsible for developing and teaching the curriculum. The institutional administrators and governing board view the proposed program in light of the institution's priorities. The State Regents provide the system perspective and their review should add value to the evaluation process. The State Regents consider the statewide capacity for each new program request, as well as linking academic planning with resource allocation. The State Regents also must ensure that requests and mandates are applied consistently applied.

To facilitate the discharge of these responsibilities, the following policy will be used in submitting and evaluating requests for new academic programs as defined below. The policy requirements are designed to match the internal institutional processes where possible, so that institutions are not required to duplicate efforts.

Program initiation is one method by which the State Regents and the institutions keep the academic curriculum current and relevant in terms of meeting present and future needs of the state and the region. These needs are both societal and occupational in nature. The State System recognizes and supports the tradition of liberal arts education and the need for higher education programs which offer individual and societal benefits that are independent of market demand considerations. Such programs provide immeasurable returns to the state by instilling in citizens a capacity for advanced learning and an understanding of the fundamentals of civilization. Similarly, the State System recognizes and supports providing the educational services to meet the occupational needs of the state and its citizenry.

The primary purposes of this policy include:

A. To maintain and enhance the quality of instruction, research, and public service conducted at state colleges and universities.

B. To respond to existing and emerging technological, social, cultural, scientific, business/industry, and economic needs.

C. To provide to citizens a variety of high-quality opportunities for intellectual growth.

D. To make programs reasonably accessible to academically qualified citizens of the state.
E. To utilize the state's and the institutions' resources effectively and efficiently.

F. To delineate the procedures to request approval of addition, modification, and deletion of instructional programs.

3.2.2 Definitions

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

“Academic Plan” is an annual report submitted to the State Regents by institutions that provides a mechanism to view each institution’s accomplishments, priorities, and aspirations about current and future plans including, but not limited to, academic efficiencies and priorities, learning sites, strategic plan, enrollment projections, and technology.

“Consortial Agreement” is an agreement between two or more institutions enabling a student to take coursework simultaneously at a “host institution” and have those courses count toward a certificate or the academic degree program at the “home institution” for the purpose of completing a degree. For the purpose of this policy, the student’s home institution is the institution that will grant the student’s certificate or degree and the host institution is the institution that offers coursework toward an academic program in an agreement with another institution, but will not award the certificate or degree.

“Course of Study” is a sequentially organized series of educational experiences designed to culminate in the awarding of an academic degree or certificate. For the purpose of this policy, instructional programs and courses of study will be considered synonymous.

“Dual Degree Program” is a program in which a student is enrolled in two or more institutions and is awarded separate degrees bearing the names, seals, and signatures of each individual institution.

“Joint Degree Program” is a program in which a student may study at two or more institutions and is awarded a single academic degree bearing the names, seals, and signatures of each of the participating institutions.

“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.

“Reverse Transfer” is a process in which credit hours earned by students after transfer to another institution may be applied to certificate or degree requirements at a previously attended institution or institutions. State Regents’ policies regarding requirements and standards for awarding an undergraduate certificate or degree shall apply.
“Substantive Change” is a modification to academic certificate or degree program requirements from those that were last approved by the State Regents, which will change the requirements for a student to complete the program of study. Substantive changes include, but are not limited to, changes in total number of required credit hours for the program, changes in required courses for the program, and changes in admission standards for the program.

3.2.3 Addition, Modification, and Deletion of Instructional Programs and Courses

The addition, modification, and deletion of instructional programs require State Regents’ approval for any program of instruction of study that results in a certificate or degree, and any designated pattern of courses within an existing major, including a new option, specialization and concentration that will be identified on the transcript, diploma, or degree. Minors are defined as a coherent set of courses in a discipline or interdisciplinary grouping other than a student's degree program, will be and are exempted for purposes of from this policy.

The terminology for the aggregation of courses into different levels of academic offerings varies from institution to institution. Within the State System, no consistent or uniform use of the terms "major," "option," "emphasis," or "degree" exists. In the interest of clarity, this policy will use the following terminology in referring to different levels of course aggregation levels of courses.

A. Levels of Instructional Programs

1. Level I

Aggregations of courses referenced in State Regents’ policy. These are (inclusive): Certificate, Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Associate in Applied Science, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of (Specialty), Graduate Certificate, Master of Arts, Master of Science, Master of (Specialty), Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of (Specialty), and First Professional Degree.

2. Level II

Aggregations of courses that appear in the institutional catalog or on the student's diploma. These vary greatly from institution to institution and include (not inclusive): Certificate, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Recreation, Master of Education, Associate in Applied Science in General Technology, and Doctor of Engineering.

3. Level III

Aggregations of courses with an institutional-unique instructional program code, as listed in the State Regents’ inventory of degree programs. The nomenclature includes the discipline area. Examples include: Certificate in Horticulture, Bachelor of Arts in English, Associate in Science in Physical

4. Level IV
Aggregations of courses under an umbrella degree program (Level III) that reflect subsets of the larger discipline and will usually share a common core (approximately 50 percent) of course requirements, as well as having objectives consistent with the objectives of the Level III program. For example, a Level III Bachelor of Business Administration degree program might have the following Level IV courses of study: Finance, Management, Accounting, Information Systems, and General; or the Bachelor of Arts in English might allow concentrations in Literature, Creative Writing, and English Education.

All four levels of courses of study require State Regents’ approval. Substantive changes in programs, including deletion, require approval of the State Regents. Nonsubstantive changes may be approved by the chief academic officer of the institution, but must be reported to the State Regents in a timely manner.

Alternative forms of delivery, including but not limited to consortial, dual, or joint degrees, are encouraged. Guidelines for proposing consortial, dual, or joint degree programs are provided in the State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook.

3.4.3 B. Addition, Modification, and Deletion of Courses

The State Regents recognize the primary role of the institution in initiating, reviewing, and authorizing course additions, modifications, and deletions. These course changes are subject to all other applicable State Regents’ policies including the institutional function and program approval policies. The institutions are to exercise this authority in the spirit of Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (APRA) and are to avoid course proliferation and de facto program expansion.

Upon request, institutions will submit a current listing of courses offered.

3.4.4 C. Uniform Course Numbering

In order to provide for a more effective and efficient system of the transfer of student’s credits among institutions of Oklahoma higher education, the State Regents adopted the following uniform system of numbering for identification of courses offered at all institutions in the State System.

A course number will consist of four digits as follows:

1. The first digit will denote the course level.
2. The second and third digits will be used to identify the course within a department.

3. The fourth digit will denote the number of semester hours credit of the course.

All courses offered at institutions should be numbered consistent with the course numbering system unless they are exempt by State Regents' action.

3.4.73.4.4 Program Request Procedures

The following procedures will be followed by the submitting institution and the State Regents for the consideration of a new academic program:

A. Letter of Intent

The institutional president must submit a "letter of intent" to initiate a new program to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will then inform the other institutional presidents of this request and provide the opportunity for comment, questions and protests, as well as, requests for copies of the proposals new program when received. Institutions will have 45 days from the date of the systemwide “letter of intent” to request a copy of the new program request for review. The "letter of intent" does not entail a commitment on the part of an institution to establish the program nor on the part of the State Regents to approve the program. The "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 new program request. The "letter of intent" must indicate the locations or campuses where the program will be offered and the delivery method. The institution's program request must be received during the one-year time period following the receipt of the intent letter, or a new "letter of intent" must be initiated.

B. Academic Plan

Demonstrate consistency with institution’s academic plan.

C. Governing Board Approval

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. Submission of a New Program Request

Upon the Chancellor’s receipt of the New Program Request from an institution, copies of the New 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.

E. Content of the New Program Request Submission
The submission will include a description of the Institution's Program Development Process, and will individually address each of the nine criteria for evaluation detailed in the New Program Request Criteria for Evaluation section of this policy and include supporting data provided as appropriate and documentation.

For programs that will use an alternative form of delivery, including but not limited to consortial, dual, or joint degrees, refer to the Academic Program Request Form in the State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook and the Academic Program Request Form which are available online.

F. State System State Regents’ Staff Review of the Program Request

The process of the State System staff review is outlined in the Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook. The State Regents’ staff will review the institution’s program request and following, the Chancellor will submit a recommendation to the State Regents’ action. The State Regents may take one of four actions:

1. Disapprove the program with a written explanation to the institution of the reasons for this action;

2. Defer the program request until the institution meets specified criteria or provides additional information;

3. Provisionally approve the program which will include a specified period of time for the program's operation with certain criteria developed in cooperation with the institution to be met if the program is to continue beyond the specified date; or

4. Approve the program without qualification.

Should an institution's request for a program be approved provisionally by the State Regents for a specified time period, there will be a window of one year to initiate the program without the year counting toward the provisional time period.

Should the State Regents defer or disapprove the program, the institution will have the opportunity to appeal directly to the State Regents.

Detailed procedures forms for program requests and reviews are available in the State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook and are available upon request online.

3.4.6 3.4.5 New Program Request Criteria for Evaluation

A. Centrality of the Proposed Program to the Institution's Mission and Approved Function(s)
A program should adhere to the role and scope of the institution as set forth in its mission statement and as complemented by the institution's academic plan. The institution should list the objectives of the proposed program and explain how the proposed program relates to the institutional mission, academic plan, and approved function(s). An evaluation will be made as to the centrality of the program to the institution's mission.

There are certain circumstances when institutions may request approval to offer programs outside their current function stated in the Functions of Public Institutions policy. For example, regional universities offer associate degrees, technical branches offer bachelor of technology degrees, etc. However, budget constraints, system efficiency and concerns about institutional capacity and priorities may further limit expansion of programmatic functions. Requests of this nature should be on a limited basis. Institutions requesting programs outside their approved programmatic function must thoroughly address all criteria specified in this section along with the remaining criteria.

1. Provide detailed and documented local demand beyond general state and national labor department industry and occupational projections.

2. For regional institutions requesting new or additional associate degrees, there must be evidence the program is outside the capacity and expertise of the community college(s) or technical branches within the same service area. There must be a statement and documentation that consortial, joint, or partnerships with community colleges or technical branches are not feasible.

3. Community colleges seeking to offer baccalaureate degree(s) or technical branches seeking to offer transfer or baccalaureate degrees must address significant considerations including capacity and infrastructure to increase the level of degree offerings. Particular considerations including accreditation standards, budget, faculty, institutional infrastructure (faculty credentials, library resources, student services, etc.) must be addressed. In addition, there must be evidence the program is outside the capacity and expertise of a regional university within the same service area. There must be a statement and documentation that consortial, joint, or partnerships with regional universities are not feasible.

4. For new program requests outside approved programmatic functions, full and sustained funding resources must be demonstrated and documented.

B. Curriculum

The curriculum should be structured to meet the stated objectives of the program, and the institution must explain how the curriculum achieves
the objectives of the program by describing the relationship between the overall curriculum or the major curricular components and the program objectives. The proposed program must meet the State Regents’ minimum curricular standards, including the total credit hour requirements for program completion, liberal arts and sciences, general education, and area of specialization credit hour requirements. The curriculum should be compatible with accreditation or certification standards, where available. Any clinical, practicum, field work, thesis, or dissertation requirements should be included in the proposal new program request. Where appropriate, the proposal new program request will also include a description of how technology is used to accomplish educational objectives.

Where appropriate, the proposal new program request must describe how the proposed program will articulate with related programs in the state. It should describe the extent to which student transfer has been explored and coordinated with other institutions.

C. Academic Standards

The admission, retention, and graduation standards should be clearly stated, must be equal to or higher than the State Regents’ policy requirements, and should be designed to encourage high quality.

D. Faculty

Faculty resources will be demonstrated to be adequate and appropriate for the proposed program, given the institution's mission, approved function and the character of the program to be developed. The number of faculty will meet external standards where appropriate. The qualifications of faculty will support the objectives and curriculum of the proposed program. Faculty qualifications such as educational background, non-collegiate and collegiate experience, and research and service interests and contributions which relate to the proposed program will be summarized. The institution must demonstrate that core programmatic faculty possess the academic and research credentials appropriate to support the program.

E. Support Resources

Access to qualitative and quantitative library resources must be appropriate for the proposed program, given the institution's mission approved function, and the character of the program, and should meet recognized standards for study at a particular level or in a particular field where such standards are available.

Books, periodicals, microfilms, microfiche, monographs, and other collections will be sufficient in number, quality, and currency to serve the program. Adequacy of electronic access, library facilities, and human resources to service the proposed program in terms of students and faculty will be considered.
The integration of instructional technology in the program's delivery is often appropriate for further engaging the student as an active learner and enhancing the overall learning experience. Access to global sources of information, as well as to other students and faculty through computing networks has become an important learning tool for all students, regardless of program. Where appropriate, the proposal new program request will include a description of how instructional and information technology resources are incorporated into this program.

Physical facilities and instructional equipment must be adequate to support a high quality program. The proposal new program request must address the availability of classroom, laboratory, and office space, as well as any equipment needs.

F. Demand for the Program

Proposed programs must respond to the needs of the larger economic and social environment. Thus, the institution should demonstrate demand for the proposed program.

1. Student Demand

Evidence of student demand, normally in the form of surveys of potential students and/or enrollments in related programs at the institution, should be adequate to expect a reasonable level of productivity.

2. Employer Demand

3. Evidence of sufficient employer demand, normally in the form of anticipated openings in an appropriate service area in relation to existing production of graduates for that area should be provided. Such evidence may include employer surveys, current labor market analyses, and future manpower projections. Where appropriate, evidence should demonstrate employers' preferences for graduates of the proposed program over persons having alternative existing credentials and employers' willingness to pay higher salaries to graduates of the proposed program.

G. Complement Existing Programs

The proposed program should complement and strengthen existing programs at the institution. Existing programs can be strengthened and enriched when appropriate new courses and degree programs are added to the curriculum. It is preferable that a proposed program be based on the existing strengths of the institution rather than be composed entirely of new courses. An interdependence among degree programs helps to strengthen and broaden the educational base of the institution.
H. Unnecessary Duplication

The prevention and elimination of unnecessary program duplication is a high priority of the State Regents. Where other similar programs may serve the same potential student population, evidence must demonstrate that the proposed program is sufficiently different from the existing programs or that access to the existing programs is sufficiently limited to warrant initiation of a new program. Where appropriate, technology will be used to reduce or eliminate duplication of effort and utilize existing resources more efficiently.

Normally, proposed programs in undergraduate core areas consisting of basic liberal arts and sciences disciplines would not be considered unnecessarily duplicative. Unnecessary duplication is a more specific concern in vocational/technical, occupational, and graduate and professional programs, which meet special manpower needs. The institution submitting the proposed new program request has the responsibility to provide evidence that the proposed program is not unnecessarily duplicative of similar offerings in the state.

In considering a program whose title or content implies duplication, the proposed program will be examined to determine the extent to which it duplicates existing programs. If duplication is found to exist, then the proposed program will be evaluated to determine whether the duplication is unnecessary. In making this determination, the following criteria will be evaluated:

1. Demand for the Program

Evidence should be presented demonstrating that there is sufficient unmet demand for the program in one or more of the following areas to justify duplication:

a. Student Demand

Present evidence demonstrating student demand for the program and the extent to which that demand is not being adequately met by existing programs.

b. Employer Demand

Present evidence demonstrating demand from employers for graduates of this program and the degree to which that demand is not being adequately met by existing programs.

a. Demand for Services or Intellectual Property of the Program

Present evidence demonstrating the demand for the services (e.g., contracts, consulting, or community
service) or the intellectual property (e.g., inventions and creative works) that would be produced by the students and faculty of the program and the degree to which this demand is not being adequately met by existing programs.

2. Alternative Forms of Delivery and Consortial or, Dual, or Joint Degree Programs

The proposal new program request should address the feasibility of meeting the demand for the program through alternative forms of delivery, including electronic and on-site delivery of the program. When duplication is evident, the proposal new program request should address the feasibility of joint or consortial, dual, or joint degree approaches, including through electronic means, or program delivery in order to improve quality and more effectively utilize resources.

I. Cost and Funding of the Proposed Program

The resource requirements and planned sources of funding of the proposed program must be detailed in order to assess the adequacy of the resources to support and sustain a quality program. This assessment is to ensure that the program will be efficient in its resource utilization and to assess the impact of this proposed program on the institution's overall need for funds.

Proposed programs may be financially supported in several ways. Institutions must provide evidence of adequate funding which may include, but not be limited to:

1. Reallocation of Existing Resources

The institution must provide evidence of campus funds to be reallocated to the proposed program. The source and process of reallocation must be specifically detailed. An analysis of the impact of the reduction on existing programs and/or organization units must be presented.

2. Tuition and Fees from Students New to the Institution

The institution must provide evidence of a projected increase in total student enrollments to the campus.

3. Discontinuance or Downsizing of an Existing Program or Organizational Unit

The institution must provide adequate documentation to demonstrate sufficient savings to the state to offset new costs and justify approval for the proposed program.
J. Program Review and Assessment

The institution must set forth program evaluation procedures for the proposed program. These procedures may include evaluation of courses and faculty by students, administrators, and departmental personnel as appropriate. Plans to implement program review and program outcomes level student assessment requirements as established by State Regents' policies should be detailed. Program review procedures will include standards and guidelines for the assessment of student outcomes implied by the program objectives and consistent with the institutional mission.
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AGENDA ITEM #13-c:

Academic Policy.

SUBJECT: Posting of the revised University of Oklahoma admissions process for first-time entering freshman.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents post the revised University of Oklahoma admissions process for first-time entering freshman who graduate from high schools in the United States (U.S.), as described below.

BACKGROUND:

In 1987-1988, entering freshmen at Oklahoma’s two comprehensive universities had the lowest average ACT scores, the highest freshman dropout rates, and the lowest graduation rates in the Big 8 Conference. As a result, in 1988, the State Regents adopted a multi-year phase-in of increased admission standards at the comprehensive and regional universities. By 1998, the University of Oklahoma (OU) and Oklahoma State University (OSU) had significantly improved student performance rates in these three categories.

Revisions to OU’s admission’s standards adopted by the State Regents in recent years are summarized below:

- October 1998 – Revisions included increasing performance admission standards effective with the Fall 2000 freshman class. The revisions raised the minimum ACT score to 24 and class rank to the top 30 percent, which is higher than the State Regents’ minimum standard of an ACT score of 22 and class rank of the top 33.3 percent.
- December 2000 – Revisions added a minimum ACT score of 22 to the 15-unit core curriculum 3.0 grade point average (GPA) admission option. This revision exceeded State Regents’ minimum requirements for the standardized test, high school rank option, and the 15-unit core curriculum GPA.
- February 2001 – Revisions established new admission standards for non-resident applicants. These changes included raising the ACT score required of non-residents from 24 to 26 or requiring a 3.5 GPA and top 25 percent class rank for non-resident student admission.
- October 2001 – Revisions raised admission standards for transfer students. This change raised the GPA standard for admission from 1.7 for students with 7 to 30 credit hours and 2.0 for students with more than 30 hours to 2.5 for all students with less than 60 hours.
- May 2002 – Revisions raised the class rank requirement from 30 percent to 25 percent for automatic admission, established the 3.0 GPA and 26-30 percent class rank OR 3.0 core curriculum GPA and 22 ACT/1020 SAT requirement.

These increases in admission standards have been accompanied by steady, long-term increases in enrollment, retention and graduation rates. OU's Spring 2011 six-year graduation rate was 68 percent, which represents a significant improvement over previous years.
While these admission standards impacted increased retention and graduation rates, OU set a goal to increase its retention rate to 72 percent. In 2004, President Boren empanelled a Graduation and Retention Rate Task Force (Task Force) to identify ways to increase retention and graduate rates. The Task Force reviewed relevant literature, best practices, and retention and graduation trends at the university and across the nation. OU proposes the adoption of a more “holistic” admissions process for all first-time entering freshman who graduate from high schools in the United States. Further details and analysis are provided below. The OU Board of Regents approved the holistic admissions standards and process at the March 29, 2012 meeting.

Current performance admission standards for resident and non-resident first-time entering freshman are provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Oklahoma</th>
<th>Option 1 Minimum ACT/SAT</th>
<th>Option 2 Minimum GPA and Class Rank</th>
<th>Option 3 Minimum GPA in the 15-Unit Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident: 24/1090 AND 3.0 GPA or top 50%</td>
<td>Resident: 3.0 GPA AND top 25%</td>
<td>Resident: 3.0 GPA AND ACT 22 or SAT 1020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident: 26/1170 AND 3.0 GPA or top 50%</td>
<td>Nonresident: 3.5 GPA AND top 25%</td>
<td>Nonresident: 3.0 GPA AND ACT 22 or SAT 1020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY ISSUES:**

This request is consistent with State Regents' Institutional Admission and Retention policy that establishes admission requirements and principles for institutions. Revisions are made with State Regents' approval and current standards for all State System institutions are published annually and made available to the public through the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) web page, publications, and the State Superintendent of Instruction and State System institutions. This request is consistent with OSRHE goals to increase the number of Oklahoma residents earning a college degree by promoting academic success and improving the probability of degree completion.

This new holistic admissions process applies to U.S. high school graduates only. International students will continue to be admitted based on the academic quality of their work that includes a similar performance-based process as noted in 3.9.4. Students for whom English is a second language shall be required to present evidence of proficiency in the English language prior to admission, either as first-time freshman or by transfer from another non-system college or university through the methods outlined in policy.

**ANALYSIS:**

OU’s research and study indicates that when compared to standardized test scores, high school engagement and other factors are stronger predictors of retention. Additionally, internal research further indicates some OU students who meet current admission standards exhibit characteristics and retention outcomes that suggest they are "at-risk," indicating the current automatic qualifying matrix alone is an inadequate predictor of academic success.

Institutions across the nation are pioneering a new kind of holistic admission process (e.g., The Common Application) for first-time entering freshman applicants. This process has been implemented by 456 institutions in 46 states. In addition to standardized test scores and high school GPA, the holistic review process includes consideration of multiple characteristics of applicants, including excellence in
intellectual pursuits and creative endeavors, an understanding of and respect for intellectual, social and cultural diversity, commitment to citizenship through public service, community involvement, school activities, leadership and/or family, integrity and maturity, and recognition of the benefits of a culturally and intellectually diverse academic community.

**Proposed Changes**

The significant and pivotal change outlined in this proposal is the integrated holistic admission process that includes consideration of multiple student characteristics and performance indicators that are designed to better predict student success.

OU will continue to use OSRHE minimum requirements performance-based admission standards, with the exception of Option 3 (see attached policy excerpt with strikeout and underscored sections for added text). OU does not consider Option 3 a viable predictor of success; therefore proposes to eliminate it effective Fall 2013. OU will continue to follow all OSRHE policy requirements related to admission as outlined in the *Institutional Admission and Retention* policy. Additionally, students will be admitted consistent with State Regents’ *Assessment and Remediation* policies.

It is important to note OU will not exceed alternative admission limits outlined in 3.9.6.B (8 percent of the number of previous year’s first-time freshman or 50 students, whichever is greater).

**Holistic Components and Review Process**

- The application evaluation system is based on the admission standards and academic credentials and includes an integrated analysis and use of a point system noted below:
  - **Academic Preparation and Performance (65 percent)**
    - High school curriculum, GPA, and class rank
    - Standardized test scores
  - **High School and Community Engagement, Leadership, and Other Factors (25 percent)**
    - Responses to application essay and questions
    - Recommendations from teacher and high school counselors
    - Alumni relationships
    - Extracurricular activities
    - Work experience
    - Exceptional talents
    - Writing and Self-expression (10 percent)
    - Application Essay
    - Additional writing samples

- Applicants will answer a series of questions designed to assess the cognitive and non-cognitive factors leading to academic success and persistence.

- Using a validated and reliable scoring template, trained personnel will review the applications and score the cognitive and non-cognitive success factors.

OU recognizes implementation of this new process requires technology upgrades and additional support personnel. Therefore, OU has committed the following resources to implement the holistic admissions process: four admission officers ($190,000), one system specialist ($62,000), one holistic training coordinator ($40,000), readers/scorers ($40,000), other staffing needs ($90,000), Public Communication ($70,000), and academic coaching ($200,000) for a total estimated cost of $692,000. The source of the
funding noted in OU’s proposal is increased tuition revenue generated by increasing retention. Therefore, no additional state funding will be required to implement this proposal.

**Effective Date**

Effective in the Fall 2013 semester, out-of-state high school graduates will be admitted through the OSRHE admissions standards and holistic admission’s outlined above.

To allow time to communicate the proposed changes to Oklahoma constituents, the effective date for Oklahoma high school graduates is Fall 2016 (students entering high school in Fall 2012). It is important to note that OU will require some Oklahoma high school graduates to participate in the Sooner Success Program effective in Fall 2013 if they meet current performance admissions standards. Sooner Success is an academic coaching program for students who need additional support services. This program has demonstrated success by increasing first-year retention rates for identified and participating students.

**Communications Plan**

OU will implement a comprehensive outreach plan to communicate and explain the holistic admissions process to internal and external audiences designed to increase understanding and transparency. These audiences include in-state and out-of-state high school students and their parents, high school counselors, the general public and State System institutions. To guide prospective students considering application, OU will publish an entering class profile from the previous year that displays applicant’s demographic and high school academic performance.

**Tracking, Reporting, and Evaluation**

- Students will be tracked and retention data, grades, and supplemental information will be collected and analyzed to assess the effectiveness of the holistic admissions process and these data will be used to determine any need for modification.
- OU will provide progress reports on the academic performance and success of students admitted through the holistic admissions process compared to the population of students admitted via the current performance admissions standards (i.e., Options 1, 2, and 3) with the first progress report due **September 19, 2014** and annually thereafter with a final comprehensive report due **September 15, 2018**.
- Effectiveness of the holistic admissions process will be determined by assessment of student outcomes as follows:
  - In what ways and at what levels did the holistic admissions process impact enrollment?
  - What was the impact on the overall student profile?
  - Demographic breakdown of students and their success rates.
  - Overall GPA, retention (as compared to 62 percent), and graduation rates compared to previous classes with as compared with previous first-time freshman test scores and performance.

It is recommended the State Regents post the proposed changes to OU’s admissions process to provide an opportunity for the general public, counselors, principals, Oklahoma State System institutions, and other constituents an opportunity to review and provide comment.
3.9.4 First-time entering students must also meet entry-level assessment requirements before enrolling in college-level courses. See the State Regents’ Assessment Policy for more information.

A. Minimum High School Performance Criteria for Admission of First-Time-Entering Students at Research Universities

University of Oklahoma (OU)

Oklahoma State University (OSU)

Any individual who:

1. is a graduate of a high school accredited by the appropriate regional association or by an appropriate accrediting agency of the home state or has achieved a high school equivalency certificate based on the GED;

2. has met the curricular requirements as set forth in part 3.10.3 of this policy;

3. has participated in the ACT program or a similar acceptable battery of tests; and

4. meets the following criteria by year for performance on standard tests or high school performance, is eligible for admission to either of the research universities in the State System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Performance-Based Admission Standards:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1:</strong> Standardized Tests</td>
<td>ACT or SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2:</strong> High School Performance A</td>
<td>High School GPA (All Courses) and Class Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong>: High School Performance B</td>
<td>High School GPA in State Regents’ Required 15-Unit H.S. Core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Effective Fall 2013 for out-of-state first-time-freshman and Fall 2016 for in-state first-time freshman, OU will not use Option 3 in the admission process.*
The State Regents have authorized and set separate higher admission standards for OU and OSU. Revisions are made with State Regents’ approval and current standards are published annually by OSRHE and available from each institution or the State Regents. OU is authorized to require a minimum high school GPA or class rank to correspond with standardized test scores. Effective in the Fall 2013 semester for out-of-state students and Fall 2016 for Oklahoma high school graduates, OU will implement a comprehensive new admissions process known as “holistic” admission that includes the use of standardized test scores and high school GPA and class rank (Option 1 and 2) and evaluation through a variety of processes. Additional details regarding the process may be found in the Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook.
AGENDA ITEM #13-d:

Academic Policy.

SUBJECT: Amendment to the OSRHE In-State/Out-of-State Status of Enrolled Students policy.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended the State Regents approve the amended changes to the In-State/Out-of-State Status of Enrolled Students policy.

BACKGROUND:

Revisions to the Residency Policy adopted by the State Regents in recent years are summarized below:

- April 1, 2004 - Revisions made at the April 1 meeting involved enacting legal immigration status legislation SB 596, which allowed an equitable system of determining residence status for undocumented students, Oklahoma high school graduates, military dependents, and full-time professional practitioners or workers’ dependents. Additional revisions included updating language, and updating the introduction to reflect legislative changes regarding the way tuition is determined by institutions.

- June 29, 2006 - A comprehensive revision to Chapter 2 (now Chapter 3) – Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures necessitated non-substantive changes to the Residence Status of Enrolled Students policy including format, definitions, and separating policy from procedures into the Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook to include detailed information regarding admission standards scores, frequently asked questions, and other useful information pertinent to policy application.

- October 25, 2007 - Revisions to the policy were required to enact legislation regarding undocumented students according to state law, Title 70, O.S. Section 3242 (2007), that requires a postsecondary student without lawful immigration status to establish eligibility to pay resident tuition by filing an affidavit upon admission or an application for permanent resident status in order to qualify for state financial aid.

- April 22, 2010 - Revisions included new provisions providing clarification to confusing passages, reduction to ambiguities in the policy language and clear guidance to State System institutions regarding residence status. The revisions also included a title change from Residence Status of Enrolled Students to In-State/Out-of-State Status of Enrolled Students.

- June 24, 2010 – Revisions pertained to an amendment adding language to policy section 3.17.7 Military Personnel to allow institutions better flexibility and provide clarity to better serve members of the armed forces.

It was discovered recently that the Academic Affairs In-State/Out-of-State Status of Enrolled Students policy did not contain a reference to the Budget and Fiscal Affairs policy regarding Oklahoma National Guard, which outlines the treatment of Oklahoma National Guard students who may be classified as out-of-state students according to policy.
POLICY ISSUES:

The *In-State/Out-of-State Status of Enrolled Students* sets the principles, definitions, criteria and guidelines to assist institutional officials in the classification of students as in-state or out-of-state for tuition and scholarship purposes. This change refers institutions that administer the policy to the appropriate Budget and Fiscal Affairs policy section that allows the waiver of out-of-state tuition for qualified applicants.

ANALYSIS:

The minor revision clarifies and links Chapter 3 Academic Affairs *In-State/Out-of-State Status of Enrolled Students* policy with the Chapter 4 Budget and Fiscal Affairs *Student Tuition and Fees Policy* pertaining to the Oklahoma National Guard tuition waiver. The recommended change will provide increased guidance to State System institutions and allow institutions to better serve those who contribute to the security and defense of Oklahoma and the country. An excerpt of the policy that includes the section amended is attached.

Summary of proposed change:

3.17.2 Definitions

Added the following language: For details regarding the Oklahoma National Guard, refer to Chapter 4 Budget and Fiscal Affairs policy section 4.18.5.j pertaining to eligibility requirements for the tuition waiver.

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the clarification to policy as outlined above effective immediately.

Attachment
3.3 IN-STATE/OUT-OF-STATE STATUS OF ENROLLED STUDENTS

3.3.1 Purpose

Oklahoma statute 70 O.S., Supp. 2003, §3218.2 authorizes the State Regents to establish tuition and fees charged at public institutions to in-state/out-of-state postsecondary students. This policy statement establishes definitions, principles, criteria, and guidelines to assist institutional officials in the classification of postsecondary students as in-state/out-of-state students. Also, the policy statement should be helpful to prospective students in the determination of their in-state/out-of-state status prior to enrollment or for those out-of-state students seeking to be reclassified as in-state. Determination of in-state status for purposes of attendance at an institution in the state is based primarily on domicile as defined below.

Since 1890, it has been public policy in Oklahoma to provide comprehensive, public higher education opportunities for citizens make to improve themselves, to upgrade the knowledge and skills of the Oklahoma work force, and to enhance the quality of life in Oklahoma generally. Therefore, residents of Oklahoma are afforded subsidies covering a portion of their educational costs at state colleges and universities. Out-of-state students are also provided educational subsidies, although at lower levels than those provided for permanent in-state students.

Out-of-state tuition waivers provide Oklahoma institutions the ability to attract and graduate out-of-state students with academic abilities and talents who contribute to the economic development, vitality and diversity of the state’s campuses. Additionally, Oklahoma institutions located near the state’s borders are especially sensitive to serving demographic areas where population, tax dollars, property ownership, etc., cross state borders frequently. Out-of-state tuition waivers allow institutions to serve the community and surrounding area to the benefit of the institution and its students without detriment to Oklahoma residents.

3.3.2 Definitions

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

“Dependent Person” is one who is under the care, custody, and support of a parent or legal guardian.

“Domicile” is a person's true, fixed, permanent home or habitation. It is the place where he or she intends to remain and to which he or she expects to return. A person can have more than one residence, but only one domicile. Domicile has two components -- residence and the intent to remain. When these two occur, there is domicile.
“Documented foreign national” is a person who was born outside the jurisdiction of the United States (U.S.), is a citizen of a foreign country, and has not become a naturalized U.S. citizen under U.S. law, but has entered the U.S. by way of legal documentation such as a visa.

“Full-Time Active Duty Military Personnel” for the purposes of this policy, are members of the armed forces who are on active duty for a period of more than 30 days (means active duty under a call or order that does not specify a period of 30 days or less). Personnel and their spouse and dependent children may be classified upon admission as in-state as long as they are continuously enrolled. “Armed Forces” means Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard. Such term does not include full-time National Guard duty. For details regarding the Oklahoma National Guard, refer to Chapter 4 Budget and Fiscal Affairs policy section 4.18.5.j pertaining to eligibility requirements for the tuition waiver.

“Full-Time Professional Practitioner or Worker” is a U.S. Citizen or Lawful Permanent Resident who has come to Oklahoma to practice a profession on a full-time basis, conduct a business full-time, or work on a full-time basis.
AGENDA ITEM #13-e:

Academic Policy.

SUBJECT: Approval of the revised Institutional Accreditation policy.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents’ approve the revised Institutional Accreditation policy, as described below.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents last approved revisions to the Policy and Procedures Manual on June 29, 2006, which included non-substantive revisions to the Institutional Accreditation policy. The revision incorporated current Administrative Procedures Act rules and created a more user-friendly document by using a standard format and numbering system to allow staff, institutions and the public the ability to more easily find information and locate citations.

On October 29, 2010, the United States Department of Education (USDE) released new program integrity regulations. To increase oversight of student federal financial aid within states, one of the regulations focused on the need for institutions offering distance or correspondence education to acquire authorization from any state in which it operates. This authorization is required to maintain eligibility for students of that state to receive federal financial aid. The regulation creates a need for Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) policy to include statements to guide issues related to state authorization.

An additional regulation requires institutions to make available for review to any enrolled or prospective student upon request, a copy of the documents describing an institution’s accreditation and its state, federal, or tribal approval or licensing. The regulation also requires institutions to provide its students or prospective students with contact information for filing complaints with its accreditor and with its state approval or licensing entity and any other relevant state official or agency that would appropriately handle a student’s complaint. The regulation creates a need for OSRHE policy to include a statement regarding student complaint procedures to guide students and educational institutions.

The changes outlined above require incorporation into current policy to implement the federal regulatory changes. Additional changes will be integrated to the Institutional Accreditation policy and will include a structure establishing processing fees and will include revisions to the policy to address changes to the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association accreditation standards.

POLICY ISSUES:

The primary purpose of the Institutional Accreditation policy is to protect Oklahoma citizens and to ensure postsecondary institutions meet and maintain minimum standards of quality and integrity regarding academics, administration, and related services. Moreover, the policy sets the accreditation
criteria, definitions, and criteria to become coordinated with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) to operate as a college or university in Oklahoma and award college credit or degrees. Specific changes to the policy are summarized below.

**ANALYSIS:**

In addition to non-substantive editorial changes throughout the policy, the proposed changes include establishing a definition of physical presence and statement regarding the student complaint process. These changes provide guidance to institutions in implementing policies and procedures for students to file complaints. Procedures for students to file complaints with the OSRHE against an institution will be outlined in the *Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook*

Summary of proposed changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.2 – Definitions</th>
<th>A definition for physical presence was added to provide guidance in determining what constitutes the need to become coordinated with the OSRHE to operate as a college or university in Oklahoma and award college credit or degrees.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3.B. - Out-of-State Institutions</td>
<td>A statement was added indicating that for programs otherwise exclusively online, physical presence would not include media advertisements or entering into an arrangement with any business, organization, or similar entity located in Oklahoma for the purposes of providing a clinical, externship, internship, student teaching, or similar opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.8 – Student Complaint Process</td>
<td>Consistent with the program integrity regulations released by the USDE, this statement establishes a new section in the <em>Institutional Accreditation</em> policy that directs institutions to formalize a student complaint and appeal process for students enrolled in either in- or out-of-state institutions while living in Oklahoma. Information regarding filing complaints with the State Regents against an institution will be placed in the <em>Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the proposed policy revisions to the *Institutional Accreditation* policy.

Attachment
3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY

3.4 INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

3.4.1 Purpose

A. Basis of Authorization

The Oklahoma Higher Education Code, enacted by the Oklahoma Legislature, states:

. . . Any persons, group, or other entity, establishing a private educational institution shall do so only as a corporation organized or domesticated under the laws of Oklahoma. A private educational institution shall be accredited under rules promulgated and adopted by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education unless such institution is accredited by a national or regional accrediting agency which is recognized by the Secretary of the United States Department of Education as a reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered by institutions of higher education for the purposes of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. A private educational institution shall grant only those degrees authorized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education unless approved otherwise by a national or regional accrediting agency which is recognized by the Secretary of the United States Department of Education as a reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered by institutions of higher education for the purposes of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended . . . (70 O.S, §4101 §4103; and §4104 (2001))

B. Purpose

Consumer Protection. The primary purpose of the policy is to protect Oklahoma citizens by ensuring that higher education institutions meet statutory and policy requirements regarding institutional quality. To operate as a college or university in Oklahoma and award college credit or degrees institutions must be accredited by one of the following three entities: a regional accrediting agency, a recognized national accrediting agency, or the State Regents as defined in this policy.

3.4.2 Definitions

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

“Accreditation” is the process used by the State Regents or other entities recognized by the U.S. Department Education (USDE) to ensure postsecondary education providers meet and maintain minimum standards of quality and integrity regarding academics, administration, and related services.

“Applicant” is an institution that has formally applied for initial or renewal of State Regents’ accreditation status. Additionally, regionally or nationally
accredited institutions seeking to coordinate with the State System are considered applicants.

“Comprehensive Evaluation” is the process of evaluation for both initial and renewal of State Regents’ accreditation that determines whether an institution meets the standards of educational quality detailed in this policy. The programs and operations of the institution are examined through the self-study and peer review process.

“Degree” is an academic credential conferred by a college or university as official recognition for the successful completion of an instructional program.

“Evaluation Team” is a group of peer evaluators is selected by the State Regents to gather and analyze information and conduct an on-site evaluation of an institution's programs and operations to determine if an institution meets the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality detailed in this policy.

“Evaluation Visit” is a visit to the institution by the evaluation team to analyze and evaluate an institution's ability to deliver and support quality courses and programs in the state of Oklahoma.

“Focused Visit” is an onsite visit conducted by an evaluation team to evaluate specific institutional developments and changes, or revisit concerns identified by a previous evaluation team.

“Physical Presence” is defined as having a physical location (i.e., brick and mortar), post office box, telephone or facsimile number originating within Oklahoma, offering courses or academic programs at a physical location or convening students for any purpose in Oklahoma.

“Private Higher Education Institution” is a private, denominational, or other two-year or four-year college or university which offers courses beyond the twelfth grade for which students earn credit and may be applied to satisfy the requirements for an associate’s, baccalaureate, graduate, or professional degree.

“Recognized National Accrediting Agency” is an accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary of the USDE (Secretary) as a reliable authority as to the quality of higher education institutions under Code of Federal Regulations 34 CFR §602. The Secretary periodically publishes in the Federal Register a list of recognized accrediting agencies and the scope of each agency's recognition, (e.g., the types of institutions the agency may accredit, the degrees and certificates awarded, the geographic area, and the preaccreditation status(es) that the Secretary has approved for recognition).

“Regional Accrediting Agency” is a nationally recognized accrediting agency whose geographic scope has been defined by the Secretary to include at least three states that are contiguous or in close proximity to one another. Regional accrediting agency is a voluntary non-governmental organization that establishes criteria for educational quality in the geographic region. The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities (HLC) accredits public and private/independent institutions in Oklahoma. The
HLC evaluates institutions based on Eligibility Requirements (ER) and the Criteria for Accreditation and accredits those institutions that meet these requirements.

“Review Panel” is a three-member panel appointed by the Chancellor if the institution objects to the evaluation team's recommendation of one of the following: denial, nonrenewal, or revocation of accreditation. The review panel examines the evaluation team’s report and rationale for the recommendations and makes a formal recommendation on the institution's status to the Chancellor for action by the State Regents.

“Self-Study Report” is a comprehensive description of the institution's own evaluation of its effectiveness and the extent of its compliance with the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality and the HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation. Additionally, the institution must indicate its compliance with HLC’s ERs in the self-study. The report serves as a key component in the evaluation conducted by the visiting team. The document also describes the process by which the self-study report was conducted.

“Team Chairman” is an experienced evaluation team member who leads the evaluation team visit and prepares the team report consistent with State Regents' policy and using HLC guidelines for the evaluation visit and team report. The chairman is responsible for submitting the completed team report including recommendations to the Chancellor within ten working days of the evaluation visit.

“Transferability” refers to credits earned by students at institutions accredited by a regional accrediting agency or the State Regents accepted for transfer at face value into like programs at institutions in the State System (and on a voluntary basis by private/independent institutions) consistent with the State Regents' Undergraduate Transfer and Articulation policy. Credits earned by a student at an institution accredited by a recognized national accrediting agency may be reviewed on a course-by-course basis, for possible transfer to an institution in the State System (and on a voluntary basis by private/independent institutions).

3.4.3 Accredited In- and Out-of-State Institutions

A. In-State Institutions

State System institutions are accredited by the HLC. For information purposes, public institutions will provide copies of self-study reports and final evaluation reports in a timely manner. This information will be reviewed and summarized for the State Regents. Private/independent institutions may provide copies of these reports on a voluntary basis.

B. Out-of-State Institutions

In- and out-of-state higher education institutions that are nationally or regionally accredited may become coordinated with the State System Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) by submitting a request to the Chancellor. The request will include written verification
and a description of its accreditation status including authorization to offer courses and programs in other states. Additionally, the request must include a course catalog, anticipated course and program offerings, faculty hiring procedures and qualifications, tuition and fee structure, and the location where courses and programs will be offered. Once coordinated with the State System OSRHE, changes in the institution's accreditation status or offerings programs offered must be reported immediately to the Chancellor.

Out-of-state institutions nationally or regionally accredited, as noted in the preceding paragraph, offering college-level courses and programs in Oklahoma via electronic technology are expected to adhere to the same high standards of program delivery as Oklahoma institutions subscribe. Therefore, out-of-state institutions are encouraged strongly to follow the academic standards of best practices in distance learning as detailed outlined in the State Regents' Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs Policy policy. Institutions that offer college-level courses and programs completely online, with no physical presence in Oklahoma, do not fall under the jurisdiction of this policy. For the purposes of this policy, for programs otherwise completely online, physical presence does not include media advertisements or entering into an arrangement with any business, organization, or similar entity located in Oklahoma for the purposes of providing a clinical, externship, internship, student teaching, or similar opportunity. The onus shall be on the student for entering into an agreement for these activities.

3.4.4 Unaccredited Private Institutions

State Regents' standards, policies, and procedures for accreditation are modeled on those of HLC. Accreditation of a college or university by the State Regents means that standards and policies prescribed for accreditation by the State Regents' policy have been satisfied. Institutions accredited pursuant to this policy are encouraged to become accredited by the regional accrediting agency, HLC.

HLC's Eligibility Requirements (ERs) establish baseline benchmarks for institutions seeking accreditation by the State Regents. The team will explore the institution's ability to meet the HLC’s ERs as evidenced by the institution's self-study report and the evaluation visit.

To achieve accreditation without qualification, an institution is required to meet the HLC's ERs and each State Regents' Standard of Educational Quality as well as address the HLC Criteria for Accreditation in the institutional self-study report and the evaluation visit.

A. Initial Application

Preliminary Conference: The institution's president will contact the Chancellor or his designee and request a meeting to discuss the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality and the procedures necessary to achieve State Regents' accreditation. The accreditation policy and
related State Regents' policies, HLC’s ERs, and the current HLC Criteria for Accreditation will be provided.

Application: To apply for consideration of accreditation, the president will submit a formal letter of request and a document addressing the proposed institution's response to HLC's ERs, as well as any documentation required by the State Regents. Upon receipt of these documents, the official accreditation process begins. Institutions will be required to follow the procedure outlined in this policy, which include an institutional self-study report and an on-site evaluation visit to determine if the institution meets the State Regents’ Standards of Educational Quality. The Chancellor will appoint a staff member to serve as liaison to the institution during the evaluation process. The anticipated time period for the team evaluation visit will be communicated.

B. Evaluation Visit Expenses

Full cost for the evaluation visit will be paid by the institution receiving the service. Such costs include the evaluation team members' honoraria, travel, lodging, and food in accordance with Oklahoma state travel laws. If an institution objects to the team recommendation and a review panel is appointed (see Procedures for Denial, Revocation, or Nonrenewal of Accreditation in this subsection), the institution will pay for the full cost of the review panel. If the State Regents determine that one or more members of the evaluation team are to be present at the review panel hearing, the cost will be borne by the State Regents.

C. Withdrawal of Application

At any time during the process, the institution may withdraw its application, but will be required to pay any expenses incurred to that point by the State Regents’ office.

D. Standards of Educational Quality

The State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality establish the foundation and requirements for State Regents' accreditation. A team evaluating an institution applying for initial or renewal of accreditation examines carefully whether the institution meets each standard by using HLC's current five Criteria for Accreditation which is adopted by reference as part of this policy. For example, educational standard 1 pertaining to Educational Mission and Objectives calls for a clear, concise, and realistic mission statement. Examples are provided throughout the policy for illustrative purposes and are not intended to limit the scope or operation of this policy. HLC criterion one asks for decision-making processes that are appropriate to the institution's stated mission and purposes. It is important to note that outstanding performance in an area covered by one standard or criterion does not compensate for unacceptable performance in another. The State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality are described below:
1. Educational Mission and Objectives

An institution accredited by the State Regents must develop a clear and realistic statement of its basic purposes as a member of the higher education community. A mission appropriate to higher education will place a high priority on educational excellence and support high expectations of students. Each institution may also define additional aims such as contributing to the development of the community or to help students prepare for a life in a democratic society.

While the mission states the institution's broad purposes, the educational objectives are more specific ways of ensuring that the mission is achieved. Examples of such objectives include the provision of student support services, laboratory and other specialized facilities, graduate placement assistance, off-campus offerings, and other arrangements.

Each applicant or accredited institution also defines additional objectives which reflect its particular character. These objectives are to be realistically determined with consideration of factors such as the institution's founding purpose, education vision, community needs, and its resources—human, physical, and fiscal. Each institution also defines additional objectives which reflect its particular character. Some examples are: helping students to prepare for employment, for the next level of education, for specialized research and public service, or simply for life in society. The institution's statement of mission should result from discussions among both faculty and administration and must be approved by the governing board. The statement of mission and objectives should be widely disseminated among members of the institution and its community through appropriate institutional publications, including the catalog.

2. Governance and Administration

The governance of colleges and universities in the United States has historically been a partnership between lay control and professional administration. Legal control and broad policy-making responsibilities for institutions have been vested in lay boards of trustees/regents, whereas responsibilities for recommending and implementing educational policy have traditionally resided with college presidents and faculties. Higher education as an activity is too important to be given over exclusively either to the lay person or the professional; therefore, the responsibility for its governance is balanced between those who are the chief recipients of its benefits and those who are its practitioners. Governing board (board) members link the institution to society and therefore should reflect society's diversity and be knowledgeable about the problems of both the institution and the society.
The board should act as an autonomous body, free from undue influence by owners, employees, political or business entities, or other interest groups. It should govern freely without political bias and should protect the institution from political pressures. Board members should have a clear idea of their general duties and responsibilities and should define them in an official policy document based on its corporate charter and bylaws. The board should appoint a president empowered to operate within board policies according to clearly stated administrative code. It is generally agreed that the most important functions of a board are to select a president, to be responsible for the institutions property and funds, and to oversee the educational programs of the institution. The crucial test of a board's operating effectiveness is the extent to which it concentrates its energies on policy matters and avoids concerning itself with administrative detail. Evaluation should concentrate on the board's effectiveness in performing its function of institutional policy making. Other factors include the method of board selection, organizational structure, terms of service, and frequency of meetings.

A clear differentiation between the policy-making function of the board and the executive responsibilities of those who carry out these policies is essential. The administrative officer should be free to operate within board policies, according to a carefully developed administrative code. Such conditions are basic to the exercise of effective, far-sighted leadership in institutional development and advancement of objectives.

Administration is concerned with every aspect of the organization and operation of an institution. The first essential for a strong institution is a carefully planned administrative organization which coordinates all the resources effectively toward the accomplishment of the institutional mission and objectives. This organization should provide for responsible participation in decision making, execution, and evaluation by various constituent groups. The complexity of the organization will necessarily vary with the nature and scope of the educational programs offered, but both its structure and the accompanying operation procedures should be clearly defined and understood by all.

The administration's commitment to fair and equitable treatment of students, faculty, and staff as well as the public is reflected in appropriate policies and procedures on equity, nondiscrimination, and due process. Manuals and handbooks spelling out the rights and responsibilities of all members of the institution are made available and a conscientious effort is made to carry out such provisions.
3. Educational Programs

Institutions will comply with the State Regents' Undergraduate Degree Requirements Policy.

An institution accredited by the State Regents is a degree-granting institution and includes programs leading to degrees as part or all of its offerings. The institution demonstrates the effort to:

a. formulate educational goals that are consistent with its mission, reflective of higher education, and focused on reorganized fields of study;

b. develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which the educational goals are being achieved; and

c. use the results of these evaluations to improve educational programs and services.

Academic program quality is expressed through effective student learning and eventual job performance. Quality of academic programs can be determined through assessment of curriculum, instructional delivery, demand, and student improvement. Instruments or measures to evaluate academic programs may include: standardized tests, portfolios, completion rates, performance of transfer students at receiving institutions, results of admission tests for students applying to graduate or professional schools, job placement rates, results of licensing examinations, student evaluations, employer evaluations, program advisory committees, and follow-up studies of alumni.

It is expected that an institution will focus its resources and energies on the education of its students consistent with its mission. Effectiveness in all educational programs, delivery systems, and support structures should be the primary goal. An effective institution of higher education provides a challenging academic environment and seeks to ensure student academic achievement, intellectual inquisitiveness, personal and professional development, ethical consciousness, academic freedom, faculty support, and an environment conducive to learning. The development, evaluation, and revision of academic programs must involve the faculty in a central way.

Auxiliary activities, such as subsidiary or related business ventures, must be conducted within general policies governing institutional relationships and consistent with the institution's mission and purposes.

An institution accredited by the State Regents must have a well-designed general education component as an integral part of its
undergraduate degree programs. General education is a required part of every student's program of study. It is not directly related to the student's area of specialization or career interests. It includes the characteristics of requiring a certain number or proportion of the total credits earned and course selections that ensure breadth of learning across the major disciplinary fields.

The institution's general education requirements must be supported by a coherent philosophy and rationale consistent with its mission and be well-understood and widely supported within its academic and administrative departments. Development and periodic review of the philosophy should involve all major constituencies, including faculty, administrators, and governing board members. The rationale and plan for general education may focus on the pattern of coverage across the disciplinary fields or on the competencies and skills expected to be developed. Examples of the former include communications, social sciences, humanities and fine arts, natural sciences, and mathematics. Examples of the latter include critical thinking, communication skills, ethical awareness, quantitative facility, research and independent learning abilities, and others.

4. Faculty

The selection, development, and retention of a competent faculty are related to the mission performance of the institution. Faculty are responsible for developing students to represent the characteristics defined in the institution's mission. An effective reward system links faculty objectives to institutional mission. The successful institution provides for adequate faculty participation in the development of institutional policies, particularly those governing academic affairs, student academic advising, assessment techniques and including mission refinement. The organization should encourage regular faculty communication within and across disciplines as well as between faculty and administration.

The number and type of full-time faculty members must reflect mission priorities and be appropriate to provide effective teaching, mentoring, research, community service, and administrative expertise in areas such as curriculum development and program assessment. Records of faculty performance should indicate their devotion to the above tasks as appropriate through the institution's mission indicators such as teaching contact hours, teaching portfolios, student evaluations, faculty development efforts, research production, awards, community service hours, and committee work. The continuous professional growth of all members of the faculty should be encouraged, and the institution should assist members of the faculty to further their professional development.
Effective faculty recruitment depends on the institution's ability to provide adequate salaries, a well-planned program of benefits, and an attractive working environment conducive to the transfer and development of knowledge. The level and kind of faculty salaries and the program of benefits should be regularly re-examined to keep them current with changing economic and social conditions. Faculty diversity will represent the institution's commitment to its social responsibilities.

A majority of the faculty in undergraduate degree programs should hold degrees at least one level above that of the programs in which they teach. Most faculty teaching in graduate programs should hold earned doctorates. It is also expected that an institution will employ faculty members whose highest degrees are from regionally accredited institutions. In exceptions to this standard, institutions must show evidence that their faculty members have appropriate academic preparation.

The employment of part-time faculty members can provide additional educational expertise to the institution while expanding student access, but the number and kinds of part-time faculty members must be regulated to protect program quality. Part-time faculty members teaching courses for credit must meet the same professional experiential requirements as their full-time counterparts teaching in the same disciplines. An institution should establish and publish policies regulating the employment of part-time faculty and provide them with appropriate orientation, supervision, and evaluation.

5. Library

The library is the institution's storehouse of knowledge and electronic portal to the global information community. The purpose of information resources and services is to support teaching, learning, and research in ways consistent with, and supportive of, the mission and goals of the institution. Information resources may include the holdings, equipment, and personnel within libraries, media and production centers, computer centers, telecommunications, and other repositories of information significant to the accomplishment of the institution's mission.

Quality information service depends on professional staff who hold the necessary expertise to lead institutional efforts in the development and use of educational resources and services. Opportunities are provided for faculty, staff, and students to participate in the planning and development of these services. Policies and regulations on information resources should be updated and made available to the institution's constituents.
Professional and technical support staff shall function with clearly defined responsibilities.

Services (instruction, consultation, professional development) are provided to faculty and students to meet their educational needs. Personnel treat the library as a hands-on classroom and engage strategies that invite student interest, encourage student questioning, and guide student resource searches. Personnel exercise initiative to inform faculty and administrators about new developments in teaching and learning technologies.

Access to information resources is a priority of the institution. Resources in libraries, computer centers and labs, media centers, and other instructional information locations are readily available to the institution's constituents. Computing and communications services extend information gathering beyond the library's physical boundaries to include international databases. Library staff should work to coordinate electronic access for institution and community constituents to search its holdings and make information requests. Efforts or plans to convert holdings for electronic transfer should be underway.

Cooperative relationships and links with other institutions and agencies should be encouraged to increase the ability of the institution to provide the needed resources and services not only to its own constituents but to potential users from other institutions agreeing to share their resources. Formal written cooperative agreements are encouraged between libraries. These cooperative relationships and external information services are not a substitute for an institution's responsibility to provide its own adequate and accessible core collection and services.

The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the adequacy and utilization of its information resources, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, and at all locations where courses or programs are offered. The institution uses the results of the evaluation to improve the effectiveness of these resources. Institutions should link their budget decision making to the assessment results and consistently provide the library financial support ranging from a minimum of five to six percent of its educational and general budget.

6. Students

Institutions will comply with the State Regents' Institutional Admissions and Retention Policy policy.

Students are not just education consumers but participants in collegiate learning, research, and community service. The institutional mission should describe the characteristics of its ideal students, then recruit, retain, and develop them. As
eventual participants in society, the student body should reflect society's diversity. Institutional effectiveness is determined through assessment of its students. Successful institutions should utilize entry-level, mid-level, and exit assessments of students as part of their self-study report and continuous improvement process.

The institution shall demonstrate it has made an effort to support all students in achieving their educational goals. Appropriate policies and procedures for student development programs and services must be established and be operational. The goals of each functional area must be compatible with and support the goals of one another.

The institution should publish and make available to potential students a catalog describing courses and curriculum, tuition and refund policies, and other matters. An additional appropriate publication is the student handbook. Policies included in the student handbook should include student rights and responsibilities, including academic honesty, redress of grievances and complaints, and procedural rights. The student handbook should be well-publicized, readily available, and implemented in a fair and consistent manner. Information release policies respect the rights of individual privacy, the confidentiality of records, the best interest of students and the institution, and are in compliance with local, state, and federal statutes and guidelines.

A program of counseling and testing should assist students in making appropriate decisions in matters of personal concerns, academic choices, and career paths. The institution should make use of educational, career, and psychological assessment tools to evaluate the capabilities and interests of the students. Accurate assessment information on students should be provided to academic advisors and counselors, and placement and achievement test data should be interpreted to the individual student.

Student services should participate in ongoing assessment activities relating to students' needs and to student services functions, with special emphasis on the relationship of student services to student retention. Evaluation should be a regular function of program development and modification. Academic advising should include an assessment component which provides direction for modifying the advising program and enhancing student success. Additionally, the institution should develop systematic and dependable methods of gathering data on student characteristics and performance. Such data may be used for institutional research, external reporting, and other purposes.
The institution should provide opportunities for students to participate in campus governance, institutional decision making, and policy and procedures development, and must involve faculty in the development of student services programs and policy. Institutions offering career-oriented programs should assist students in developing skills to secure employment upon program completion. They should maintain continuing contact with prospective employers in professions and other occupations related to their programs. Institutions may also assist students in securing part-time employment while pursuing their education.

7. Finances

The management of financial resources for a postsecondary institution determines, in part, the quality of academic programs. Sources of income, distribution of expenditures, operating budgets, indebtedness, surpluses, audits, capital outlay, and sound financial management are issues to be addressed in the accreditation process. A key assumption underlying financial management policies should be that financial resources are tools of the educational enterprise, never the reverse. The adequacy of financial resources and the pattern of expenditures of an institution are to be judged in relation to its mission and objectives, the diversity and scope of its programs, and the number and kinds of its students.

There should be a well-conceived organizational plan assigning responsibilities of the various activities that together comprise the business and financial affairs of the institution. The chief business or financial officer should be one of the principal administrative officers of the institution. Among the key functions that should be performed by the chief business or financial officer is assistance to the president in the preparation of annual budgets. Faculty and department chairs should also have a substantial role in the academic budgetary process. Other key functions are maintenance of an appropriate system of accounting and financial reporting, supervision of the operation and maintenance of the physical plant, procurement of supplies and equipment, control of inventories, financial management of auxiliary enterprises, and receipt, custody, and disbursement of funds belonging to the institution.

Institutions should demonstrate that their sources of income, distribution of expenditures, operating budgets, indebtedness, surpluses, capital outlay, and financial management have been utilized to successfully execute their missions. Institutions should forecast future development with respect to changes in enrollment and evolving community needs. Institutions with students that receive financial aid must maintain compliance with federal regulations including a requirement for management of excessive student loan default rates. Institutions must report
any difficulty in maintaining compliance to the State Regents as part of the institutions overall financial picture.

In this context, institutions shall demonstrate at least a three-year history of satisfactory financial management, which includes a three-year history of amounts borrowed (internal and external) for capital outlay and for operating funds. The institution must also report the amount of interest and principal paid on such debts including a statement of operating income used in debt service.

In addition to such other audits as may be required by the governing board of the administration of the institution, the governing board shall annually obtain the services of an independent accounting firm that is licensed to practice public accounting to perform a complete financial audit of the institution.

8. Facilities, Materials, Equipment and Grounds

Buildings, materials, equipment and grounds should be designed and maintained to serve the needs of the institution in relation to its stated purposes. There should be sufficient campus area to provide adequately for buildings and such activities as are related to the educational programs of the institution. A master plan for campus development should be maintained.

Sufficient rooms for classes of various sizes should be available to meet the instructional needs of the institution. These should be properly lighted and adequately equipped, heated, and ventilated. Classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities should be properly scheduled for maximum utilization. Laboratory equipment, instructional facilities, furnishings, and expenditures should be adequate to meet institutional needs. As a part of its operational and strategic planning, the institution should develop and periodically update a long-term plan for the maintenance and replacement of equipment and laboratory facilities. Programs requiring special facilities should not be offered unless the appropriate facilities are available. Consistent with the guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, arrangements should be made for handicapped access to campus buildings and facilities.

Adequate landscaping should be utilized to divide the campus into attractive and useful areas. Satisfactory parking space should be available, and attention given to protect and enhance the safety and security of students on campus.

Space utilization studies should be made to determine actual needs before the addition of new facilities. It is strongly recommended that administrative officers and faculty members
who are to occupy or direct the activities of a new building be consulted during the planning stages.

When an institution does not have its own campus but rents instructional facilities or when an institution does have a campus but rents facilities away from campus so as to extend its programs into the community, it must demonstrate that the facilities so used are instructionally adequate, especially where laboratories, specialized instructional equipment, and library and information resources are known to be necessary for acceptable educational programs.

9. Planning

An accreditable institution is guided by leaders with a vision of its future and a long-range perspective on the means necessary to reach that future. The basis for the institution's attempts to achieve its mission and to continue to improve is a long-range plan and a set of active and participative planning processes.

Long-range planning should be conducted in a manner that includes all functional areas and groups within the institution and draws upon internal and external data and data analysis. Basic characteristics of such planning are environmental assessments and forecasts of current and emerging trends.

Departmental and functional planning should be integrated within broader planning processes and reflected in the allocation of financial, physical, and human resources. Planning processes should be ongoing and produce annual planning documents that are widely distributed and well-understood within the institution and used as a basis for decision making. Annual planning processes should be conducted to adjust existing plans at all levels and to extend the scope of planning further into the future.

A key set of inputs to the planning process is the range of activities and measures that represent institutional assessment. Like well-designed planning processes, effective institutional assessment involves all major constituencies and is shaped by the institution's mission and educational purposes. It is characterized by multiple measures and focuses on using the results to improve educational programs in order to strengthen learning and achievement. The institution must provide evidence that planning efforts have been implemented.

Continuous improvement of the institution is the ultimate goal of institutional planning and assessment. In a changing social, economic, technological, and educational environment, institutions must be committed to evaluating their current performance in order to make necessary changes and position themselves in relation to future needs as they seek to achieve
their missions. Institutions should therefore set educational improvement as a key goal and should be able to demonstrate that they have achieved this goal.

An institution must have a contingency plan should the institution close. The contingency plan must outline the procedures for the disposition of all student records, including educational billing, accounting, and financial aid records in an accessible location, an explanation of how the school would notify students in the event of closure, and a proposed teach-out agreement with one or more institutions in reasonable geographic proximity which currently offer programs similar to those offered at the institution.

E. Institutional Self-Study Report

The self-study report (defined in section 3.1.2) plays an important role in the accreditation process. It is the foundation for the evaluation for initial and renewal of accreditation. The self-study report demonstrates the institution's ability to analyze its effectiveness and develop plans for its own improvement. It provides an opportunity for the institution to show its effectiveness in meeting the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality, HLC's Criteria for Accreditation, and HLC's ERs.

In preparing its self-study report for submission to the State Regents, an institution should involve all of its affected constituencies including administration, faculty, staff, governing board members, and students. Outside stakeholders should also be involved as appropriate, including alumni, advisory groups, and citizens of the community.

The self-study report should be a well-written, readable narrative that communicates the institution's compliance with the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality. It should be evaluative rather than merely descriptive and written with the other materials its readers will have access to in mind. The following information must accompany or be included in the self-study: faculty and student handbooks, the institutional catalog, official financial audits (last three years), the institution's federal regulatory status (if applicable), licensing or cooperative agreements, and any other information requested by the State Regents.

The self-study report will include a table of contents organized by the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality and an introduction that provides the context for the evaluation. A brief history of the institution and its accreditation status should also be included. The body of the report must include a self-evaluation of the institution's compliance with each of the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality as correlated with HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. The State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality include the requirement of compliance with State Regents' Policy Standards of Educational Quality, Sections 3.1.4.D.3 Educational Programs, and 3.1.4.D.6 Students. Institutions will explain
within each Standard of Educational Quality how they are in compliance with these Regents' policies. The report should also include tables with statistical data regarding enrollment, programs, student charges, faculty, library, finances, and other pertinent topics. Such data should be used to conduct the necessary analysis and to support conclusions within the self-evaluation process. If the application is for renewal of accreditation, it must address the concerns expressed in the latest evaluation team report.

Five copies of the institutional self-study report, along with five copies of all materials noted above, must be filed in the Chancellor's office 90 days prior to the expiration date shown on the Certificate of Accreditation or for initial application by a new institution, at a date specified by the Chancellor. Any exceptions to this requirement must be in writing and must be approved by the Chancellor prior to the date such materials are due. Failure to provide the information required by this policy in a timely manner could have adverse consequences for the institution. Specifically, if an institution fails to provide information applicable to a given accreditation standard, the institution may be deemed not to have met that standard. If the institution fails to provide information necessary for a meaningful on-site evaluation, the visit will not be conducted, and the institution may be presumed not to meet the accreditation standards of educational quality.

Additional guidance for the self-study report can be found in a current copy of the HLC Handbook for Accreditation.

F. On-site Evaluation Process

The purpose of the evaluation process is to determine if the institution meets the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality. The primary methods for achieving this purpose are:

1. the institutional self-study report, and

2. an on-site evaluation of the institution's programs and operations by an evaluation team.

3. The evaluative criteria for determining the institution's efficacy in meeting the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality will be the current NCA Criteria for Accreditation.

G. State Regents' Staff Role in the Evaluation Process

The role of State Regents' staff in the evaluation process is to coordinate the logistics and materials in preparation for the evaluation visit and to serve as a liaison between the team and the institution. It is the responsibility of State Regents' staff to inform the team members of their charge and of the State Regents' policies related to accreditation as well as serve as a facilitator for the evaluation visit. State Regents' staff will only accompany the team at the beginning and conclusion of the visit.
The staff will not in any way actively participate in the evaluation team's work.

In preparation for State Regents' action on the team's report and recommendation, the staff will provide historical, policy, and factual context information to the State Regents.

H. Evaluation Visit

1. Team Selection: An effort will be made to select individuals who understand the uniqueness and nature of the institution under review. An effort will also be made to insure that the team includes individuals who have had significant professional experience with institutions of the type under review. In selecting individuals to serve on evaluation teams, the State Regents will seek out those persons who are best qualified, regardless of sex, race, religion, or national origin. Unless extenuating circumstances exist that cause the State Regents to select an in-state evaluator, the evaluators will be selected from out of state. The institution has the opportunity to express in writing suggestions for the areas of expertise and types of institutional representation it prefers. A list of potential team members will be provided to the institution before final selection occurs. Every effort will be made to alleviate institutional concerns about potential team members prior to selection of the team. However, the institution does not have the authority to veto a potential team member(s).

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 (see definition of team chairman). Guidance for the team chairman as it relates to the evaluation visit will be provided by the HLC Handbook of Accreditation.

Team members will be required to sign a conflict of interest form provided by the State Regents' office. This form signifies that the individual team member has no association with the institution and does not stand to benefit in any way from its accreditation or lack thereof.

2. Length of the on-site evaluation visit: Typically the evaluation visit, whether for initial or renewal of accreditation, will be scheduled for two to three days. The dates for the evaluation visit will be determined by the State Regents' staff members who will coordinate with the institution before confirming the dates in writing. Unless extenuating circumstances exist, renewal of accreditation evaluation visits are to be scheduled well before the State Regents' accreditation expires.
3. Materials for the Team’s Review: The self-study report, catalogs, and other pertinent materials will be forwarded to the team members, if possible, in advance of the evaluation. Other materials may be requested as appropriate before or during the on-site evaluation.

4. Team Room: A comfortable room with adequate facilities should be set aside for the team to perform its work for the duration of the on-site visit.

5. On-Site Interviews: The team chairman will schedule interviews with key institutional personnel, faculty, students, board members and others as part of the evaluation process.

6. Exit Interview: The team chairman will schedule a meeting with the president to summarize the team’s findings and recommendation. Other members of the institution may be invited to the exit session at the discretion of the president. The exit session will provide the institution with an oral preview of all the major points that will appear in the team report.

I. State Regents’ Action

The five State Regents' accreditation actions are provided below:

1. Accreditation without Qualification

The institution fully meets HLC's ERs and the standards of educational quality, as correlated with HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Accreditation status is for a period of five years with a formal reevaluation at a date set by State Regents' action.

2. Initial Candidacy

This category is only open to new applicants for accreditation. The institution meets HLC's ERs and the minimum State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality, but corrective measures are required to enable the institution to fully meet all the standards as correlated with HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation. Corrective measures along with time lines for improvement will be communicated to the institution. A formal evaluation visit will take place at a date set by State Regents' action. Initial candidacy is limited to a period of six years.

3. Probationary Accreditation

The institution fully meets HLC's ERs, but conditions exist at an accredited institution that endangers its ability to meet the standards of educational quality, as correlated with HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Corrective measures along with time lines for improvement will be communicated to the institution
with a formal evaluation at a date set by State Regents' action. Probationary accreditation may not exceed a total period of three years with a formal evaluation at a date set by State Regents' action. Institutions that move to probationary accreditation status from initial candidacy will be limited to a maximum of two years in this category. When the time limit expires, the institution will be required to achieve Accreditation without Qualification or HLC accreditation.

4. Denial of Accreditation

The institution does not meet HLC's ERs or the standards of educational quality, as correlated with HLC's Criteria for Accreditation outlined in this policy, and its initial application for accreditation is denied. Institutions facing this action are entitled to due process under Procedures for Denial, Revocation, or Nonrenewal of Accreditation (3.1.4.K). The institution may pursue program improvement and reapply at a later time.

5. Nonrenewal or Revocation of Accreditation

An institution's accreditation is revoked or is not renewed due to its failure to correct deficiencies to achieve "Accreditation without Qualification" within the applicable time periods required by this policy or the institution otherwise does not meet HLC's ERS and the standards of educational quality, as correlated with HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Institutions facing this action are entitled to due process under Procedures for Denial, Revocation, or Nonrenewal of Accreditation. The institution may pursue program improvement and reapply at a later time.

J. Post Evaluation Visit

1. Team Report and Recommendations: Following the evaluation visit, the team will prepare a report of its visit 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 working days following the evaluation visit.

The team report will address all of the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality applicable to the institution's evaluation. The report will provide a fair and balanced view of the institution's compliance with each of the Standards at the time of the visit. With respect to non-compliance of a standard, the team must identify the specific Standard involved and provide examples of ways in which the standard is not met. Recommendations for improvement should be made with sufficient specificity as to allow meaningful follow-up evaluation.
A statement of recommendation will be included in the Evaluation Team's report and should be supported by a clear and explicit rationale based on the State Regents' Standards of Educational Quality. The recommendation must be consistent with this policy and will be one of the following: accreditation without qualification, initial candidacy, probationary accreditation, denial of accreditation, or nonrenewal or revocation of accreditation (as described in 3.1.4.I State Regents’ Action).

2. Institutional Response: The Chancellor will promptly forward a copy of the Evaluation Team's report and recommendation to the president of the institution. Institutional representatives will be afforded an opportunity to correct any factual errors in the report. 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.

3. State Regents' Action: The Chancellor will submit to the State Regents for their consideration the evaluation team's report and recommendation and the review panel recommendation (if applicable) together with any other pertinent information relating to the institution's request for accreditation. An institutional representative may address to the State Regents comments pertinent to the issue of the applicant's fitness for accreditation. After full consideration of the matter, the State Regents will make a decision on final disposition of the institution's request for accreditation, and will take one of the following actions: accreditation without qualification, initial candidacy, probationary accreditation, denial of accreditation, or revocation of accreditation. The institution will be officially notified of State Regents' action on the application for accreditation.

4. Certificate of Accreditation: If the decision of the State Regents is to extend accreditation, a Certificate of Accreditation, identifying the type and expiration date of the accreditation accorded, will be issued and sent to the president of the institution.

5. Public Disclosure: The institution must make public the action of the State Regents with regard to its accreditation status. The institution's accreditation status shall be described accurately and completely in its advertisements, brochures, catalogs, and other publications.

K. Procedures for Denial, Revocation, or Nonrenewal of Accreditation

When the team recommendation for accreditation is denied, revoked, or non-renewed, its due process rights will be governed and limited by 75
O.S., §314 (2001), and any pertinent amendments. Those provisions of the Oklahoma Administrative Procedures Act (APA) pertaining to individual proceedings, 75 O.S. §309 (2001), et seq., are not applicable to State Regents' accreditation decisions. The following procedures will apply specifically to denial, nonrenewal, and revocation actions.

1. **Objections by Institutions:** The institution will have 10 days from the receipt of the final evaluation team's report to inform the Chancellor, in writing, of any objections it may have thereto. If the institution does not object, the evaluation team's report and recommendations will be forwarded to the State Regents for their consideration and action.

2. **Forming a Review Panel:** If the institution objects to the evaluation team's report, the Chancellor will convene a neutral three-member panel of educators to consider the institution's objections. The Chancellor will also designate a lawyer to serve as a non-voting legal advisor to the panel. The institution will have a reasonable opportunity to object, for good cause shown, to the Chancellor's appointees to the panel.

3. **Review Panel Hearing:** The review panel schedule a hearing in a timely fashion at which the institution's objections to the evaluation team's report will be fully considered. The institution may call its own witnesses and may question any witness called by the State Regents. If requested, the State Regents will produce, at the institution's expense, the evaluation team members.

   The institution may be represented at this hearing by persons of its own choosing, including legal counsel. Notwithstanding the participation of legal counsel, it should be recognized that the State Regents do not have the authority in such hearings to issue subpoenas or to compel sworn testimony.

   The State Regents will arrange to have an audio recording made of the hearing, a copy of which shall be furnished to the institution. Either the State Regents or the institution may, at its own expense, arrange for a transcription of the hearing.

4. **Review Panel's Proposed Findings:** Within 15 days of the hearing, the panel will issue proposed findings addressing the objections raised by the institution. The findings will be supported by, and based solely upon, testimonial and documentary submissions at the hearing and on matters officially noted at the hearing. The panel's proposed findings will be submitted, together with any other records from the hearing, to the State Regents at their next regular meeting.

5. **State Regents' Action:** The State Regents, after considering the panel's findings, the evaluation team's report, and the rest of the
official record pertaining to the accreditation application, will take appropriate action on the institution's application. No new evidentiary materials will be received at the State Regents' meeting. The institution will, however, be given the opportunity to present to the State Regents remarks in support of fitness for accreditation. The State Regents' consideration of these matters and action taken thereon will constitute a final State Regents' review of the institution's application for accreditation.

L. Renewal of Accreditation

A schedule will be set by State Regents' action following an institution's evaluation. The frequency of evaluation visits will vary from institution to institution depending upon the respective institution's accreditation status. Institutions on probation or in initial candidacy status will be required to address specific areas of concern. Additionally, if the situation warrants, a comprehensive evaluation may be performed at the same time as the focused visit. The institution will be notified promptly after State Regents' action of the scheduled expiration date of its accreditation and the requirements for renewal. This notice will also inform the institution of the scope of the evaluation visit and the deadline for the receipt of the institution's self-study report. The anticipated time period for the evaluation visit will be communicated. In any event, an institution which desires renewal of its State Regents' accreditation must so inform the Chancellor, in writing, four months (120 days) prior to the expiration date stated on its certificate of accreditation.

3.4.5 Required Annual Reporting

Institutions accredited by the State Regents or coordinated with the State Regents will report enrollment, student credit hours, and other information in the format prescribed on an annual basis.

3.4.6 Reporting Institutional Change in Condition

Institutions covered by this policy are required to immediately advise the State Regents, in writing, of any substantive change in its objectives, scope, ownership or control, financial status, geographic area of offerings, programs, or any other significant matter. The institution is required to notify the State Regents of any significant action by other accreditation or governmental regulatory bodies. Under such circumstances, the State Regents may require additional focused or comprehensive visits and/or such other actions as are appropriate in light of relevant facts. In addition to scheduling evaluation visits, the Regents may require reports on specific changes. Such reports may also trigger evaluation visits or provide information for scheduled visits.

3.4.7 Publications

All institutions operating in the state of Oklahoma shall detail prominently in all appropriate publications and promotional materials its current and complete accreditation status. Institutions shall not make misleading, deceptive, and/or
inaccurate statements in brochures, catalogs, web sites, or other publications. Disclosure of the institution's complete accreditation status shall be in boldface print and in a manner reasonably calculated to draw the attention of the reader. Such disclosure must also include information about the transferability of courses. Failure to make required disclosures or the making of misleading statements about the institution's accreditation status is prohibited. These requirements also apply to unaccredited institutions that offer certificates or diplomas.

3.1.8 Student Complaint Process

In- and out-of-state institutions shall include student complaint procedures and a complaint appeal process in the student handbook or other student information documents and will provide enrolled and prospective students living in Oklahoma with contact information, upon request, for filing complaints against the institution at the institutional level.

In- and out-of-state institutions will also provide enrolled and prospective students living in Oklahoma with contact information, upon request, for filing complaints with the appropriate state agency or with the institution’s accrediting body.

Information regarding filing complaints with the State Regents against an institution can be found in the Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook.

3.1.89 Teach-Out Agreements and Records Disposition

The Chancellor must be notified immediately if loss of institutional accreditation or closure is imminent. Official notification may originate from the institution or the accrediting agency, but must be received within ten working days of action taken against an institution. Institutions that face imminent loss of accreditation will arrange formal teach-out agreements with surrounding institutions as coordinated with the State Regents’ office. Arrangements for loss of accreditation or closure should also include student notification (present and former students), processes for addressing issues relating to degree or course completion before the school closes, and detailed plans (including contact information and location and maintenance of the records) regarding issuing official transcripts and release of records. Additionally, specific procedures regarding the accrediting agencies’ procedures and obligations under Title IV of the Higher Education Act will be followed.

AGENDA ITEM #13-f:

Academic Policy.

SUBJECT: Approval of the Professional Programs policy.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve revisions to the Professional Programs policy, as described below.

BACKGROUND:

In 2009, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Educations’ Professional Programs policy was revised and the changes adopted. Overall, the majority of the revisions involved editorial changes, updating standards for admission and retention, and moving prerequisite or required courses into the procedures manual.

During this process, policy language pertaining to Southwestern Oklahoma State University’s (SWOSU) Doctor of Pharmacy was inadvertently omitted. SWOSU College of Pharmacy was founded in 1939 and graduated its first class in 1941. The College of Pharmacy is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education and is a member of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. The mission of the SWOSU College of Pharmacy is to educate and graduate highly competent practitioners of pharmaceutical care. The College of Pharmacy achieves its mission through excellence in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service to the university, state, profession, and society.

SWOSU’s Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs and the Dean of the College of Pharmacy were consulted and provided recommendations for policy language regarding the Doctor of Pharmacy degree. This change to policy did not require action from the Council on Instruction due to changes being non-substantive and editorial in nature.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action incorporates SWOSU’s Doctor of Pharmacy into the Professional Programs policy.

ANALYSIS:

A summary of the language incorporated into the policy section is provided below.

Summary of changes:

3.25.8 SWOSU College of Pharmacy

- Function – describes the function and mission of the College of Pharmacy and how the mission is to be achieved.
- Standards for Admission – lists the minimum standards to be considered for admission.
Standards for Retention – lists the minimum retention standards to be eligible for continued enrollment.

Standards for Graduation – lists the minimum standards to be eligible for graduation from the SWOSU College of Pharmacy with a Doctor of Pharmacy degree.

Program pre-requisite requirements will be incorporated into State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook at a later date.

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the proposed policy revisions to the Professional Programs policy.

Attachment
3.5 PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

3.5.1 Purpose

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

3.5.2 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 (CGPA)” 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. The use of the CGPA on the transcript is optional, but it may be used to determine financial aid eligibility, admission to graduate or professional programs, or for graduation honors.

“Retention/Graduation Grade Point Average (hereinafter referred to as GPA unless preceded by another descriptor such as ‘high school’)” 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 GPA. (See the State Regents’ Grading Policy.) This GPA may be used to determine financial aid or eligibility, admission to graduate or professional programs, or for graduation honors.

3.5.3 Admission Standards for the Oklahoma State University College of Osteopathic Medicine (OSUCOM) and the University of Oklahoma 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 incoming class enrollment limits set by the State Regents (OSUCOM – 115 and OUCOM – 200), the colleges of medicine may admit out-of-state students per year as indicated below:

OSUCOM – 15 percent or 20 out-of-state students, whichever is greater

OUCOM – 25 percent or 50 out-of-state students, whichever is greater

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
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 courses needed for admission.

3.5.4 Program Standards for the OU College of Medicine
Grading, promotion and graduation standards are determined by college faculty and are consistent with the Liaison Committee for Medical Education (LCME) standards for accreditation of medical education programs leading to the Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) degree. LCME accreditation standards are described in the Function and Structure of a Medical School publication.

The grading, promotion and graduation standards are outlined in policies published in the College of Medicine Policy Manual and in the College of Medicine Student Handbook.

3.5.5 OSU College of Osteopathic Medicine

A. Functions
The 1988 Oklahoma Legislature adopted House Bill No. 1801, repealing provisions of law relating to establishment and operation of The Oklahoma College of Osteopathic Medicine and Surgery (70 O.S., Supp. 1981, §4501, §4502, §4503 and §4504), merging The Oklahoma College of Osteopathic Medicine and Surgery with Oklahoma State University (70 O.S., Supp. 1981, §3423 and §3424), and declaring the College of Osteopathic Medicine to be an agency and an integral part of Oklahoma State University (70 O.S., Supp. 1981, §3103). Among other provisions, House Bill No. 1801 expresses legislative intent "... that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, in determining the functions, programs of study, and standards of education of the college, continue to give emphasis to the preparation of doctors of osteopathic medicine in the field of general practice."

In recognition of the merger of Oklahoma State University with The Oklahoma College of Osteopathic Medicine and Surgery, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education hereby determine the functions of Oklahoma State University to include the operation of a college of osteopathic medicine located in Tulsa County. The Oklahoma State University is authorized to carry out the following functions through the College of Osteopathic Medicine, effective July 1, 1988.

1. To prepare osteopathic physicians and surgeons for the State of Oklahoma through approved and accredited programs which offer complete medical studies, provide bases for further professional advancement, and encourage entrance into general practice.
2. To establish postgraduate programs of medical study, including multi-year internships and residencies, which prepare osteopathic physicians for full participation in both primary and specialized care aspects of professional practice in the State of Oklahoma.

3. To provide a program of public service to Oklahoma communities which are deficient in physician manpower by means of the college-affiliated outpatient clinics, hospitals, and other health-related centers.

4. To offer programs in continuing education for osteopathic physicians and related professionals in order to guarantee the continuation of high standards of osteopathic medical practice for the citizenry of Oklahoma.

5. To cooperate with scientific, educational, and public health agencies in the development of programs which contribute to the improvement of health service and are responsive to general public needs.

6. To engage in scientific research designed to improve the quality of health care with special emphasis given to the application of osteopathic concepts and principles.

B. Grading and Promotion Standards

1. In order to be eligible for promotion or graduation, a student must maintain a minimum of a 2.0 CGPA (based on a four-point scale) during any given academic year.

2. A student who receives a “D” or a “U” in any course may have the privilege of taking a single re-examination in that course or completing special projects or studies in the deficient area(s). If the student passes, the final grade may be no higher than a “C.” At the discretion of the department head, appropriate remedial action may be required prior to the re-examination.

3. A student may not be promoted from either the first, second, or third year with a “U” grade being the grade of record for any course taken during that year to be applied toward satisfaction of graduation requirements. All “U” grades must be satisfactorily cleared in accordance with existing academic policy before a student may be promoted from one academic year to the next.

4. A student may not be promoted to the third year of study without passing the Comprehensive Osteopathic Medical Licensing Examination (COMLEX) Level 1.
C. Graduation Criteria and Standards

1. A fourth-year student must have completed all scheduled course work including required courses and clerkships, scheduled electives, and preceptorship in order to be eligible for graduation.

2. All students graduating in 2008 and later must take and pass the COMLEX Level 2 Computer Exam (CE) and Performance Exam (PE) as a requirement for graduation.

3. No fourth-year student may be considered for graduation with a “U” grade being the grade of record on any course taken during that year. All “U” grades must be satisfactorily cleared in accordance with existing academic policy before a fourth-year student may be graduated.

4. No student shall graduate without the recommendation of the Faculty, College of Osteopathic Medicine. However, a student who successfully completes all academic requirements but who is not recommended for graduation shall be entitled to receive in writing from the Chief Academic Officer the reasons why he or she is not being recommended, and shall have the right of appeal utilizing an appropriate due process procedure established for this purpose.

3.5.6 OU College of Dentistry

A. Functions

The authorized functions for the College of Dentistry located at the University of Oklahoma Health Science Center are as follows:

1. To prepare dentists for the State of Oklahoma through an approved dental education program in dental education leading to a D.D.S. degree.

2. To prepare dentists for specialty practice, research and teaching by offering approved graduate post-doctoral programs leading to certification and/or M.S. degrees.

3. To present short courses in continuing education for the dentists of Oklahoma according to the need and demand.

4. To provide oral health care for the citizens of Oklahoma in the School's outpatient clinics, University hospitals, and extramural facilities.

5. To conduct research in various clinical and basic science areas.
B. Standards for Admission

In order to be eligible for consideration for admission to the first year class of the OU College of Dentistry, a student must meet the following requirements listed below. The State Regents Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook lists the courses needed for admission.

1. Completed 90 semester-credit-hours at an accredited institution of higher education, with a CGPA of 2.5 (based on a 4.0 scale). Coursework must include a minimum number of credit-hours in subject areas with a grade of “C” or better for each course.

2. Submit competitive scores from the Dental Aptitude Test (DAT).

3. Present acceptable recommendations from 1) pre-professional advisory committee or two science instructors, and 2) a practicing dentist.

4. Have accumulated at least 100 hours of paid or volunteer experience with a dental office, clinic or lab environment.

5. Be granted an interview by the Admissions Committee and earn an acceptable evaluation.

C. Advanced Standing Program for Foreign Trained Dentists

The program for advanced standing students offers qualified graduates of foreign dental programs seeking to practice dentistry in the United States (U.S.) the opportunity to earn the Doctor of Dental Surgery (D.D.S.) degree from the OU College of Dentistry.

Foreign trained dental students who have received their dental degree from an institution outside of the U.S. must meet the standards for retention and must meet the standards for graduation as defined in this policy.

In order to be eligible for consideration for admission to the advanced standing program, the student must have obtained a degree in dentistry from a foreign dental school and must meet the following requirements listed below.

1. The applicant must present official transcripts from previous dental education;

2. Present acceptable TOEFL scores;

3. Complete a comprehensive clinical skills assessment;

4. Pass Part I of the National Board Dental Examination; and

5. Interview.
Those who are conditionally admitted must successfully complete the following requirements below.

1. General orientation;
2. Pre-clinic orientation; and

Students admitted into the advanced standing program shall be fully integrated into the third-year class and shall receive the same clinical education as all other students receiving the D.D.S. degree.

D. Standards for Retention

In order to be eligible for continued enrollment in the professional program in dentistry a student must meet the following requirements:

1. Complete each prescribed course in the curriculum with a minimum grade of "C" (2.0 on a 4.0 scale).
2. Exhibit professional behavior according to the Principles of Ethics of the American Dental Association and the rules for student conduct as established by the University.
3. Pass Part I of the National Board Dental Examination prior to the third year.

E. Standards for Graduation

In order to be eligible for graduation from the School of Dentistry with a Doctor of Dental Surgery degree, a student must meet the following requirements. The State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook lists the courses needed for admission.

1. Complete each prescribed course with a minimum grade of "C."
2. Exhibit acceptable professional competence (knowledge, skills, attitudes) as judged by the faculty.
3. Pass Part II of the National Board Dental Examination.

3.5.7 Admission Standards for the OU Doctor of Pharmacy Program

The OU College of Pharmacy may admit students if they meet the specified Pharmacy College Admission Test (PCAT) score and college GPA requirements or if they are admitted under the alternative admissions by the College of Pharmacy, using standards defined by the college.

In addition to meeting these quantitative standards, the student must also meet
qualitative standards which include, but are not limited to a personal interview. Preference will be given to Oklahoma residents. Current admission criteria can be obtained from the College of Pharmacy.

The State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook lists the courses needed for admission.

3.25.8 SWOSU Doctor of Pharmacy

A. Functions

The College of Pharmacy is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education and is a member of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. The mission of the SWOSU College of Pharmacy is to educate and graduate highly competent practitioners of pharmaceutical care. The College of Pharmacy achieves its mission through excellence in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service to the university, state, profession, and society.

B. Standards for Admission

3.  The State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook lists the courses needed for admission. The minimum standards to be considered for admission are as follows:

5. 1. Satisfactory completion of at least 60 semester hours of the pre-pharmacy curriculum.

2. Completion of all pre-pharmacy biology, chemistry, mathematics, and physics courses.

3. A minimum CGPA of 2.50.

4. Submission of valid ACT or SAT scores.

5. Submission of Pharmacy College Admission Test (PCAT) scores from a PCAT test taken within 3 years of the date of application.

6. In addition to meeting these quantitative standards, applicants will be required to appear for a personal interview before a committee composed of faculty members and pharmacy students. Preference will be given to Oklahoma residents.

8. C. Standards for Retention

9. In order to be eligible for continued enrollment in the professional program in pharmacy a student must meet the following requirements:

10. 1. Must maintain at least a 2.00 CGPA (based on a four-point scale) during any given academic year.
Complete each prescribed course in the curriculum with a minimum grade of “C.”

Complete at least 12 hours during the fall and spring semesters.

D. Standards for Graduation

In order to be eligible for graduation from the College of Pharmacy with a Doctor of Pharmacy degree, a student must meet the following requirements.

1. Complete each prescribed course with a minimum grade of "C."
2. Maintain at least a 2.00 CPGA in the professional program.
3. Satisfy a minimum residency requirement of eight semesters or its equivalent while enrolled full-time in the professional program.

3.25.89 NSU College of Optometry

A. Functions

The authorized functions of the Optometry Education Program at NSU are as follows:

1. To establish, maintain and operate a four-year professional program leading toward the Doctor of Optometry (O.D.) degree.

2. To recruit, admit and train a number of optometry students sufficient to meet Oklahoma's need for optometrists, based upon criteria determined by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in collaboration with the optometry profession and recognized health manpower specialists. In the admission of first-time students, preference shall be given to qualified Oklahoma applicants.

3. To maintain and further develop a professional and support staff capable of operating a quality four-year professional program of optometric education.

4. To establish on the campus at Northeastern State University appropriate classroom and laboratory facilities necessary to support the didactic portion of the four-year professional program in optometry. Also, the institution may establish limited clinical facilities to supplement those external clinical experiences not provided by hospitals, public health agencies, nursing homes, private clinics, and the like.

5. To utilize the clinical facilities of the Hastings Indian Medical Center at Tahlequah as the primary clinical base for the
implementation of the four-year professional program in optometry, and to develop agreements with other external clinical agencies as may be necessary to carry out the authorized functions of the professional program.

6. To cooperate with appropriate health care institutions and agencies toward the improvement of vision care among the public in the institution's geographic area of service.

7. To engage in departmental and other research activities designed to maintain and upgrade the professional skills of the faculty and consequently to improve instruction in the professional program of optometric education.

8. To provide leadership for maintaining and upgrading the quality of the optometry profession in Oklahoma through the provision of continuing education opportunities for practicing members of the profession.

B. Standards for Admission

In order to be eligible for admission to the NSU Professional Program in Optometry Education, a student must meet the following criteria and standards listed below. The State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook lists the courses needed for admission.

1. The applicant must have completed a minimum of ninety (90) semester hours of work at an accredited college or university, which will include the satisfaction of the originating institution's lower-division general education requirement.

2. The applicant must present a transcript showing a composite GPA of at least 2.7, based upon a 4.0 scale.

3. The applicant must have taken the Optometric Admission Test (OAT).

4. The NSU Optometry Education Program will consider applicants for admission from all qualified candidates without regard to age, sex, race or national origin.

C. Retention

For continued enrollment in the program, a student must maintain a CGPA of 2.0 in the professional program. In addition, the student must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the faculty those moral, ethical and professional qualities deemed suitable to the professional practice of optometry.

D. Authorized Fees and Tuition Charges
The fees and tuition charges for professional optometry courses will be established at a level consistent with the fees and charges of other professional health-related programs and charges for courses outside the professional sequence will be the same as those authorized for other courses at Northeastern by academic level.

E. Standards for Graduation

A student who satisfactorily completes the first two years of the four-year professional optometry program, and who has met the basic admission standard of ninety (90) semester credit hours including the satisfaction of the general education requirement, shall be eligible to receive the bachelor of science degree with a major in vision science. Following receipt of the bachelor of science degree in vision science, a student who satisfactorily completes the final two years of the prescribed four-year professional optometry program shall be eligible to receive the Doctor of Optometry (O.D.) degree.

F. Degrees and Certificates

A student who satisfactorily completes the four-year professional optometry curriculum shall be awarded the Doctor of Optometry (O.D.) degree. A student who satisfactorily completes the baccalaureate curriculum as described above shall be awarded the Bachelor of Science degree.

3.25.910 OSU College of Veterinary Medicine

A. Functions

The functions of the College of Veterinary Medicine of OSU shall be as follows:

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

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

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

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

5. To offer service courses for students of the several colleges of OSU and other appropriate institutions.

6. To offer continuing education programs for the veterinary medical and related professions.
7. To maintain and operate clinics and hospitals to serve the instructional program.

8. To maintain and operate an animal care and procurement center for the College of Veterinary Medicine and for the university.

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

10. To conduct basic and applied veterinary medical research.

B. Admission Standards

Students are admitted to the OSU College of Veterinary Medicine on the basis of records of academic performance in preparatory studies; personal interviews and references to determine personal characteristics and career motivation; and standard achievement tests. The following specific criteria and standards are hereby adopted for first-time-entering students and transfer students. The State Regents’ Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook lists the courses needed for admission.

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

1. Nonresident freshman enrollment shall be limited so that the number of nonresident students enrolling in the OSU College of Veterinary Medicine shall not exceed 25 percent of the total College student enrollment. See the State Regents’ Policy Statement on Contract Fees for Nonresident Students located in the fiscal policy section Policy and Procedures Relating to Student Fees and Tuition for a definition of out-of-state contract students.

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

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

4. A limited number of students may be admitted by transfer each year from other accredited colleges to fill the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year classes back to their original authorized levels. However, the number of nonresident students enrolled at any given time shall not exceed 25 percent of the total enrollment for the college.
5. A maximum of 15 percent of the entering class may be admitted who meet special college admission criteria, but who do not meet the State Regents’ admission criteria. These students must have credentials close to those required of students regularly admitted and must be interviewed. Special consideration should be given to the diversity of the students admitted to the program.

3.25.4011 OU College of Law

A. Functions

The authorized functions of the Law Center at the University of Oklahoma shall be as follows:

1. To provide a three-year first-professional program of professional training in law culminating in the awarding of the Juris Doctor degree.

2. To provide advanced graduate and professional degree programs in the Law School designed to produce research scholars and specialists.

3. To provide continuing legal education for members of the bench and the bar through special courses, institutes and seminars, including the publication of appropriate materials in support of this function.

4. To provide nonprofessional legal training degree programs, vocational programs and programs designed for persons already qualified in professions other than the legal profession, which programs, when authorized, may culminate in the awarding of degrees or certificates of achievement.

5. To provide, upon request, service courses in law for institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, with academic credit for such service courses to be granted by the requesting institution.

6. To provide a law library which supports the scholarly and instructional activities of the Law Center’s faculty, staff, and students and which serves the informational needs of the University, the legal community, and the public.

7. To provide for the publication of legal periodicals such as, but not limited to, the Oklahoma Law Review, the American Indian Law Review, and the Oklahoma Journal of Law and Technology with the proceeds from the sale of such periodicals, together with royalty payments or charges for permission to use copyrighted material there from, to be held by the Law School for its exclusive use.
B. Admission

1. An applicant for admission to the College of Law must have a baccalaureate degree and must have taken the Law School Admission Test (LSAT); provided that a limited number of students with superior undergraduate grades and LSAT scores may be eligible for admission to the Law School after the successful completion of 90 hours of undergraduate study.

2. To be eligible for admission to the College of Law with advanced standing, applicants must have satisfactorily completed at least one full semester or equivalent of work at an American Bar Association accredited law school.

3. The number of students to be admitted shall be determined in accordance with physical facilities and financial resources available by the President of the University upon recommendations of the Dean of the College of Law.

4. Undergraduate College Grade Point Averages and scores on the LSAT shall be used as the primary factor in the screening and selection of students for admission purposes. Other factors, such as proven leadership ability, real life experiences, and success in college extra curricular activities may be considered.

5. Nonresident freshman enrollment shall be limited so that the number of nonresident students enrolling in the College of Law shall not exceed 15 percent of the total law student enrollment. Upon request of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education or the Chancellor, a report on the number of nonresident students admitted each year with subsequent retention, graduation, and placement information will be provided.

6. Any student who has been admitted to the College of Law to begin his or her study with a given class but who cannot service shall be re-admitted at the first enrollment after the expiration of his or her original term of military service upon renewal of his or her application.

3.25.12 Program Standards for Teacher Education Programs

The State Regents have set standards for several areas within teacher education programs including admission, general education, required teaching competencies, articulation, and teacher education faculty. For specific details on teacher education program standards, see the State Regents’ Teacher Education Policy.

3.25.13 Program Standards for Nurse Education

A. Associate Degree Nursing Programs

1. Institutions Eligible to Offer Programs

Associate degree nursing programs may be offered at institutions in the State System provided (a) there is a need for the program in the area served by the college and (b) adequate resources are available at the institution to support the program.

2. Procedures for Program Approval
Institutions desiring to offer associate degree nursing programs should first make application to the State Regents to establish eligibility. Following establishment of eligibility, the institution should proceed to develop the educational program in collaboration with the Oklahoma Board of Nursing (OBN). The State Regents coordinate consultation with qualified nursing educators to assist institutional officials in program development. After the program has been developed, formal application for program approval should be made to the State Regents following the Academic Program Approval Policy.

3. Educational Standards

The standards for nursing education programs offered at institutions in the State System are as follows:

Institutions eligible to offer associate degree nursing programs will be expected to formulate proposed standards for the admission of students which will provide reasonable assurance of their successful completion of the program. The standards shall be submitted to the State Regents for approval.

Faculty members who teach the nursing courses shall have qualifications comparable to other members of the faculty and shall be entitled to the same benefits and have similar responsibilities as other faculty members.

The curriculum of the nursing program should meet the standards recommended by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) or the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) and when developed should be submitted to the OBN and the State Regents for final approval.

Students who complete the curriculum will be expected to meet the graduation standards of the institution and shall be awarded the associate degree.

Graduates of the program shall be eligible to make application to the OBN for examination for licensure as a registered nurse.

4. Accreditation

Accreditation of institutions approved to offer associate degree nursing programs is required. The institution must meet the standards of the OBN and hold provisional or full approval from the OBN while proceeding with the necessary steps to attain accreditation by the National League for Nursing NLNAC or the
CCNE within a reasonable time.

B. Baccalaureate Degree Nursing Programs

1. Institutions Eligible to Offer Programs

Baccalaureate degree nursing programs may be offered at institutions in the State System provided (a) there is a need for the program in the area served by the college, and (b) adequate resources are available to support the program.

2. Procedures for Program Approval

Institutions desiring to offer baccalaureate degree nursing programs should first make application to the State Regents to establish institutional eligibility. Following establishment of eligibility, the institution should proceed to develop the educational program in collaboration with OBN. The State Regents will coordinate consultation with qualified nursing educators to assist institutional officials in program development. After the program has been developed, formal application for program approval should be made to the State Regents following the Academic Program Approval Policy.

3. Educational Standards

The standards for nursing education programs offered at institutions in the State System are as follows:

Institutions eligible to offer baccalaureate degree nursing programs will be expected to formulate proposed standards for the admission of students which will provide reasonable assurance of their successful completion of the program. The standards shall be submitted to the State Regents for approval.

Faculty members who teach the nursing courses shall have qualifications comparable to other members of the faculty and shall be entitled to the same benefits and have similar responsibilities as other faculty members.

The curriculum of the nursing program should meet the standards recommended by the NLNAC or the CCNE and when developed should be submitted to the OBN and the Oklahoma State Regents for final approval.

Students who complete the curriculum will be expected to meet the graduation standards of the institution and shall be awarded the bachelors degree.

Graduates of the program shall be eligible to make application to the Oklahoma Board of Nursing for examination for licensure as
a registered nurse.

4. Accreditation

Accreditation of institutions approved to offer bachelors degree nursing programs may be extended by the State Regents on a year-to-year basis until the first class is graduated. The State Regents' accreditation standards will be based on and consistent with those of the National League for Nursing. Institutions offering nursing programs will be expected to proceed with the necessary steps to attain accreditation by The National League for Nursing within a reasonable time. There is a recognized need for trained manpower in the field of professional nursing. Where appropriate, institutions may desire to develop proposed program offerings in this field. The staff of the State Regents' Office will be available to advise with institutional administrators regarding the need for nursing programs as reflected by results of research and study related to this area of manpower need. Accreditation of institutions approved to offer baccalaureate degree nursing programs is required. The institution must meet OBN standards and hold provisional or full approval from the OBN while proceeding with the necessary steps to attain accreditation by the NLNAC or the CCNE within a reasonable time.

3.25.1314 Program Standards for Health Education with External Clinical Components

Colleges and universities of the State System seeking to offer undergraduate programs of health education based in part on clinical training provided by external agencies shall do so only upon prior approval by the State Regents. The following statement is designed to facilitate the observance of uniform standards and practices among institutions awarding academic credit or granting academic degrees or certificates based on clinical training taken by students in hospitals or other external clinical settings.

A. General Principles

1. Colleges and universities are responsible to the public for the content and quality of their educational programs, including those in which the clinical part of the program is carried out by an external institution or agency.

2. Academic degrees or certificates conferred by institutions in health-related fields are typically based upon a combination of general education, preclinical specialized and related education, and specialized clinical training. The proportion of student credit hours devoted to each kind of education will vary depending upon the academic level, degree to be conferred, and field of training. However, the clinical component of health-related programs should probably not exceed 50 percent of a two-year program or 25 percent of a four-year program.
3. A student taking clinical training in a hospital or other external clinical setting must be enrolled in a college or university and must have paid his or her fees before an institution can certify that he or she is a bona fide student for any purpose, including certification to enable students to qualify for participation in a student assistance program.

B. Standards Relating to the Academic Calendar

Programs of clinical training carried out by hospitals and other external agencies will be expected to meet the same calendar standards applicable to colleges and universities of the State System. Although it is not expected that external agencies will conform to the calendar framework of the academic semester, students taking clinical training will be required to complete a requisite number of didactic and laboratory class hours to meet the standards contained in the State Regents’ Academic Calendars Policy.

C. Standards Related to Licensure and Accreditation

Students completing health education programs utilizing an external clinical component must be eligible to qualify for state licensure or certification in the field in which the education and training has been received. Also the sponsoring institution will be expected to move toward accreditation by a national agency recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation within a reasonable length of time.

D. Relationships between Academic Institutions and Clinical Agencies

1. Colleges and universities will be expected to make appropriate arrangements for the clinical portion of students' training which takes place in external agencies based upon bilateral affiliation agreements between institutions and clinical agencies.

2. Academic standards for admission of students to the clinical portion of health-related programs shall be consistent with standards utilized by colleges or universities for admission to the clinical or internship portion of other academic programs on the same level.

3. Colleges and universities can reasonably expect to reimburse clinical agencies for that portion of employee time and resources which can be identified as educational in nature and for which the clinical agency is not otherwise reimbursed.

4. Responsibility for assessing student achievement and for awarding academic credit shall lie with the academic institution, whenever students are utilizing the clinical component of their health-related programs for application toward an academic degree or certificate.
E. Standards Relating to Awarding Academic Credit

1. Colleges and universities desiring to award academic credit for work taken by students engaged in clinical training carried out by external agencies shall submit requests for approval of specialized course offerings to the State Regents prior to the signing of affiliation agreements with external clinical agencies. Such requests shall describe the nature and content of each specialized course to be carried out by the external agency, together with the methodology to be utilized for the particular course offering, the qualifications of the personnel responsible for each course and the like.

2. Following completion of students' clinical training, the sponsoring college or university shall place on students' transcripts the name of each specialized clinical course undertaken, the appropriate academic mark earned by students in each course, and the name of the external clinical agency in which the specialized training occurred. The granting of block credit by institutions for clinical training without course-by-course designation is not authorized.

3. The awarding of academic credit or the conferring of academic degrees or certificates by colleges and universities shall not be contingent upon the passing of a state licensure examination or a standardized national board examination, without the express and prior approval of the State Regents.

4. Institutions desiring to award advanced standing credit for clinical training carried out by hospitals or other clinical agencies shall do so in accordance with the State Regents’ Credit for Extrainstitutional Learning Policy.

3.25.1415 Program Standards for Business Education

This statement guides the State Regents and institutions of the State System with respect to the educational standards and the graduation requirements of business programs (associate in applied science degrees are exempt). The standards and requirements are to coordinate with the economic development functions of institutions as described in the State Regents’ Functions of Public Institutions Policy.

A. Education Standards

The program curriculum shall:

1. Be integrated with and incorporate the input of an active community-based advisory board, including applicable business and industry leaders.

2. Include an entrepreneurial component that promotes enterprise
development.

3. Include a student internship component or similar experience that ties classroom learning to business applications and provides feedback which may be used in future curriculum development.

4. Integrate technology into course content and deliver.

5. Systematically determine technology needs and develop a technology investment policy based on the evaluation of the desired student outcomes.

B. Accountability

Institutions shall conduct business program reviews that:

1. Collect data to compare program performance with a cohort of like institutions.

2. Evaluate student retention and graduation rates for university programs and transfer rates for community colleges with the goal of continued improvement.

3. Evaluate the demand for and uniqueness of the program to assure that it is not unnecessarily duplicative of existing programs (see the State Regents’ Academic Program Review Policy). If the program is found to be unnecessarily duplicative, the institution should work to collaboratively meet program need with another institution(s).

4. Collect data from alumni in the workplace to ensure that program objectives and student outcomes are congruent.

C. Graduation Requirements

The program shall:

1. Provide comprehensive career services including career counseling, job fairs, resume preparation, interviewing skills, and placement services. Such services should be publicized and readily available to students.

2. Require students to complete a capstone course or project that integrates business disciplines, incorporates practical field experience, and business applications.

3. Develop student learning outcomes standards and require students to demonstrate the designated learning competencies on appropriate assessments prior to graduation.
To monitor the progress, institutions are required to include planning and implementation information for business programs and economic development efforts within their annual academic plans.

AGENDA ITEM #14-a:

Scholars for Excellence in Child Care.

SUBJECT: Approval of contract and contract modification between the Oklahoma Department of Human Services and the Oklahoma State Regents to continue the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care scholarship contract modification, renewing the existing contract for the first one-year term allowable, and approve the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program contract, in an amount not to exceed $1,369,226, to continue the scholarship program.

BACKGROUND:

Since June 2000, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) and the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (OKDHS) have contracted, in an effort to improve the quality of care children receive in licensed child care facilities, increase teacher educational levels, compensation, and improve retention. The annual contract allows community colleges to, among other things, offer specialized academic and support programs and to recruit licensed child care providers as a way to encourage child care professionals to further their education in the field of early childhood and child development.

Given the success of the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care (Scholars) program and the desire of OKDHS to continue to improve the quality of services available to child care staff, the Director of OKDHS asked the Chancellor to broaden the OSRHE current scholarship offerings, beginning Fall 2004, by assuming responsibility for administering and managing the scholarship program (formerly Teacher Education and Compensation Helps-TEACH) in conjunction with the Scholars program. Therefore, a contract between the two parties was entered into to provide funding for administering the scholarship program.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ commitment to enhance educational opportunities and encourage coordination and cooperation between the State Regents, State System institutions and other state agencies.

ANALYSIS:

Oklahoma has led the nation in developing a program linking its child care licensing standards and quality criteria with state reimbursement payments. Called “Reaching for the Stars” the program attempts to improve the quality of child care by building teacher competence, informing parents of the quality of
program and creating more slots for subsidized child care by raising the reimbursement rate to facilities. OKDHS rates each child care facility from one-star (minimum requirements) up to a three-star (highest standards) according to the number of quality criteria each facility meets.

The Scholars Program has achieved success since its inception. Through summer 2011, there have been approximately 392 child care providers that, through taking courses at the community colleges, have obtained a Child Development Associate, a nationally recognized credential; approximately 2,685 have earned a certificate of mastery and 753 an associate degree through the Scholars program initiative. There have been 209 directors/assistant directors who have obtained a Director’s Certificate of Completion awarded through the Scholars program.

Note: Contract and contract modification attachments are on file in the State Regents’ office.

Attachments
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

FIRST RENEWAL AND SECOND MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

This Renewal and Modification of the current contract PA# 12000290, PO# 800290 is entered into by and between the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (“Department”) and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (“OSRHE”).

WHEREAS, on or about July 16, 2011, the Department and the OSRHE entered into an agreement effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012 whereby the OSRHE agreed to administer the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care (Scholars), a comprehensive scholarship program for eligible child care providers attending two year colleges and technology centers pursuing education toward a Child Development Associate (CDA), Certificate of Mastery, Director’s Certificate of Completion, and associate of arts or science in child development/early childhood education, or a bachelor’s degree. (“Agreement”);

WHEREAS, on or about September 13, 2011 the parties entered into a modification to decrease the original contract to an amount not to exceed $1,054,989;

WHEREAS, the Contract Term section of the Agreement provides that after the initial one-year period, the Agreement may be renewed for three one year periods at the level of services outlined in Attachments A&B;

WHEREAS, the Modification section of the Agreement provides that any modifications or amendments to the Agreement shall be in writing and agreed to by both the OSRHE and the Department;

WHEREAS, both parties desire to renew the Agreement for a one-year period and modify the Agreement as set forth below.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the premises, the mutual covenants hereinafter contained, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

I. Modifications

Attachments A & B of the Agreement are hereby amended by deleting them entirely and substituting, in lieu thereof, the following:

See “Attachments A & B” attached hereto.

II. Renewal

This Agreement shall be renewed for the first of three (3) one-year renewal periods. This renewal period shall be in effect for a period beginning July 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2013.

Except as expressly amended and modified by this First Renewal and Modification, all provisions of the Agreement and First Modification shall remain in full force and effect.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have each caused this First Renewal and Modification to be executed as of the latter date written below as evidenced by the signatures of their respective duly authorized officers.

**Oklahoma Department of Human Services**

By: __________________________
    OKDHS Representative

Date: __________________________

**Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education**

By: __________________________
    Glen D. Johnson, Chancellor

Date: __________________________
This agreement is entered into, effective July 1, 2012, by the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (hereinafter Department) and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (hereinafter OSRHE). The OSRHE hereby offer and agree to provide education/training opportunities to assist child care employees in obtaining a Child Development Associate (hereinafter CDA) credential, Certificate of Mastery, Director’s Certificate of Completion, an associate degree in early childhood education/child development or a bachelor’s degree as described in Section V in accordance with the following terms and conditions.

I. Contract Allowable Cost And Payment Schedule

For and in consideration of the performance of this contract by OSRHE, the Department agrees to pay an amount not-to-exceed $1,369,226 (One million three hundred sixty-nine thousand, two hundred twenty-six dollars) for services agreed upon herein (budget Attachment A). Payments will be made in accordance with written authorization by the Department on a quarterly basis. Billing shall be submitted in the format and in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Department. Payment for all services required herein will be made in arrears. OSRHE will be allowed to transfer budget authority from within the initial line items. Changes to budget authority greater than 10% must have prior approval from the Department. The Department will not make any advance payments.

II. Contract Term

It is agreed by both parties this agreement will be in effect for a period beginning 7-1-12 and ending 6-30-13. This agreement may be renewable for three one year periods at the level of services outlined in Attachment A.

III. OSRHE will agree to provide the following:

1. Review, coordinate, and approve operating budgets for each institution’s program;

2. Assist with the coordination of the State System community college and pilot four-year college programs in accordance with contract guidelines;

3. Assure compliance with contract requirements;

4. Reimburse program costs to approved participating community college and pilot four-year university programs;

5. Notify the Colleges of the assurances and responsibilities that the Colleges are obligated to meet pursuant to the contract. Approval of any subcontract will not relieve OSRHE of any responsibility for performance under this contract.

6. Assure accountability measures through the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care (Scholars) program’s database to determine the project’s success. In addition, information will be evaluated to determine any needed program adjustments.
7. In collaboration with Department, and with input from institutions, continue to refine the duties and expectations for the position of scholar coordinator.

8. Conduct campus site visits or other evaluative measures as agreed upon by the Department on a rotating (every other year) basis, or more frequently as needed, for the purposes of monitoring program goals, objectives and fiscal compliance to assure adherence to the contract and program guidelines.

9. Update the Scholars website within 30 days of significant program changes.

10. At the end of each semester provide a summary of activities and statistical data as submitted by the scholar coordinators; and at the end of the contract period provide a formal report detailing services that have been provided in the format prescribed by the Department. The annual report is due as part of claims documentation for the final billing.

IV. OSRHE will oversee and coordinate with community colleges to:

1. Assure all early childhood/child development courses that are appropriate incorporate Child Development associate (CDA) competencies established by the Council for Professional Recognition.

2. If not incorporated into courses taken toward CDA credential, offer CDA preparation workshops to be conducted by scholar coordinators or advise them to enroll in the Pathway CDA preparation module.

3. Provide an 18-credit hour certificate of mastery program consisting of 15 credit hours in early childhood education/child development and 3 hours of English composition for child care staff currently working in licensed child care facilities that articulates toward an associate of arts or science degree in early childhood education/child development in order to facilitate articulation to a four-year institution. A Certificate of Mastery could be earned through an associate of applied science degree if that degree articulates to a bachelor’s degree without loss of any credit hours.

4. Assure the 24-credit hour Director’s Certificate of Completion articulates toward an associate of arts or associate of science degree in early childhood education/child development in order to facilitate articulation to a four-year institution and toward an associate of applied science degree in child center administration.

5. After appropriate student assessment, ensure literacy is woven into all of the early childhood education/child development courses which may include, but not be limited to: independent reading and writing assignments, reading groups, computer-aided instruction, learning resource center assignments, instructional tutoring, etc.

6. Provide additional support services for students having difficulty or deficiencies with reading, writing, and math, as appropriate.

7. Offer early childhood education/child development courses in a variety of educational delivery modalities including, but not limited to: accelerated coursework (i.e., a 8-week period), non-traditional class times, distance learning or on-site training opportunities.
8. Ensure a seamless transfer of coursework equivalent to 6 credit hours, if a CDA credential has been received through a technology center, to an early childhood education/child development associate of arts or associate of science degree program to facilitate articulation.

9. Annually submit for approval to the State Regents’ staff a detailed budget outlining the cost for the scholar coordinator’s salary and benefits and anticipated operating costs to manage and oversee the program for 12 months.

10. Provide a program plan that details the scholar coordinator’s responsibilities and activities as outlined below (Attachment B-1- B-12).

11. Serve a minimum number of active program participants per semester as outlined in the OSRHE Scholars Guidebook (Attachment C);

12. Request approval from OSHRE and OKDHS for out of state travel for scholar coordinators;

13. Ensure all financial aid and/or loans are applied to the scholar’s educational costs prior to applying the program scholarship.

14. Ensure two-year colleges employ a scholar coordinator with, at a minimum, a bachelor’s degree in early childhood education or child development. If the scholar coordinator is attending graduate school a copy of the class schedule must be submitted to OSRHE two weeks prior to commencement of classes.

15. Responsibilities of the scholar coordinator include, but are not limited to, the following:

   a) Scholar Coordinators are expected to have at least two designated field days each week (i.e., out of the office and in the field recruiting, providing technical assistance, and/or following up with Scholars at their child care facility).

   b) Provide materials to OSRHE for approval to be used for recruiting child care providers in the communities for purposes of encouraging them to pursue the CDA Credential, Certificate of Mastery, and/or associate of science or arts degree program in early childhood education or child development (with emphasis on the CDA Credential). Teachers and family child care home providers pursuing an AAS degree do not qualify for the program or scholarship unless the AAS degree articulates to a bachelor degree without loss of any credit hours. Any other flyers or promotional materials must be submitted to OSRHE for approval prior to use.

   c) Provide materials for recruiting directors/assistant directors for the Director’s Certificate of Completion. Directors/assistant directors that have completed the Director’s Certificate of Completion will be allowed to pursue an AAS degree in Child Care Center Management (or other similar approved AAS degree) if they determine they do not want to pursue an AA/AS degree in early childhood education or child development for the possibility of later obtaining a bachelor’s degree.
d) Determine best placement of scholar for beginning CDA coursework – either college or technology center. Determination should be based upon: (1) personal observation through recruitment visit, (2) previous training and/or transcripts, if available, and (3) assessment scores. If a scholar begins at a college and does not perform well, consideration should be given to transfer the scholar to a technology center to complete the Pathway CDA curriculum and then continue toward the Certificate of Mastery at the college.

e) Maintain a minimum active caseload as follows: active Scholars for the fall and spring semester. (Active Scholar is defined as Scholars approved for the SECC program, officially enrolled, and taking college coursework, or enrolled at the local technology center in the Early Education: Pathway to CDA curriculum).
- Rural Area – 50 scholars
- Rural Area w/SC assistant – 65 scholars
- Metro Area – 65 scholars
- Metro Area w/SC assistant – 80 scholars

Note: caseload requirement can be adjusted by OSRHE and the Department

f) Assist caseload scholars with the financial-aid process (Pell and SECC).

g) Attend each licensing supervisor staff meeting at least once per year to explain the SECC program. Provide informational brochures for each licensing regulator at the staff meeting.

h) Scholar Coordinators will be responsible for providing necessary Scholar information to the State Regents’ office, including grades, drop/withdrawal information, change of job location, etc. on a semester basis, or as needed.

i) Maintain database by entering Scholar information on a weekly basis.

j) Serve as the liaison between the scholar and faculty to assist in addressing issues and resolving conflicts.

k) Scholar Coordinators who have had CDA advisor training are expected to perform a mock CDA observation for each Scholar pursuing a CDA Credential. Scholar Coordinators that have not had the CDA advisor training should attend training at the first available opportunity.

l) Further professional development by attending any staff development activities coordinated through the State Regent’s office and other professional development opportunities approved by the Special Programs Director and the OKDHS Programs Administrator.
m) State Regents staff must approve out-of-state travel. Traveling out-of-state without authorization may result in travel expenses being disallowed.

n) **NOT under any circumstances** perform other duties (*including teaching*) for the college or child development department unrelated to the contract or program guidelines administered through the State Regents’ office. Doing so, could cause program termination.

o) Scholar Coordinators working on a master’s degree should furnish a copy of the course schedule to the State Regents office. Courses cannot be scheduled during working hours without prior approval.

p) Adhere to the requirements contained in the “OSRHE Scholars Guidebook” (Attachment C).

V. **OSRHE will oversee and implement a pilot bachelor degree scholarship program:**

1. Eligibility for regional and comprehensive institutions to receive scholarship support will require an articulation agreement that reflects program to program acceptance of coursework with no loss of college hours for the scholar.

2. The pilot participants must have been on the scholars program and graduated from a two-year college with an associate degree in early childhood education or child development, or an associate in applied science degree in ECE/CD administration or ECE/CD that meets the program to program articulation requirement.

3. OSRHE will employ an administrative support person will work with up to three institutions that meet the program to program articulation standard.

4. OSRHE will provide copies of articulation agreements (or degree plans) to OKDHS prior to the approval of any scholarships for the bachelor’s degree.

5. OSRHE will ensure all financial aid and/or loans are applied to the scholar’s bachelor’s degree educational costs prior to applying the program scholarship.

6. Will ensure that the administrative support person will have at a minimum a bachelor’s degree.

VI. **Department agrees to provide the following:**

1. Conduct site visits to the participating college campuses as needed for the purposes of assessing or monitoring program, and to assure adherence to approved program purposes, goals and objectives;

2. Review and approve proposed SECC program plans and budgets in consultation with OSRHE’s staff prior to OSRHE’s approval.
3. At the six-month interval, evaluate programs from OSHRE’s reports, monitoring reports and on-site visits, if needed, for program continuance or in developing a corrective action plan.

VII. **Department’s Financial Commitment**

The Department will provide funding, based on approved institutional budgets, on a quarterly reimbursement basis for a coordinator (salary and benefits) and the associated operating costs. An amount not to exceed 13.175% of program costs will be provided to OSRHE as an administrative fee.

Performance-based financial incentives will be made to the institutions’ early childhood/child development academic programs to purchase items that will benefit the child development program/students (not a lab school). Examples include: dye cut machines, small furniture/items for a model classroom, resource materials that can be checked out by students, etc. Scholar coordinators must request approval by OSRHE for potential purchases attributable to performance-based incentives prior to purchase. Performance incentives to the institutions’ child development academic program will be as follows:

Following the receipt of the CDA credential–by caseload scholars and if the scholar is employed and receives pay for an average of 30 hours per week at a licensed facility, the college’s academic child development program will be eligible for $175 per student.

VIII. **Reporting/Accountability**

It will be the responsibility of each institution’s scholar coordinator to maintain reports/documentation in a form agreed upon by the Department and the OSRHE.

1. Institutions will be expected, among other things, to submit reports/documentation to the State Regents staff on a quarterly or semester basis or upon request, if needed. Documentation for quarterly invoicing will be due by the 10th of the month following the end of the quarter.

2. OSRHE staff will submit invoice amounts to the Department no later than 45 days following the end of the quarter.

3. The Department will transfer funds to the OSRHE staff within 45 days upon receipt of an invoice.

4. OSRHE agrees that it has not contracted with another state agency to provide similar services as outlined herein.

IX. **General Provisions**

A. **Billing**

This is a cost reimbursement contract. Claims for reimbursement of services shall be submitted within (90) calendar days of the provision of services. Supporting encumbrances will be canceled upon a lapse of six months from the actual provision of services, unless specified otherwise in the contract. All claims for reimbursement must be submitted no later than September; after this date all funds will be canceled.
The State of Oklahoma has 45 days from presentation of a proper invoice to issue payment to the OSRHE.

In the event that any cost items claimed by the OSRHE are subsequently disallowed by the Department as cost items of the contract, the OSRHE shall repay the Department, on demand, the amount of any such disallowed items. At the discretion of the Department, the Department may deduct such amounts from subsequent payments to be made to the OSRHE without prejudice to the OSRHE’s right to establish the allow-ability of any such item of cost under the contract.

The difference between the contract negotiated indirect rate and the federal allowable indirect rate is an in-kind state funded contribution made by two-year institutions.

B. Travel

The travel expenses to be incurred by the OSRHE pursuant to this contract for services shall be included in the total amount of the contract award. The Department will only pay travel expenses (including per diem) specified in and charged against the total amount of the contract award. In addition, the Department will not reimburse travel expenses in excess of the rate established by the Oklahoma State Travel Reimbursement Act, Department policy. The OSRHE shall be responsible for all travel arrangements and providing supporting documentation when submitting claims for reimbursement.

C. Modification

Any modifications or amendments to the contract shall be in writing and agreed to by both the OSRHE and the Department.

D. Termination

It is agreed by both parties that this agreement may be terminated by notice in writing by either party 30 days before termination date.

E. Sub-Contracting

The service to be performed under this contract by OSRHE and the institutions shall not be subcontracted, in whole or in part, to any other person or entity without the written consent of the Department. The terms of this contract and such additional terms as the Department may require shall be included in any approved subcontract, and approval of any subcontract shall not relieve OSRHE of any responsibility for performance under this contract.

F. Disallowance of Claims

In the event that any payments are subsequently disallowed by federal or state authorities due to negligence/performance of OSRHE (and on behalf of the colleges), OSRHE agrees to reimburse the Department in an amount equal to the disallowance.

G. Supporting Documentation

The OSRHE assures that all costs billed will be supported by documentation that will include copies of paid invoices, payroll records and time reports and approved methods for application of indirect costs. The OSRHE further assures that all billings will be based on actual costs incurred. All costs
billed will be supported by documentation that will include copies of invoices dated within the contract period.

H. Unavailability of Funding

OKDHS cannot guarantee the continued availability of funding for this Contract, notwithstanding the consideration stated herein. In the event funds to finance this Contract become unavailable, either in full or in part, due to insufficient funding, OKDHS may terminate the contract, or reduce the contract consideration, upon notice in writing to Contractor. The notice shall be delivered by certified mail, return receipt requested, or in person with written proof of delivery. OKDHS shall be the final authority as to the availability of funds. The effective date of such contract termination or reduction in consideration shall be specified in the notice, provided, that the funding adjustments stated in this paragraph shall not apply to payments made for services satisfactorily completed prior to the effective date of the termination or reduction. In the event of a reduction in Contract consideration, Contractor may work with OKDHS to reduce the Scope of Work proportionately or cancel this contract as of the effective date of the proposed reduction, upon advance written notice to OKDHS. Both parties shall make a good faith effort to reach mutual agreement on reasonable phase-out costs upon notice of termination or reduction of contract.

The OSRHE represents that it has, or will have by the date services are delivered, under its control, the personal services, labor and equipment, machinery or other facilities to perform work required from it pursuant to this agreement.

X. Assurances


XI. Marketing

The Department retains ownership to all names, artwork, publications, web content and web domains associated with the services provided by the contractor on behalf of the Department. The Department will determine the overall branding of services (may include, but not limited to: name of the service, artwork or logos) provided by contractor on behalf of the Department. The Department and the Contractor agree to collaborate on the marketing of services provided by the contractor on behalf of the Department. The Department agrees that there may be reference to the contractor or designee in certain marketing publications.

All major publications or web content associated with a service provided on behalf of the Department, or paid by the Department, will be furnished to the Department prior to use or distribution.

Contractor agrees that the marketing terms will be complied with by all sub-contractors or grantees of the contractor providing services on behalf of the Department.
Representative for the
Oklahoma Department of Human Services

Glen D. Johnson, Chancellor
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

Date: ______________________   Date: ________________________
AGENDA ITEM #14-b:

Scholars for Excellence in Child Care.

SUBJECT: Allocation of funds to Oklahoma community colleges participating in the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care Program pursuant to the contract with the Department of Human Services.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the community college’s Scholars for Excellence in Childcare Program allocations in the amounts set forth below pursuant to the contract between the Oklahoma Department of Human Services and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

BACKGROUND:

Since June 2000, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) and the Department of Human Services (OKDHS) have contracted to allow State System community colleges to participate in the Scholars for Excellence in Child Care (Scholars) program. All twelve community colleges and Oklahoma State University-Oklahoma City have a Scholars program in place. Northern Oklahoma College offers a program in Stillwater and the Enid campus.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ commitment to the enhancement of educational opportunities, as well as coordination/cooperation between State System institutions and other state agencies.

ANALYSIS:

A review of the community college Scholars for Excellence in Child Care program continuation applications by OKDHS and State Regents’ staff resulted in the following recommendations for FY13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Albert State College</td>
<td>$82,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State College</td>
<td>$77,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Oklahoma A&amp;M College</td>
<td>$69,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Oklahoma College-Enid</td>
<td>$81,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Oklahoma College-Stillwater</td>
<td>$96,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>$79,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University-OKC</td>
<td>$71,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands Community College</td>
<td>$71,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose State College</td>
<td>$92,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole State College</td>
<td>$84,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Community College</td>
<td>$154,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>$88,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #15:

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

SUBJECT: Allocation of funds to Oklahoma community colleges participating in the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program pursuant to the contracts with the Department of Human Services.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the community college Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program allocations in the amounts set forth herein pursuant to the contract between the Oklahoma Department of Human Services and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

BACKGROUND:

Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Act was legislated, short-term training programs at the two-year college tailored for recipients of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program (TANF) have been operational through funding provided through a contract between the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (OKDHS) and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE). Five State System two-year colleges offer TANF programs at seven locations on and off the campus as follows: Carl Albert State College, Poteau and Sallisaw; Connors State College – Muskogee and Tahlequah; and Murray State College – Tishomingo, Ardmore and Atoka. Effective July 1, 2011, Murray State College has undertaken administration oversight for the programs formerly administered by Eastern Oklahoma State College in McAlester and Idabel; Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College – Miami and Jay, and Northern Oklahoma College – Stillwater and Enid.

In July 1999, OKDHS and the OSRHE entered into a separate contract to offer a job readiness only program for TANF recipients at Oklahoma State University-Oklahoma City. The purpose of this program was to offer intense job readiness skills and job search assistance to help TANF recipients become employed in 4-6 weeks. Most of the TANF recipients referred to this program have already received some type of vocational training and have been unable to find employment.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the State Regents’ commitment to the enhancement of educational opportunities, and coordination and cooperation between State System institutions and other state agencies.

ANALYSIS:

A review of the two-year college TANF program continuation applications for FY13 by OKDHS and OSRHE staff resulted in the recommended amounts listed below:
### Community College TANF Programs

**FY13 Funding Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Albert State College</td>
<td>$217,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connors State College*</td>
<td>$137,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State College (McAlester and Idabel program locations**)</td>
<td>$293,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State College</td>
<td>$333,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Oklahoma A&amp; M College</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Oklahoma College-Enid</td>
<td>$143,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Oklahoma College – Stillwater</td>
<td>$156,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>$280,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City</td>
<td>$200,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City (job readiness)</td>
<td>$131,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology – Okmulgee</td>
<td>$201,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands Community College</td>
<td>$259,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose State College</td>
<td>$259,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole State College</td>
<td>$247,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College*</td>
<td>$140,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* joint program with area technology center

** previously administered by Eastern Oklahoma State College
Meeting of the
OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
May 25, 2012

AGENDA ITEM #16:

Tulsa Community College.

SUBJECT: Tulsa Community College EXCELerate Concurrent Enrollment Pilot Project Update.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

In September 2010, Tulsa Community College (TCC) received approval for exceptions to sections of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Educations’ (OSRHE) policy to implement the EXCELerate Concurrent Enrollment Pilot Project between TCC and nine high schools in the Tulsa Public School (TPS) system and Union High School (UHS). The initial pilot project dates extended from Fall 2010 to Spring 2012. However, TCC received two one semester extensions due to implementing the pilot project Spring 2011 and to accommodate and mitigate the stranding of students midway through the academic year. A final report on the pilot project is expected September 6, 2013. Data will be collected and analyzed at the conclusion of the project to determine its impact and effectiveness. The University of Oklahoma Educational Administration Department will assist with identifying the research components regarding data needs, collection, and analysis.

The policy exceptions approved at the September 2010 State Regents’ meeting are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Regents’ Policy</th>
<th>Approved Policy Exception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent enrollment admission requirements:</td>
<td>• Juniors – 19 (composite) ACT or GPA of 2.5 and subject score of 19;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Juniors – 21 ACT (composite) or GPA of 3.5 and subject score of 19;</td>
<td>• Seniors – 19 ACT (composite) or 2.5 and subject score of 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seniors – 19 ACT (composite) or GPA of 3.0 and subject score of 19.</td>
<td>Rationale: Align with current TCC admission standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission: Sophomores are not allowed to enroll in concurrent enrollment.</td>
<td>Allow high school sophomores with a 15 PLAN score or equivalent EXPLOR score to enroll in TCC’s Strategies for Academic Success as a prerequisite for concurrent enrollment in their junior and senior years. The course will be taught by a TCC faculty member on the high school campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale: The course will prepare students for concurrent enrollment by teaching strategies for college success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Workload: A high school student may enroll in a combined number of high school and college courses per semester not to exceed a full-time college workload of 19 semester-credit-hours. | Allow a combined college workload of 19 hours excluding extracurricular elective courses.  
Rationale: Too restrictive. Students can incorporate extracurricular elective courses (e.g., yearbook, band, chorus, and athletics) and still be successful. |
|---|---|
| GPA requirement: High school students may continue concurrent enrollment in subsequent semesters if they achieve a college cumulative GPA of 2.0 or above on a 4.0 scale. | Allow students who receive a cumulative GPA below 2.0 to be placed on academic probation for one semester. Students must achieve a semester GPA of at least 2.0 to remain in concurrent enrollment.  
Rationale: TCC will provide on-site academic support for the students in the pilot. This exception will allow students the opportunity to continue enrollment and improve their performance in the same way regular students are supported. |
| Faculty: To ensure the students achieve college credit through a collegiate experience, high school students must be taught by regular faculty whose primary educational employment is as a faculty member at the institution delivering the course. | Allow high school teachers who meet TCC faculty qualifications to teach concurrent enrollment courses. For review and selection, high school faculty members will be required to present undergraduate and graduate transcripts along with an updated résumé. |
| Assessment/remediation: Concurrently admitted high school students are not allowed to enroll in any remedial/developmental courses offered by colleges or universities which are designed to remove high school curricular or basic academic skills deficiencies. | Allow concurrently admitted students to enroll in remedial/developmental courses offered by TCC.  
Rationale: TCC will provide remedial courses on the high school campus in collaboration with high school faculty to ensure course content will prepare students for college level work.  
Note: It is understood that high school students enrolling in remedial/developmental courses are not eligible for a tuition waiver and will be responsible for tuition and fees. |

On April 9, 2012, TCC received an additional policy exception, which was a non-substantive change and is within the context of the pilot project and of the policy exceptions outlined above. This additional policy exception allows a minimum ACT PLAN score of 19 [equivalent to an ACT composite score range of 19-23] for juniors and seniors. It is important to note these juniors and seniors must have taken the ACT PLAN during their sophomore year to qualify for this exception. A preliminary report on the pilot project is outlined below.
POLICY ISSUES:

The exceptions include sections of the 3.9 Institutional Admission and Retention policy section 3.9.6.1 Special Admissions – Concurrent Enrollment, 3.19 Assessment and 3.20 Remediation. Specifically, the exceptions involve:

- Admission of concurrent enrollment students;
- Credit hour workload;
- Concurrent enrollment grade-point average;
- Faculty qualifications;
- Admission requirements;
- Assessment; and
- Remediation.

ANALYSIS:

Preliminary data analysis of the Spring 2011 EXCELerate pilot project cohort shows a total of 339 juniors and seniors enrolled in TCC classes at either UHS or one of the nine high schools in the TPS system. Of these 339 students, 18 (5.3 percent or 13 juniors and 5 seniors) of them would not have met the minimum admission standards for concurrent enrollment without the EXCELerate pilot project exceptions. These 18 students are defined as the EXCELerate cohort. For comparison purposes, the remaining 321 students who took TCC courses at either UHS or one of the nine high schools in the TPS system are defined as non-EXCELerate cohort. As expected, the EXCELerate students have lower high school GPAs and composite ACT scores than the students in the other groups, whose scores qualified them to take TCC courses without the EXCELerate policy exceptions.

While findings suggest only a small percentage of students taking TCC courses at UHS or TPS high schools in Spring 2011 were eligible to enroll because of the policy exceptions for the EXCELerate pilot program, it is noteworthy that at least one student from each high school included in the pilot was eligible to enroll in TCC courses exclusively because of the EXCELerate pilot project.

Using grades of C or better in TCC courses, spring-to-fall persistence, and the number of seniors matriculating to TCC as the measures of student success for each group, the findings show higher rates of spring-to-fall persistence and seniors matriculating to TCC for students in the EXCELerate cohort compared to non-EXCELerate and concurrent enrollment students attending a TCC campus. Although the sample size for EXCELerate group is very small, these results provide preliminary evidence suggesting that students enrolling in TCC courses through the EXCELerate pilot project are particularly likely to take TCC courses in the following semester.

Despite the small sample size, preliminary results provide evidence suggesting that students enrolling under the special admissions requirements were especially likely to take TCC courses the subsequent semester and these preliminary data suggests the unique structure of the EXCELerate pilot project is effective in increasing access to higher education, student retention, persistence, and overall student performance for students that would have been otherwise unable to participate in concurrent enrollment.
AGENDA ITEM #17:

Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant.

SUBJECT: Award Schedule for 2012-2013.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the proposed 2012-2013 award schedule for the Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant program.

BACKGROUND:

The 1971 Oklahoma Legislature created the Oklahoma Tuition Aid Grant (OTAG) program. OTAG is a need-based grant program that currently provides awards for both full-time and part-time undergraduate students. The maximum award is $1,000 at public institutions and $1,300 at private institutions. The program currently serves about 21,500 students with a total budget of nearly $18.8 million. The award is available to students attending state system institutions, non-profit accredited private institutions and public career technology centers.

Until 2010-2011, the OTAG program received annually approximately $900,000 in federal matching funds. However, due to federal budget reductions in 2011, those funds were eliminated beginning in 2011-2012.

POLICY ISSUES:

OTAG continues to play an important role in providing college aid to Oklahoma students with the least financial resources, including a significant number of adult students.

ANALYSIS:

As shown in the attached document, the proposed award schedule reflects the following:

- Awards will initially be limited to students with an Expected Family Contribution (EFC) of 1700 or less and can be extended if funds are sufficient. The EFC is the amount that the student and their family are expected to pay “out of pocket” toward the student’s college costs. The amount is determined by a formula utilized for the federal student financial aid application.

- Awards will be made to students on a first-come/first-serve basis with an expectation to fund students applying at least through March 1. This date can be extended if funds are sufficient. For 2011-2012, funds were sufficient to pay awards to students applying through March 15.

- The maximum award level will remain at $1,000 for students attending public institutions and $1,300 for students attending private/independent institutions. The maximum award for students attending public institutions has remained $1,000 since 1982.
• The proposed schedule will continue to exclude graduate students. Graduate student eligibility was initially suspended in 2003-2004 due to budget cuts. Due to the inability to fund all eligible undergraduate students, it is recommended that graduate students remain ineligible for the award.

• The proposed schedule includes an option for offering awards for summer enrollments if funds remain available after all Fall and Spring disbursements have been paid.

• While the highest EFC for awards is 1700, a maximum eligible EFC is determined in order to identify the total eligible OTAG applicant pool. The maximum EFC is 4995, which is consistent with eligibility for federal Pell Grants in 2012-2013.

Attachment
Expected Family Contribution (EFC) as calculated for federal student financial aid programs is the basis for determining OTAG award eligibility. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) set an annual award payment schedule. The applicant's EFC is incorporated into the payment schedule to determine the percentage of enrollment costs (tuition and mandatory fees charged to all students) the applicant is eligible to receive. The percentage is then applied to the appropriate standard OTAG enrollment cost for the school. Based on their EFC, an applicant is eligible for up to 75% of their enrollment costs. This percentage is applied to the school cost amount for the student’s enrollment status (full-time or part-time) to determine the maximum OTAG award amount.

Maximum Award Amount is 75% of Enrollment Costs, not to Exceed $1,000 For Students Attending Public Colleges, Universities and Career Technology Centers or $1,300 for Students Attending Non-Profit Private Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFC RANGE</th>
<th>% OF ENROLLMENT COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1700</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701 – 2000</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 – 2500</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501 – 3000</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001 – 3500</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501 – 4000</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001 – 4500</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4501 – 4995</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Shaded area represents initial 2012-2013 funding cutoff for non-renewal applicants. The EFC cutoff may be extended if funds remain available.
- EFCs greater than 4995 are ineligible in 2012-2013.
- In setting the annual schedule, an EFC cap (highest EFC an applicant can have and be eligible for OTAG) is based on the highest EFC a student can have and be eligible to receive federal Pell Grant funding.

2012-2013 Awarding Priorities:
Only undergraduates will be considered for awards in 2012-2013.
1. Undergraduate applications with receipt dates of March 1 or earlier and EFC’s from 0 through 1700 will be awarded. If funds are not available to award all eligible undergraduate applications with EFC’s from 0 through 1700 received through March 1, those with the earliest application receipt dates will receive priority consideration.
2. If funds remain available after awarding eligible undergraduate applications meeting priority 1 above, the application receipt date cutoff may be extended beyond March 1 and/or the EFC cutoff may be extended above 1700.
3. If, after all Fall and Spring disbursements have been paid, funds remain available, the OSRHE may authorize the payment of awards for Summer enrollments. If the OSRHE determine that funds are available to offer summer awards, institutions will be notified. At the time of notification, summer award amounts will be announced.
AGENDA ITEM #18-a:

Student Performance Reports.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma High School Indicators Project. Reports required by 1989 legislation relating to (1) high school to college-going rate by high school site, (2) performance of college freshmen by high school site, and (3) ACT performance by high school site.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

In Senate Bill No. 183 from the 1989 legislative session, Section 13 set up a program designed to evaluate the performance of individual schools and school districts in the state of Oklahoma. This program not only required multiple types of evaluation by the State Department of Education, but also required that the individual schools and districts be notified of these evaluations, and that the general public also be advised as to the "effectiveness" of individual schools or districts. In response to the directive of SB 183, the State Regents provide the following four reports; (1) High School to College-Going Rates for Oklahoma High School Graduates to Oklahoma Colleges; (2) Headcount, Semester Hours, and GPA Report; (3) Mean ACT Scores by Oklahoma High School Site; and (4) Remediation Rates for Oklahoma High School Graduates in Oklahoma Public Higher Education (beginning in 1995).

POLICY ISSUES:

These reports are consistent with States Regents’ policy.

ANALYSIS:

A summary of remediation rates for Oklahoma high school graduates in Oklahoma public higher education are contained within this agenda. The data describes 2010 Oklahoma high school graduates 17, 18 or 19 years old who entered an Oklahoma public college or university as first-time entering freshmen in fall 2010. The summary identifies remediation activity of students who took at least one remedial course. Listed are the freshmen student headcount and percentage for each of the four subject areas of remedial courses: science, English, mathematics, and reading. An unduplicated headcount and percentage is also provided for students who could have been remediated in more than one subject area but counted only once in the unduplicated total. Additional information will be provided online containing headcounts and percentages grouped by county, district and high school site.
Of the fall 2010 first-time freshmen (20,500) 38.0 percent (7,798) enrolled in one or more remedial courses. The unduplicated remediation percent has changed little since first being reported for fall 1996 first-time freshmen (37.3), a difference of seven tenths percentage points. Fall 2010 unduplicated remediation is down 2.8 percentage points from the previous year. This marks the first year that the Unduplicated and Math remediation rate have declined after three consecutive years of increases. Math declined 3.7 percentage points from the previous year. English declined 4.2 percentage points from its previous year which coincides with a 3.7 percentage point increase in reading. This shift can in part be explained by a change in methodology used to better identify both reading and English remediation. Science remediation dropped two tenths of a full point to 1.1 percent.

In compliance with Senate Bill No. 183, the State Regents will transmit these reports to the Office of Accountability.
AGENDA ITEM #18-b

Student Performance Reports.


RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

- In 1991, the State Regents adopted the Student Assessment Policy that required each institution to develop and implement a comprehensive assessment program with mandatory student placement in Fall 1994. This is the twentieth annual student remediation (here after referred to as developmental education) report.

- Societal, demographic, and technological changes have contributed to increased demands for access to higher education with minorities and immigrants overrepresented among those who need developmental education. Recent economic conditions have resulted in substantial increases in regional and community college enrollment along with concomitant increases in developmental education needs.

- The widespread need for college developmental education has brought about efforts to prepare students while still in high school. National and regional studies report approximately one-third of new freshmen enroll in remedial courses, and states with mandatory assessment and placement programs, such as Oklahoma, report higher remediation rates.

- Nationally, little change in the number of students enrolled in developmental education courses has taken place in the last few years. Community colleges report the greatest percentage of developmental education, with math being the most cited area of deficiency.

- Nationally, 60 percent of all developmental education is conducted by community colleges. Oklahoma community colleges have over 79 percent of the State System’s developmental education enrollments.

- Financial costs of developmental education are being addressed in different ways by various states, with some requiring additional fees from the developmental education student. Others have proposed that the developmental education costs be borne by the secondary schools that graduated the student needing developmental education. Nationally, developmental education costs are less than 1 percent of the total public higher education budget.

- Oklahoma students pay more for developmental education courses at State System institutions. Those developmental education fees, set by the individual institution, generated $3.46 million in 2010-2011.
OKLAHOMA INITIATIVES:

- The State Regents approved the adoption of a College Completion agenda at their October 20, 2011 meeting which includes reform in remedial and developmental education as a key component. The agenda incorporates the Complete College America and National Governors Association Complete to Compete metrics, recommitts to a revised Brain Gain performance program, and makes college completion a top priority with commitments to state and campus goals, action plans and measures of progress. The State Regents have committed the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education to statewide reform and redesign of developmental education through redesign projects and a common framework established by the OSRHE and implemented by all colleges and universities.

- The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) Council of Presidents and the Council on Instruction are currently guiding institutions through reviews of existing remedial and developmental education programs to work toward a reform that advances the student’s time of completion and learning outcomes. All campuses are involved in redesign projects with several piloting academic assessment, placement, and delivery reforms with a common evaluation framework. Policy and program redesign efforts will continue through 2012-2013 with new OSRHE Assessment and Remediation policies expected to be finalized in Spring 2013.

- Prior measures which the State Regents have taken to reduce developmental education include: 1) enhancing teacher preparation, 2) increasing standards for college preparation, 3) establishing better communication with and feedback to Oklahoma high schools, and 4) facilitating cooperation between various state education entities to increase the number of students who go to college directly from high school.

- Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS)—a voluntary student assessment and instructional support program that provides feedback to middle and high schools about their performance in preparing students for college is funded and supported by the OSRHE. Currently, 98 percent of all K-12 public school districts, 65 private schools and two Bureau of Indian Affairs schools participate in EPAS, reaching more than 98 percent of the state’s eighth grade students and 99.5 percent of tenth graders attend a school that participates in EPAS. ACT reports that, from 1993 to 2011, the percent of Oklahoma students taking the ACT has increased by ten percent and the mean score for Oklahoma’s students has increased from 20.1 to 20.7.

- Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)—a federal program designed to better prepare middle and high school students for college through mentoring programs, scholarships, and new academic preparation and awareness programs for students and parents. In Spring 2011, GEAR UP awarded sub grants to 29 school districts, serving over 33,000 students. With a focus on training educators to adopt classroom strategies proven to help students learn more effectively, GEAR UP provided 19 professional development workshops for 600 participants during the first six months of 2011. In Fall 2011, GEAR UP was awarded its third consecutive federal grant. Phase III of the grant targets education and direct student services locally to 24 rural school districts and 21,170 students. It helps make Oklahoma communities more of a college-bound population by providing activities, services and information to strengthen classroom learning and student achievement, empower educators and community leaders and educate students and families. Since 2005 in schools served by GEAR UP, assessments at the 8th and 10th grade level designed to gauge college and career readiness have steadily improved, especially for minority students, resulting in a narrowing in the achievement gap for these students. Parental involvement in GEAR UP communities has also increased. GEAR UP's Parent Leadership Academy has provided training for 133 parents to complete local school projects providing much-needed programs and supplies to help student improve academic achievement.
• Legislation passed in 2005 established a college preparatory track with strengthened graduation requirements and made it the default curriculum. The new high school graduation standard requiring satisfactory completion of end-of-instruction tests becomes effective for those graduating in Spring 2012.

FINDINGS:

• 41,117 students enrolled in at least one developmental education course in 2010-2011: 2.5 percent (1,012 students) at the research universities, 18.5 percent (7,593 students) at the regional universities, and 79.1 percent (32,512 students) at the community colleges. (Figure 1)

• Of Fall 2010 first-time freshmen, 41.9 percent enrolled in developmental education courses. (Figure 2)

• Of Fall 2010 first-time freshmen who did not meet the OSRHE 15-unit high school core curriculum, 52.6 percent enrolled in developmental education courses, compared to 25.7 percent of freshmen who completed the high school core curriculum. (Figure 3)

• Developmental education by subject for Fall 2010 first-time freshmen was as follows: 34.7 percent mathematics, 18.6 percent English, 14.0 percent reading, and 1.0 percent science. (Figure 4)

• From 2001-2002 to 2010-2011, the developmental education rate for first-time freshmen direct from Oklahoma high schools decreased from 36.5 to 35.7 percent. The 2010-2011 rate of 35.7 percent is lower than the 41.9 percent for all first-time freshmen. (Figure 5)

• Older freshmen require more developmental education. During the 2010-2011 academic year, a higher percentage of first-time freshmen 21 years of age and older (57.2 percent) enrolled in developmental education courses than freshmen less than 21 years of age (37.8 percent). (Figure 6)

• A study of eight cohorts of first-time freshmen indicates that math developmental education increases the chances of success in college algebra. (Figure 7)

• In 2010-2011, Oklahoma State System institutions generated $3.46 million from student-paid developmental education course fees.

CONCLUSIONS:

• The reforms in developmental education anticipated for 2013 should result in more students retained in the higher education system through better targeted rapid learning, with reduced time to degree.

• Community colleges continue to be the primary source of developmental education in the State System. This is consistent with the community college’s mission.

• Relatively high secondary test pass rates for English and reading indicate a need to examine the appropriateness of cut scores for ACT subjects and secondary tests. Colleges and universities are encouraged to continue monitoring the relationship between cut scores for course placement, developmental education effectiveness and the academic success of the developmental students.

• Students enrolling soon after high school (17 to 20 year-olds) are less likely to need developmental education than students 21 years of age and older (37.8 and 57.2 percent, respectively).
• Recent economic conditions have resulted in large increases in enrollment at regional universities and community colleges. Since most of these students probably did not plan on attending college they were ill-prepared.

• The financial costs associated with developmental education are small in comparison to total higher education budgets and are negligible when compared to the alternatives, which can range from falling levels of degree attainment to employment in low paying jobs.
FIGURE 1
Tier Distribution of Oklahoma Students Taking Developmental Education Courses

FIGURE 2
Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental Education Courses
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FIGURE 4
Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental Courses by Subject
FIGURE 5
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FIGURE 6
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FIGURE 7
Average Grade and Pass Rate Comparison of Developmental and Non-Developmental Education Student Success in College Algebra by Cohort Years 1999-2000 to 2006-2007

*Earning an "A", "B", "C", or "D" in College Algebra
AGENDA ITEM #19:

Commendations.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

RECOGNITIONS:

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

- **Jose Dela Cruz**, Academic Affairs project coordinator, graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a Master of Education in Higher Education Administration with a concentration in Institutional Research

- **Payton Hamlin**, Administration coordinator, graduated from the University of Central Oklahoma, with a Bachelor’s Degree in Organizational Leadership as a part of the first Reach Higher Class.

- **Dr. Lisa Holder**, director, Teacher Education and Oklahoma Teacher Connection, served as an assessor for the research projects conducted during the Capstone Research Experience course at the University of Central Oklahoma; led a panel discussion on higher education policy at the Oklahoma Educational Studies Association (OESA) at the University of Oklahoma.

- **Chancellor Glen D. Johnson**, spoke at the investiture of President Don Betz at the University of Central Oklahoma in Edmond; spoke at the 2012 Economic Development Partnership Program in Oklahoma City; met with Secretary of State Glenn Coffee at the Capitol to discuss higher education issues; met with Governor Mary Fallin, President David Boren and President Burns Hargis to discuss higher education issues; spoke at the Reach Higher Professional Development Workshop in Midwest City; addressed the Senate Pages at the State Capitol; served as Master of Ceremonies at the Okemah Hall of Fame in Okemah; spoke at the Oklahoma City Community College 2012 Commencement Ceremony in Oklahoma City; spoke at Oklahoma State University – OKC’s 2012 Commencement Ceremony in Oklahoma City; spoke to the Lawton Community Foundation Scholarship Breakfast in Lawton; met with the Council of Presidents regarding higher education issues; met with Senator Clark Jolley regarding Higher Education issues at the Capitol; met with Representative Earl Sears to discuss higher education issues at the Capitol; was interviewed by Gwen Faulkner Lippert on KTOK concerning higher education issues; was interviewed on KWTV Channel 9 concerning higher education issues.

- **Irala Magee**, director of Scholarship and Grant Administration, was presented the 2011 Partner Award by the Oklahoma Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (OASFAA) at the Association’s annual conference. The award goes to a person who has made a significant
contribution to the benefit of the financial aid community, specifically the facilitation of the massive collection of student-level financial aid data being implemented through the Noel-Levitz project.

- **Brian Rousey**, default prevention specialist II at OCAP, graduated from Southern Nazarene University with a Bachelors of Science degree in Business Administration.

- **Saeed Sarani**, curriculum advisor, **Deena Thomas**, OTEP coordinator, and **Goldie Thompson**, coordinator, Oklahoma Teacher Connection, passed out information to international students about higher education and State Regents’ initiatives at International Student Day at the Capitol.

- **Goldie Thompson**, coordinator, Oklahoma Teacher Connection, is serving as the president of the Oklahoma Educational Studies Association (OESA) at the University of Oklahoma. The group celebrated its 10th anniversary with a panel presentation, *The Future of the Professoriate*, which covered the topics of policy, administration, research, and practice; will have a book review published in the May issue of *Educational Studies Journal* – “Race and the University: A Memoir.”

- **Lourdes M. Torres**, GEAR UP project coordinator, graduated from the University of Central Oklahoma, with a Bachelor’s Degree in Organizational Leadership as a part of the first Reach Higher Class.

- **Debbie Terlip**, assistant director of Campus Compact and student relations liaison, graduated from Oklahoma State University with a Master of Science in Educational Leadership Studies, Higher Education.

- A team of OSRHE staff including **Ricky Steele**, executive director of Research and Information Systems, **Chris Evans**, assistant director of Applications and Systems, **Brian Burkhart**, assistant director of Network Systems, **Roy Sanderson**, network support engineer, **Joseph Dubray**, network support engineer, **Liza Hanke**, director of Purchasing, **Mei-Lin Yang**, assistant controller, **Rachell Bowers**, payroll and benefits manager, and **Ashley Hines**, accountant, met with the University Center at Ponca City staff regarding the transition of OSRHE as the University Center’s fiscal agent.
AGENDA ITEM #20:

Executive Session.

SUBJECT: Possible vote to go into executive session pursuant to Title 25, Oklahoma Statutes, Section 307(B)(4), for confidential communications between a public body and its attorneys concerning pending investigations, claims or actions.
AGENDA ITEM #21:

Personnel.

SUBJECT: Personnel Changes.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the personnel change as noted below.

BACKGROUND/POLICY ISSUES:

State Regents' personnel policy (2.8.2) requires Regents' ratification of decisions relating to director level and above personnel.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

DIRECTOR- AND- ABOVE ACTIONS. It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the following personnel action:

Executive Director of OneNet and Higher Education Chief Information Officer (CIO). It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the appointment of Von Royal to serve as the Executive Director of OneNet and Higher Education Chief Information Officer. Mr. Royal currently serves as the Executive Director of OneNet. Mr. Royal will assume this position on June 1, 2012 with a salary of $145,000. A copy of the job description is attached.
THE OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

JOB DESCRIPTION
Executive Director of OneNet and
Higher Education Chief Information Officers (CIO)

THE OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

JOB DESCRIPTION
Executive Director of OneNet and Higher Education Chief Information Officer

Exempt
Position #100328

ESSENTIAL FUNCTION

Serve as executive director responsible for overall direction and administration of OneNet, a statewide telecommunications wide-area network that serves higher education institutions, K-12 schools, vocational technical schools, hospitals, public libraries, and governmental agencies and as the Higher Education Chief Information Officers (CIO) responsible for facilitating cost savings through coordinated system operations and shared services.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

- Responsible for oversight and general administration of OneNet, a division of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.
- Develop long-range plans for OneNet for recommendation to the Chancellor.
- Develop the statewide backbone and local connections, including contract negotiations as required.
- Stay informed on national and international developments in telecommunications technology and applications to ensure that network technology and network development are kept current.
- Develop and maintain customer support for OneNet’s short-term and long-term goals.
- Serve as spokesperson for OneNet to communicate with customers on service and policy issues.
- Represent OneNet at national and state conferences and hearings before the Oklahoma State Legislature as required.
- Ensure compliance with applicable State Regents policies and federal and state rules, regulations and statutes.
- Responsible for recommending hiring, firing, advancement, promotion or other changes to assigned employee status.
- Responsible for interagency communications related to OneNet functions and partnerships.
- Coordinate with the Council on Information Technology (CoIT) on operation of IT, network and security related systems at each of the Higher Education institutions.
- Coordinate the collection and dissemination of information between and among all institutions for optimum system operations and cost savings.
- Coordinate and leverage economies of scale through purchasing consortiums, shared serves and development of best-practices.
• Responsible for system reports to the Chancellor detailing all designated initiatives and cost-savings.
• Coordinates cost-saving activities with the Chief Information Officers of the higher education institutions.
• Perform other related duties as assigned.

POSITION QUALIFICATIONS

Master’s or bachelor’s degree in telecommunications management, information management, or a related field of study, and ten (10) years professional experience including experience in evaluating, selecting, and implementing information systems, services, and related technologies. Must have at least five (5) years experience in a supervisory or administrative capacity or an equivalent combination of education and work-related experience.

Must have knowledge of information systems and telecommunication networks, data processing hardware and software, security and control methods and systems, planning techniques, and the principles of business and public administration. Must be able to direct the work of others, coordinate activities and resources within or between units, sections or divisions, communicate effectively and establish and maintain effective working relationships with others. Strong written, verbal, and presentation skills are required. Experience with state government or higher education budgeting processes is preferred. Some travel required.

SUPERVISION

The employee performs work under the supervision of the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance, Information Technology, Telecommunications and OneNet.
AGENDA ITEM #22-a:

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)
10 degree program requirement changes
3 degree program name changes
1 degree program degree designation change
2 degree program option name changes

Oklahoma Panhandle State University (OPSU)
1 degree program option addition

Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU)
1 degree program requirement change

University of Central Oklahoma (UCO)
2 degree program option deletions

Tulsa Community College (TCC)
1 degree program option name change
10 degree program requirement changes

POLICY ISSUES:

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

ANALYSIS:

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Communication (223)
Degree program requirement change
• Remove COMM 5033 and COMM 5323 from required courses.
• Allow students to select COMM 5033 or COMM 5323.
• The proposed changes allow students to complete more electives in their area of interest.
• No new courses will be added or deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy (187)
Degree program requirement change
• Increase credit hours allowed for dissertation research from 30 to 39.
• Decrease credit hours required for course work from 60 to 51.
• The proposed changes are in line with other doctoral Philosophy programs at peer institutions.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum (064)
Degree program requirement change
• Increase maximum number of credit hours allowed for dissertation from 12 to 18.
• The proposed change corrects a typographic error which occurred during the last program modification.
• No new courses will be added or deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Studies (116)
Degree program requirement change
• Increase required credit hours for “Research Methods” from 18 to 21.
• Remove sequence options under “Quantitative Methods” requirements and require students to complete EIPT 5023 and EIPT 6023.
• Remove required courses under “Qualitative Methods” and allow students to complete 6 credit hours approved by student’s advisor and graduate liaison.
• The proposed changes will better meet the needs of the students and update the curriculum according to course offerings.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Doctor of Education in Education Administration (278)
Degree program requirement change
• Remove 3 credit hours of qualitative research methods course options and require students to complete EACS 5133.
• The proposed change reflects current student and advisor approved practice.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Cellular and Behavioral Neurobiology (363)
Degree program option name change
• For the “Cellular and Behavioral Neurobiology: Zoology” option:
  o Change option name to “Cellular and Behavioral Neurobiology: Biology.”
The proposed change is needed to mirror the requested changes in the name of the department and other graduate programs from Zoology to Biology.

- No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Doctor of Philosophy in Zoology (230)
Master of Science in Zoology (229)
Bachelor of Science in Zoology (228)

Degree program name changes and degree program option name changes
- Change program name to “Biology.”
- For the “Zoology” option:
  - Change option name to “Biology.”
- The proposed changes will align the program name with OU’s request to change the name of the Department of Zoology to the Department of Biology and will better reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum within Biology and aid in the recruitment of students.
- No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Master of Arts in Anthropology (009)

Degree program requirement change
- Allow students to select ANTH 5003 or both ANTH 5223 and ANTH 5123.
- Change credit hours allowed for electives from 15 to 12-15.
- The proposed changes allow students who need only one-term of a theory class to do so, while providing an option for students who need a two-term class.
- One new course will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Master of Law in Law (384)

Degree program designation change
- Change degree designation to “Master of Laws”
- The proposed name change reflects the correct translation of the Latin *Legum Magister*, which means Master of Laws.
- No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

OU – Bachelor of Science in Education in Social Studies – General (208)

Degree program requirement change
- Remove “Electives” from “General Education” Requirements and reduce credit hours required from 55 to 46-47.
- Add EIPT 3011, EDUC 4060, and ILAC 4143 to “Professional Education” courses and increase credit hours required from 22 to 35.
- Remove GEOG 3633 from “Specialized Education” and reduce credit hours required from 47 to 42-43.
- Remove “Graduate Certification Component” requirement.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

**OU – Bachelor of Science in Computer Science in Computer Science (233)**
Degree program requirement change
- Remove ENGR 2002 and add CS 3202.
- The proposed change provides the necessary student outcomes as established by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology.
- One new course will be added and one course will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

**OU – Bachelor of Science in Environmental Engineering in Environmental Engineering (331)**
Degree program requirement change
- Remove ENGR 2002 and add ENGR 2431 and ENGR 3401.
- The proposed change allows students to have more focused knowledge in the content taught in the courses.
- Two new courses will be added and one course will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

**OU – Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering in Civil Engineering (037)**
Degree program requirement change
- Remove ENGR 2002 and 3 credit hours of “Professional Elective” and add ENGR 2431 and ENGR 3401.
- Add GEOL 1114 or “Basic Science.”
- The proposed change allows students to have more focused knowledge in the content taught in the courses and addresses weaknesses cited by an accreditation evaluator.
- Three new courses will be added and one course will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will change from 126 to 127.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

**OPSU – Associate in Applied Science in Technology (050)**
Degree program option addition
- Add option “Emergency Medical Services.”
- The proposed option will address the need for emergency service personnel both in the State of Oklahoma and OPSU’s service area.
- Policy indicates options will usually share at least a 50 percent common core. Although the program will not have a common core, based on industry needs and location of the institution, an exception to this practice is warranted.
- Eight new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

**SWOSU – Bachelor of Business Administration in Business Administration (011)**
Degree program requirement change
- For the “Finance” option:
  - Remove ACCTG 4643 from “Required Courses” and reduce credit hour requirement from 15 to 12.
• Increase credit hours required for “Electives” from 12 to 15.
• The proposed changes remove an unnecessary course from the curriculum and allows for more electives.

• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

UCO – Master of Education in Adult and Higher Education (156)
Degree program option deletion

• Delete option “Gerontology.”
• The option was approved at the April 19, 2012 State Regents’ meeting as a stand-alone graduate degree.
• There are currently 20 students enrolled in the option and they will be allowed to complete their plan of study.
• Funds will be used to support the new Master of Arts in Gerontology approved at the April 19, 2012 State Regents meeting.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

UCO – Master of Arts in Political Science (136)
Degree program option deletion

• Delete option “Public Administration.”
• The option was approved at the April 19, 2012 State Regents’ meeting as a stand-alone graduate degree.
• There are currently 16 students enrolled in the option and will be allowed to complete their plan of study.
• Funds will be used to support the new Master of Public Administration in Public Administration.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Art in Pre-Education (006)
Degree program option name change and degree program requirement change

• Change option name from “Elementary Education-LU” to “Elementary and Secondary Education.”
  o The proposed name change is more inclusive since the degree transfers to other state institutions and to majors in both elementary and secondary education.
• Require students to complete CHLD 2032.
• Decrease credit hours required for electives from 25 to 23.
  o The proposed curriculum change requires students to complete a field experience and allows exposure to the classroom earlier in the students’ college experience.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Science in Engineering (007)
Degree program requirement change
Remove APPR 1203 from “Specialized Course Requirements” and reduce credit hours required from 33 to 30.
The course was used to award extra-institutional credit for work experience; however, TCC now requires that credit for work experience must be applicable to a course taught by TCC.
No new courses will be added and one course will be deleted.
Total credit hours for the degree will change from 67 to 64.
No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Science in Child Development (246)
Degree program requirement change
For the “Early Childhood-LU,” “Early Childhood-OSU,” and “Early Childhood-OU” options:
- Increase credit hour requirement for CHLD 2031 from 1 to 2 (2032).
- Increase credit hour requirement for “Specialized Course Requirements” from 25 to 26.
- The proposed change allows students to complete a enhanced field experience and allows exposure to the classroom earlier in the students’ college experience.
- No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the options will change from 60-63 to 61-64.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Applied Science in Electronics Technology (031)
Degree program requirement change
For the “Alternative Energy” option:
- Remove ENGR 1363, ENGR 1463, and NCMT 1212 from “Specialized Course Requirements.”
- Add 7-8 credit hours of “Controlled Electives” and include CHEM 1114, DRFT 1363, ELET 2215, ELET 2244, EGR 1463, and NCMT 1212.
- The proposed changes provide students with more flexibility in course selection and remove a course that is no longer relevant to the degree option.
- No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the option will change from 61-63 to 60-63.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Applied Science in Medical Laboratory Technician (050)
Degree program requirement change
- Decrease credit hour requirement for MDLT 2365 from 5 to 4 (2364) and MDLT 2395 from 5 to 4 (2394).
- Increase credit hour requirement for MDLT 2434 from 4 to 5 (2435).
- Decrease credit hours required for “Specialized Course Requirements” from 41 to 40.
- The proposed changes adjust lab hours and are based upon accreditation standards
- No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
- Total credit hours for the degree will change from 69 to 68.
- No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Applied Science in Respiratory Care (073)
Degree program requirement change
- Decrease credit hour requirement for RESP 2103 from 3 to 2 (2102).
- Increase credit hour requirement for RESP 1413 from 3 to 4 (1414), RESP 2413 from 3 to 4 (2414), and RESP 2203 from 3 to 4 (2204).
- Remove RESP 2391 from “Specialized Course Requirements.”
• Increase credit hours required for “Specialize Course Requirements” from 52 to 53.
• The proposed changes reflect the merger of two courses and efforts to ensure consistency in
  the lab hour/credit hour ratio used in the program.
• No new courses will be added and one course will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will change from 71 to 72.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Applied Science in Physical Therapist Assistant (101)
Degree program requirement change
• Increase credit hour requirement for PHTA 1231 from 1 to 2 (1232).
• Remove PHTA 2432 from “Specialized Course Requirements.”
• Decrease credit hours required for “Specialize Course Requirements” from 50 to 49.
• The proposed changes eliminate a 40-hour clinical which was recommended by faculty,
  students, and the advisory committee.
• No new courses will be added and one course will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will change from 69 to 68.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Associate in Applied Science in Digital Media (216)
Degree program requirement change
• Remove ART 1013 from “Core Courses” and add ART 2413.
  o The proposed change provides course work that is more relevant to digital design
    students.
• For the “Adobe Master Design Specialist” option:
  o Remove CSYS/JRMC 2573 and add CYS 1013.
  o The proposed change adds a course that is a prerequisite to another required course and
    removes a course that is unnecessary for the option.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will not change.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Certificate in Electronics Technology (223)
Degree program requirement change
• Reduce credit hour requirement for “Controlled Electives” from 5-6 to 3-5.
• The proposed change is based on input from the advisory committee to reduce the total hours
  required for the certificate while providing more course options related to the industry.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will change from 21-24 to 19-23.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.

TCC – Certificate in Electronics – Alternative Energy (277)
Degree program requirement change
• Remove ELET 1503.
• The proposed change is based on input from the advisory committee who believed the course
  is not necessary for the plan of study.
• No new courses will be added and no courses will be deleted.
• Total credit hours for the degree will change from 18 to 15.
• No funds are requested from the State Regents.
AGENDA ITEM #22-b:

GEAR UP.

SUBJECT: Approval of License Agreement with the Aurora Learning Community.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the License Agreement between the Aurora Learning Community and Oklahoma GEAR UP to provide a longitudinal data system to track and house student achievement data for the 24 GEAR UP school districts.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents’ Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) project was created to significantly increase the number of students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education. Based on the 2011 federal grant proposal, Oklahoma GEAR UP wrote for the Competitive Preference Priority 3: Projects are designed to collect (or obtain) analyze and use high quality and timely data, especially on participant outcomes, in accordance with privacy requirements, in the following priority area: Improving instructional practice, policies and student outcomes in elementary and secondary schools. Aurora Learning Community Association is a statewide, non-profit organization that provides counsel and innovative solutions for today’s complex educational improvement challenges. Aurora Learning Community grew from the Aurora Project, a $5 million U.S. Department of Education 1997 funded Technology Innovation Challenge Grant (TICG) project. Aurora Learning Community Association is one of only three remaining TICG projects that achieved self-sustaining momentum beyond its five years of grant funding.

POLICY ISSUES:

The provision of professional development for teachers, counselors and school administrators is a major component of the 2011 GEAR UP project proposal to the U.S. Department of Education, along with communications for college success, grants to identified school districts, direct student services and parent education and involvement. While other professional development will be offered through the GEAR UP grant, elements of Aurora Learning Community Association are copyrighted (including workshop materials), and therefore can only be provided exclusively by Aurora Learning Community Association. Aurora Learning Community Association is an approved vendor to the State of Oklahoma and a partner in the Phase III GEAR UP project. GEAR UP is in compliance with agency procedures for purchase of services and materials.

ANALYSIS:

In Phase III (2011-2018) of its project, GEAR UP is partnering with Aurora Learning Community Association, and has negotiated the provision for a longitudinal data system for the 24 GEAR UP school districts. The data system will provide data over time for each individual school site and aggregate data for the state GEAR UP project, which will be used for federal reporting and evaluation of services.
Aurora Learning Community utilizes two platforms. The Comprehend platform supports data sets that can be used to assess learner knowledge and skills and continuous improvement within a community. The Arch platform is the learning community management system for engaging teachers and learners across any field of knowledge. Arch is documentable, and reproducible. Materials for teachers, school administrators and resources for implementation will be provided by Aurora Learning Community Association. Beginning in the summer of 2012, Aurora Learning Community Association will provide the following services exclusively for GEAR UP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>Day of Training</th>
<th>TIMELINE/DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEAR UP Staff Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>July 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Aurora Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>July 11-12, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Comprehend Data with Standard Content</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>July 30-31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Acting on Strengths and Weakness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying Rigor of Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Smart Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Action Plans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies Professional Development and Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Training</td>
<td>12 Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$22,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Platform - Web Service and Resources</td>
<td>$134,546.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPAS Data 24 Schools</td>
<td>$8,308.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Mandated/Common Core Testing 24 Schools</td>
<td>$39,533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$204,487.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a license agreement, Aurora Learning Community Association has described its provision of consultants and staff for each workshop. Aurora Learning Community Association is a Fairview, Oklahoma based non-profit governed by a board of directors. Aurora Learning Community Association has committed to partner with Oklahoma GEAR UP for seven years. The estimated total value of Aurora Learning Community Association partner commitment to the Oklahoma GEAR UP project in FY 2012 is $189,957.

Total funding for the professional development services and deliverables is $204,487.00 federal dollars - all derived from the State Regents’ current GEAR UP grant award. No state dollars are involved.

Total funding for the professional development services and deliverables is $204,287.00 federal dollars - all derived from the State Regents’ current GEAR UP grant award. No state dollars are involved.
AGENDA ITEM #22-c:

Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System.

SUBJECT: Approval of ACT Agreement for 2012-2013.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the 2012-2013 ACT Agreement.

BACKGROUND:

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) have sponsored the Oklahoma Educational Planning and Assessment System (OK EPAS) as a student preparation initiative since 1993. In the 2011-2012 academic year the EXPLORE assessment was taken by 45,465 8th grade students and 42,529 students took the 10th grade PLAN assessment. This is an increase of 1,550 students being served than the previous year. Beginning with four school districts in the 1993 pilot, EPAS has now grown to include over 97 percent of Oklahoma’s public schools, 78 private schools and one Bureau of Indian Affairs school; 98.5 percent of Oklahoma public school eighth graders and 99.8 percent of tenth graders attend a school that participates in EPAS.

Each district voluntarily participates in EPAS, 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 assessment system in the state 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 OSRHE 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 continues to be a valuable tool for Oklahoma middle and high school students and their parents and educators.

Continuing support of EPAS is consistent with State Regents’ social justice policy and goals, the State Regents Public Agenda goals, and supports the early intervention component of the federal GEAR UP program. EPAS is the foundation of State Regents K-16 student preparation efforts.

ANALYSIS:
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and the

Oklahoma State Regents
for Higher Education

Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS)
July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013
Agreement between
ACT, Inc. and Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

This Agreement is executed by and between ACT, Inc., 500 ACT Drive, P. O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52243-0168, hereafter “ACT” and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 656 Research Parkway – Suite 200, Oklahoma City, OK 73104, hereafter “OSRHE.”

RECITALS

OSRHE recognizes, as a matter of social justice, the need to foster, support, and engage in programs founded on the principle of equity of access to ensure that students receive information about college expectations and are provided the necessary interventions to assist them to meet these expectations early and at developmentally appropriate points in time during their pre-collegiate education.

ACT shares OSRHE’s belief that assisting students to plan and prepare early for their after-high-school education and career objectives increases the likelihood that students will both enroll and perform successfully in the postsecondary education studies that they pursue.

To accomplish OSRHE’s vision of maximizing the number of Oklahoma students prepared to succeed in their after-high-school pursuits, OSRHE seeks to implement, in collaboration with ACT, the Educational Planning and Assessment System, a unique system of assessment, research, career planning, and consultative services, solely available through ACT.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. Scope of Work

ACT agrees to furnish and OSRHE agrees to purchase, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein and in any written addendum to this Agreement which may be executed and incorporated herein, the goods and services as described in Exhibit B, which is incorporated into this Agreement.

2. Term

The term of this Agreement will be from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

Modifications in the scope of goods and services and prices may be suggested by either party at any time. Such modifications shall be negotiated, mutually agreed upon and set forth in a written amendment to this Agreement by OSRHE and ACT. This Agreement may also be terminated at any time by either party giving ninety (90) days written notice to the other. In the event that OSRHE elects termination prior to the expiration date, it is agreed that ACT will be reimbursed for that portion of the goods and services performed up to the effective date of termination.

3. Compensation and Payment

During the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, ACT will provide the goods and services identified in Exhibit B, at the unit prices in each period stated in Exhibit B.
On or about May 1, 2013, ACT will provide OSRHE with an invoice for the Total Amount. OSRHE shall pay invoices within 45 days of the date of such invoices. The "Final Amount" shall mean the total cost of all goods and services provided to OSRHE. Total compensation for the period from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 will not exceed $750,000.

4. Ownership of Data and Software

All test materials and related materials ("ACT Materials") used in the performance of this Agreement are the sole and exclusive property of ACT. Statistical or analytical data reflecting statewide aggregate Oklahoma student performance are the sole and exclusive property of OSRHE as the sponsoring organization. The parties acknowledge and agree that ACT may use and disclose the data collected from the administration of the assessments, as set forth in ACT’s data usage policies, as amended from time to time.

Software, specifications, and programs comprising the systems developed and maintained by ACT in connection with its services under this Agreement and all copyrights and other proprietary interests therein are the property of ACT as sole owner or licensee.

5. Privacy of Information

Contracts involving ACT’s proprietary programs are subject to ACT’s standard data policies and procedures. In this regard, all data bearing personal identification or personal characteristics indicating individual identity collected by ACT shall be retained by ACT as part of the national data set in a fashion that ensures confidentiality.

6. Notices

Notices under this Agreement shall be duly made when in writing and will be deemed given to the other party upon delivery to the address set forth below if delivered personally (including by courier) or mailed by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, or upon confirmation if transmitted by telex, teletype, or other means of facsimile.
If to ACT: Thomas J. Goedken  
Chief Financial Officer  
ACT, Inc.  
500 ACT Drive  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243-0168

If to OSRHE: Dr. Cynthia Brown  
Director, Student Preparation  
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education  
655 Research Parkway – Suite 200  
Oklahoma City, OK 73104

Mailing Address:  
P.O. Box 108850  
Oklahoma City, OK 73101-8850


General terms and provisions are provided on Exhibit A which is incorporated into this Agreement.

8. Description of Services

The Description of Services is provided in Exhibit B.

9. Complete Agreement

This Agreement (including all exhibits hereto) constitutes the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes all other prior agreements and understandings, both written and oral. This agreement terminates and replaces the EPAS agreement between the parties dated July 1, 2011.

10. Representatives

The administration and technical direction of this Agreement will be conducted for the parties by the following designated individuals:

For OSRHE: Dr. Cynthia Brown  
Director, Student Preparation  
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education  
655 Research Parkway – Suite 200  
Oklahoma City, OK 73104

Mailing Address:  
P.O. Box 108850  
Oklahoma City, OK 73101-8850
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For ACT: Paul Weeks  
Vice President, Educational Services  

Sean Moore  
Principal Consultant, State Partnerships  
ACT, Inc.  
500 ACT Dr.  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243-0168

Each party reserves and retains the right, within its sole discretion, to substitute its designated representative. Each party will promptly notify the other in writing of any change in its representatives.

11. Governing Law

This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

12. Headings

This section and other headings contained in this Agreement are for reference purposes only and shall not affect the interpretation or meaning of this Agreement.

Executed this 10th day of May, 2012.

ACT, INC.  
By: Jon Whitmore  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer

By:  
Thomas J. Goedken  
Chief Financial Officer

OSRHE  
By: Glen D. Johnson  
Chancellor

Agreement between ACT, Inc. and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
AGENDA ITEM #22-d (1):

Electronic Media.

SUBJECT: University of Oklahoma. Approval of request to offer an existing degree program via electronic delivery.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents approve the University of Oklahoma’s request to offer the existing Master of Science in Construction Administration in Construction Administration (243) via electronic media.

BACKGROUND:

The University of Oklahoma (OU) is currently approved to offer the following degree programs via electronic media:

- Bachelor of Arts in Administrative Leadership (375);
- Bachelor of Arts in Information Studies (343);
- Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (231);
- Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice (356);
- Certificate in Human Resource Diversity and Development (340);
- Master of Arts in Administrative Leadership (373);
- Master of Arts in Liberal Studies (232);
- Master of Environmental Science (076);
- Master of Library and Information Studies (151);
- Master of Prevention Science (374);
- Master of Science in Civil Engineering (038); and
- Master of Science in Knowledge Management (347).

OU’s governing board approved electronic delivery of the existing Master of Science in Construction Administration in Construction Administration at the March 2012 meeting and OU requests authorization to offer this program, as outlined below.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is consistent with the Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs policy. This policy allows institutions with approved electronic media delivered programs or grandfathered status to request programs through an abbreviated process. The process calls for the President to send the following information to the Chancellor: 1) letter of intent, 2) the name of the program, 3) delivery method(s), 4) information related to population served and student demand, and 5) cost and financing.
ANALYSIS:

OU satisfactorily addressed the requirements in the *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy as summarized below.

**Master of Science in Construction Administration in Construction Administration**

**Demand.** The Oklahoma Employment Security Commission (OESC) and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) indicate job prospects in the construction administration industry look favorable with an average growth rate for construction administration occupations. The OESC projects an 11.45 percent increase in construction administration occupations through 2018 and the BLS 2012-2013 *Occupational Outlook Handbook* indicates that construction administration occupations are expected to grow 17 percent through 2020.

The curriculum is designed to build on experience construction undergraduates typically gain in their first three to five years in the industry. The potential graduate student demographic will be similar to the representation in the traditional face-to-face format, which will consist of full-time working professionals seeking to obtain an advanced degree to enhance management skills and professional advancement.

**Delivery method.** OU will utilize the Desire2Learn (D2L) learning management system, which is a complete web-based suite of easy-to-use teaching and learning tools for course development, delivery and management. Additionally, OU will utilize synchronous audio and video capabilities for scheduled class meetings.

**Funding.** No new funding will be required to deliver the degree program electronically. The program will be funded through existing allocations, program fees and tuition.

Based on staff analysis and institutional expertise, it is recommended the State Regents approve OU’s request to offer the existing Master of Science in Construction Administration in Construction Administration via electronic media online delivery as described above.
AGENDA ITEM #22-d (2):  
Electronic Media.  

SUBJECT: Oklahoma Panhandle State University. Approval of request to offer an existing degree program via electronic delivery.  

RECOMMENDATION:  

It is recommended that the State Regents approve Oklahoma Panhandle State University’s request to offer the existing Bachelor of Business Administration (005) with options in Finance, General Business, Management, and Marketing via electronic media.  

BACKGROUND:  

Oklahoma Panhandle State University (OPSU) is currently approved to offer the following degree program via electronic media:  

- Bachelor of Science in Nursing (053)  

OPSU’s governing board approved electronic delivery of the existing Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) degree with options in Finance, General Business, Management, and Marketing at the December 2011 meeting and OPSU requests authorization to offer this program, as outlined below.  

POLICY ISSUES:  

This action is consistent with the *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy. This policy allows institutions with approved electronic media delivered programs or grandfathered status to request programs through an abbreviated process. The process calls for the President to send the following information to the Chancellor: 1) letter of intent, 2) the name of the program, 3) delivery method(s), 4) information related to population served and student demand, and 5) cost and financing.  

ANALYSIS:  

OPSU satisfactorily addressed the requirements in the *Electronically Delivered and Traditional Off-Campus Courses and Programs* policy as summarized below.
Bachelor of Business Administration

**Demand.** The Oklahoma Employment Security Commission (OESC) and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) indicate job prospects in the business industry look favorable with a slightly faster than average growth rate for business occupations. The OESC projects a 17.97 percent increase in business industry occupations through 2018 and the BLS 2012-2013 *Occupational Outlook Handbook* indicates that business industry occupations are expected to grow 15 percent through 2020.

The Oklahoma Department of Commerce data indicates that through 2015 the number of jobs requiring a BBA will increase by 4.7 percent in northwest Oklahoma. Additionally, data from the Texas Workforce Commission and the Kansas Department of Labor indicates an 11.2 percent and a 2 percent increase, respectively, in business related occupations in the Texas panhandle and southwest Kansas through 2018. These data indicates an increased need for graduates with degrees in business to accommodate the projected need within the OPSU service area.

**Delivery method.** OPSU will utilize the eCollege online delivery learning management system. The eCollege platform provides additional student and instructor tools such as eCompanion, which is a complete web-based suite of easy-to-use teaching and learning tools for course development, delivery and management.

**Funding.** No new funding will be required to deliver the degree program electronically. The program will be funded through existing allocations, program fees and tuition.

Based on staff analysis and institutional expertise, it is recommended the State Regents approve OPSU’s request to offer the existing Bachelor of Business Administration with options in Finance, General Business, Management, and Marketing via electronic media online delivery as described above.
AGENDA ITEM #22-e:

Capital.

SUBJECT: Ratification of Capital Allotments for FY2012.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the capital allotments made during the period of March 29, 2012, through May 4, 2012.

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 March 29, 2012, through May 4, 2012, 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 $5,384,936 representing $4,355,000 in State funding and $1,029,936 in Section 13/New College Funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Date Allotted</th>
<th>Section 13/New College Amounts</th>
<th>State Fund</th>
<th>Totals by Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>General Campus Repair, Maintenance &amp; Remodel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>General Campus Repair, Maintenance &amp; Remodel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>562,682</td>
<td>1,562,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central University</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>General Campus Repairs, Renovation, ADA Compliance</td>
<td>4/30/2012</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern OK State University</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Native American Resource Center</td>
<td>5/2/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97,254</td>
<td>97,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Minor Repair &amp; Renovation</td>
<td>5/3/2012</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Science &amp; Arts of OK</td>
<td>650-New College</td>
<td>Physical Fitness and Wellness Enhancement</td>
<td>4/17/2012</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Campus Infrastructure</td>
<td>4/17/2012</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Renovation/Construction Performing Arts Venue</td>
<td>4/17/2012</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron University</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Academic and Other Equipment</td>
<td>4/30/2012</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Academic and Other Equipment</td>
<td>4/30/2012</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600-Section 13</td>
<td>Academic and Other Equipment</td>
<td>4/30/2012</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>295-State</td>
<td>Arts Education Center</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>System Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,355,000</td>
<td>1,029,936</td>
<td>5,384,936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #22-f:

Supplemental Allocations.

SUBJECT: Approval of revolving fund allocations and revised FY12 budgets for institutions.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents ratify the authorization of the changes to Educational and General, Part I Budget allocations as requested and approve the revised budgets.

BACKGROUND:

Changes to the allocation of Revolving Funds for the 2012 fiscal year in support of the Educational and General Budget - Part I has been requested subsequent to the allocation made by the Regents on June 25, 2011. Evidence of the change in revenues, not previously taken into account, has accompanied the institution’s request.

POLICY ISSUES:

This action is in accordance with Policy 4.14 (I.)

ANALYSIS:

Langston University has requested that the allocation for the current year’s E&G Budget be increased from $33,990,137 to $34,012,137, an increase of $22,000. The supplemental funding will be used for travel, supplies and other operating expenses.

Southeastern Oklahoma State University has requested that the allocation for the current year’s E&G Budget be decreased from $43,296,798 to $42,928,618, a decrease of $368,180. The decrease was applied in personnel services and supplies and other operating expenses. The decrease is a reflection of the reduction in student tuition and fee revenue.

East Central University has requested that the allocation for the current year’s E&G Budget be increased from $41,150,225 to $41,565,700, an increase of $415,475. The supplemental funding will be used for personnel services, supplies and other operating expenses.

Seminole State College has requested that the allocation for the current year’s E&G Budget be increased from $11,247,133 to $11,285,133, an increase of $38,000. The supplemental grant funding will be used for personnel services, travel, supplies and other operating expenses.
AGENDA ITEM #22-g (1):

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 March 24, 2012 and April 26, 2012.

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.

ANALYSIS:

For the time period between March 24, 2012 and April 26, 2012, there were six (6) purchases in excess of $25,000 but not in excess of $100,000.

Purchases Between $25,000.00 and $99,999.99

Core

1) Dell in the amount of $40,028.04 for the replacement of critical servers that are out of warranty and becoming obsolete. (Funded from 210-Core).

2) Question, Persuade and Refer Institute in the amount of $37,606.00 for suicide prevention training and course materials. This training will be provided to campus trainers who are required to deliver a minimum of two classes per year. (Funded from 210-Core).

3) R. William Funk in the amount of $58,000.00 for services related to recruiting a new Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Recruitment services to include but are not limited to candidate search and review, initial screening and preliminary interviews. (Funded from 210-Core).

OneNet

4) Telco Supply in the amount of $31,480.88 to construct fiber optic cable to connect Enid Library to OneNet. (Funded from 718-OneNet).
GEAR UP

5) Center for Parent Leadership in the amount of $46,030.00 to provide training and support to the new 24 GEAR UP school sites. This training will satisfy the requirements in the Federal GEAR UP program provisions for a parent engagement program component. (Funded from 730-GEAR UP).

Change Orders to Purchase Orders that are now in excess of $25,000.00 but not in excess of $100,000

OneNet

6) Comdata in the amount of $21,000.00. The increase is needed for additional fuel as well as additional vehicle maintenance used primarily during the OneNet Core Network upgrade. The new total for this purchase order is now $54,000.00. (Funded from 718-OneNet).

7) Beggs Telephone in the amount of 12,100.00. The increase is due to an OneNet customer network connection upgrade causing an increase in expenditures for this purchase order. The new total for the purchase order is now $38,600.01. (Funded from 718-OneNet).
AGENDA ITEM #22-g (2):

Agency Operations.

SUBJECT: Contract with Attorney General.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the State Regents authorize the Chancellor to enter into a renewal contract (attached) for legal services with the Office of the Attorney General for Fiscal Year 2013.

BACKGROUND:

Since September 2001, the State Regents have contracted with the Office of the Attorney General for legal services. The contract has been renewed annually thereafter. Upon the departure of Assistant Attorney General Lisa Davis to become General Counsel to Governor Brad Henry, the contract was modified (and approved by the State Regents on February 13, 2004) to substitute the half-time services of an AAG assigned by the Office of the Attorney General. From 2004 to 2010, the Office of the Attorney General assigned AAG Gretchen Harris. Ms. Harris retired in 2010. Since then, the Office of the Attorney General has assigned AAG Regina Switzer. Ms. Switzer is a former Associate General Counsel for the State Regents, and is therefore familiar with the agency and the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. She has served in the Office of the Attorney General for approximately three years.

POLICY ISSUES:

Contracts for legal services between the Office of the Attorney General and certain named agencies, specifically including the State Regents, are authorized by 74 O.S. 2001, § 18/ as amended. This is a renewal of an existing contract.

ANALYSIS:

The contract provides considerable value to the State Regents and to the State System.

- The contract provides a strong connection with the Office of the Attorney General, current information about its thinking on a variety of legal issues, and links to its advice to other agencies on issues of common concern.

- The contract has enabled the State Regents to provide legal services support to the Quartz Mountain Arts and Conference Center and Nature Park, and to small institutions that do not have ready access to legal services. This is consistent with the State Regents’ preventive law philosophy.
• Ms. Switzer's prior experience is especially relevant to the State Regents’ needs with respect to both the agency and the State System.

The annual cost of the contract is $54,065.64 annually, and will be billed at $4,505.47 per month. This includes Ms. Switzer's salary, benefits, and non-salary costs incurred in connection with the provision of legal services pursuant to the contract. The annual cost of the contract for FY 2012 was $51,065.64. The Office of the Attorney General has advised that the increase in annual cost is due to AAG Switzer's annual salary being increased. However, her salary is still less than AAG Harris' annual salary of $59,791.38 for FY 2011. A copy of the proposed contract is attached. The contract provides that the assigned AAG, if requested by the State Regents, shall provide quarterly reports to the State Regents setting forth the time expended and the work performed by that AAG. The Legal Department will continue to request such quarterly reports. The contract also provides that the State Regents, acting through the Chancellor or his designee, reserve the right to determine the scope of the assigned AAG’s activities on behalf of the State Regents. The Chancellor will direct that the assigned AAG not include within the scope of the activities any matters pertaining to the Ardmore Higher Education Program or the Office of Accountability. Approval of the contract is recommended.
1. **PARTIES:**

   This Agreement is between the Office of Attorney General and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education ("OSRHE"), and the authorized signatures below bind the parties to the terms set out hereafter.

2. **AUTHORITY:**

   This Agreement is authorized by virtue of 74 O.S. 2001, § 18/.

3. **CONTRACT DURATION:**

   This Agreement commences July 1, 2012, and covers fiscal year 2013, ending June 30, 2013.

4. **CONSIDERATION:**

   (a) The Attorney General’s Office ("AGO") shall provide the legal services of the Assigned Attorney for and on behalf of OSRHE during the contract period, in exchange for payment in the amount of $54,065.64 annually, with monthly payments in the amount of $4,505.47. This sum is comprised of the salary and benefits of the Assigned Attorneys and non-salary costs incurred in connection with the provision of legal services pursuant to this contract. The OSRHE will be billed monthly for the monthly amount set forth above. Should the OSRHE desire that the Assigned Attorney have additional training, any costs associated with such training shall be paid by the OSRHE. The OSRHE shall reimburse the Assigned Attorney pursuant to the Travel Reimbursement Act for travel undertaken by the Assigned Attorney on behalf of OSRHE.

   (b) The scope of legal services to be provided by the Assigned Attorney includes matters pertaining to the OSRHE’s official duties, particularly including representation in legal proceedings, provision of legal advice and assistance, appearance at meetings as necessary and other legal needs, consistent with the provisions of Paragraph 6.

   (c) The Assigned Attorney, if requested by the OSRHE at the beginning of the contract period, shall provide quarterly reports to the OSRHE setting forth the work performed by the Assigned Attorney. These reports shall be furnished by October 15, January 15, April 15 and July 15.
(d) It is explicitly recognized, however, that the consideration paid herein by the OSRHE is in the nature of a retainer that enables the AGO to employ and ensure the availability of the Assigned Attorney one-half (50%) time for the OSRHE regardless of whether the Assigned Attorneys are in fact utilized. It is agreed by the parties that the Assigned Attorneys’ obligation to provide legal services to the OSRHE will be fulfilled by the availability of the Assigned Attorney for the purposes provided for in this Agreement, regardless of the number of hours actually used by the OSRHE.

5. **OFFICE LOCATION:**
   The Assigned Attorney will maintain an office with the AGO, to facilitate the delivery of legal services.

6. **SUPERVISION:**
   The Assigned Attorney will be expected to coordinate his/her activities on behalf of the OSRHE with the OSRHE General Counsel. The OSRHE, acting through the Chancellor and his designee, reserve the right to determine the scope of the Assigned Attorneys’ activities on their behalf. However, the supervision of the Assigned Attorney and his/her work product, and its consistency with AGO policies, shall remain the prerogative of the AGO.

7. **TERMINATION:**
   This agreement may be terminated by either party upon 60 days written notice.

8. **AGENCY DESIGNEES:**
   The authorized agent and designee for the Office of Attorney General is Janis W. Preslar. The authorized agent and designee for the OSRHE is Glen D. Johnson.

**OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

By: ______________
   Glen D. Johnson
   Chancellor

**OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

By: ______________
   Janis W. Preslar
   Assistant Attorney General
   Chief, General Counsel Section

DATE: ______________

DATE: 3-8-12
AGENDA ITEM #23-a:

Programs.


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, 2011 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 (2011-2012).

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 #23-b:

Audit Report.

SUBJECT: State Regents’ policy - Admission of First-Time Freshmen Performance Requirements.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

State Regents’ policy 3.9.4 establishes minimum performance standards for admission to State System institutions for first-time entering students. A “first-time entering student” is defined as a student with six or fewer attempted credit hours, excluding remedial/developmental (zero-level courses) or pre-college work and excluding credit hours accumulated by concurrently enrolled high school students. Performance requirements (see Attachment) for regular admission include three options for admission: (1) minimum ACT/SAT, (2) minimum GPA and Class Rank, or (3) minimum GPA in the State Regents’ 15-units of required high school core courses. Oklahoma State University has obtained State Regents’ approval for a fourth option.

The objective of this review was to assess State System institutions’ implementation of regular admission performance standards for first-time entering students leading to baccalaureate degrees. The scope of this review included first-time freshmen students admitted at comprehensive and regional universities during the summer and fall 2009 semesters and reported to the State Regents’ as having met the minimum performance requirements.

In order to accomplish the review objective, a detailed listing of students was used from the records reported by the institutions and contained in the Unitized Data System (UDS). Students were judgmentally selected from UDS records based upon their ACT score and/or HS GPA/Class Rank as not being sufficient to meet the performance requirement for admission to the specific institution. Additionally, 50 students were randomly selected for review at both research institutions and 30 at each of the regional universities. Each student’s record was reviewed at each of the institutions under review and any instances of non-compliance with OSRHE’s policy were noted.

POLICY ISSUES:

The authority for insuring institution compliance with State Regents’ policy is found in the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Policies and Procedures at 2.12. The Compliance Policy is derived from the Oklahoma Constitution, Article XIII-A, Section 2 and 70 O.S. §3206, especially subsection(o), which confers upon the State Regents all powers necessary or convenient to accomplish their constitutional purposes and objectives.
ANALYSIS:

A total of 12,134 first-time freshmen baccalaureate degree seeking students were identified in UDS as being admitted to state-system institutions during the summer and fall 2009 semesters. Of this total, 1,208 student’s records were selected for review, which consisted of 778 judgmental and 430 random selections. Out of the 1,208 records reviewed, 36 students who did not meet performance requirements for admission into the institution’s baccalaureate degree program were found. The students lacked either class rank or high school GPA required for admission per State Regents’ policy 3.9.4

Based upon the review, the State System institutions’ are substantially complying with State Regents’ policy 3.9.4 and recommend that institutions should adhere to the State Regents’ performance admission requirements with regard to class rank and high school GPA. Institution personnel reviewing student transcripts for an option 2 admission should be certain that the minimum high school GPA and class rank are met prior to granting admission. Following these established performance requirements will ensure furtherance of the State Regents’ ultimate goal of achieving student success.

Attachment.
DATE: April 6, 2012

TO: Dr. Glen D. Johnson, Chancellor
Julie K. Carson, Chairman

FROM: Jon Domstead, State System Auditor

RE: Review of OSRHE policy 3.9.4 - Admission of First-Time Freshmen: Performance Requirements.

SUMMARY

As directed by your letter dated February 17, 2011, a review was completed at the research and regional universities to determine whether the first-time freshman admitted during summer and fall 2009 met the minimum performance requirements according to State Regents’ policy – see Attachment.

Overall as a State System, there is compliance with OSRHE policy 3.9.4 based upon exceptions found as a percentage of total students – 36 out of 12,134, which equals 0.30 percent. However, some institutions could make improvement through strict adherence to the admission option requiring minimum GPA and Class Rank (option 2 in Attachment).

BACKGROUND

State Regents’ policy 3.9.4 establishes minimum performance standards for admission to State System institutions for first-time entering students. A “first-time entering student” is defined as a student with six or fewer attempted credit hours, excluding remedial/developmental (zero-level courses) or pre-college work and excluding credit hours accumulated by concurrently enrolled high school students – 3.9.2.

Performance requirements (see Attachment) for regular admission include three options for admission: (1) minimum ACT/SAT, (2) minimum GPA and Class Rank, or (3) minimum GPA in the State Regents’ 15-units of required high school core courses. Oklahoma State University obtained State Regents’ approval for a fourth option.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The objective of this review was to assess State System institutions’ implementation of regular admission performance standards for first-time entering students leading to baccalaureate degrees. The scope of this review included first-time freshmen students admitted at comprehensive and regional universities during the summer and fall 2009 semesters and reported to the State Regents’ as having met the minimum performance requirements. A detailed listing of these students was used from the records reported by the institutions and contained in the Unitized Data System (UDS). Students were judgmentally selected from UDS records based upon their ACT score and/or HS GPA/Class Rank as not being sufficient to meet the
performance requirement for admission to the specific institution. Additionally, 50 students were randomly selected for review at both research institutions and 30 at each of the regional universities. Student records at each of the institutions under review were reviewed and any instances of non-compliance with OSRHE’s policy were noted.

RESULTS

A total of 12,134 first-time freshmen baccalaureate degree seeking students were identified in UDS as being admitted to state-system institutions during the summer and fall 2009 semesters. Of this total, 1,208 student records were selected for review which consisted of 778 judgmental and 430 random selections.

230 exceptions were found of which 36 were performance admission errors and 194 involved misclassification of admission category.

Finding - Of the 230 exceptions, there were 36 students who did not meet performance requirements for admission into the institution’s baccalaureate degree program. This was due to either an insufficient class rank or high school GPA. The 36 performance exceptions were found at UCO, NSU, and SEOSU. Most of these students were not admissible due to an insufficient class rank.

Included in the 194 admission misclassifications were 133 students admitted at regional institutions offering both associate as well as bachelor degrees (Rogers State University, Panhandle State University, Langston University and Cameron University) and thus the student could have attended the institution through its’ open admission function. The remainder of the misclassifications occurred at institutions not offering associate degrees and was attributable in most instances to incorrectly identifying home-school students as regular admits. While the home-school students met the performance admission requirements, they did not possess the curricular requirements because their school is not accredited.

Recommendation – Institutions should adhere to the State Regents’ performance admission requirements with regard to class rank and high school GPA. Institution personnel reviewing student transcripts for an option 2 admission should be certain that the minimum high school GPA and class rank are met prior to granting admission. Following these established performance requirements will ensure furtherance of the State Regents’ ultimate goal of achieving student success.

Response – All state system institutions concurred with the recommendation.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the review, State System institutions’ are in compliance with State Regents’ policy 3.9.4 covering regular admission performance standards for first-time entering students leading to baccalaureate degrees.
## ATTACHMENT

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education  
655 Research Parkway, Suite 200, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73104  
Phone: 405-225-9100; E-mail: studentinfo@osrhe.edu  
Web Site: www.okhighered.org

### Admission Standards 2009-2010  
**FIRST-TIME ENTERING STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum High School Performance Criteria for Admission of First-Time-Entering Students</th>
<th>Option 1 Minimum ACT/SAT</th>
<th>Option 2 Minimum GPA and Class Rank</th>
<th>Option 3 Minimum GPA in the 15-Unit Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University of Oklahoma | Resident: 24/1090  
3.0 GPA or top 50%¹  
AND  
Nonresident: 26/1170  
3.0 GPA or top 50%²,³ | Resident: 3.0 GPA  
AND  
top 25%² | Resident: 3.0 GPA  
AND  
ACT 22 or SAT 1020⁴ |
| Oklahoma State University | 24/1090 | 3.0 GPA  
AND  
top 33% | 3.0 GPA  
AND  
ACT 21 or SAT 980 |
| University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma | 24/1090 | 3.0 GPA  
AND  
top 33% | 3.0 GPA  
AND  
ACT 21 or SAT 980 |
| Regional Universities | 20/940 | 2.7 GPA  
AND  
top 50% | 2.7 GPA |
| Community Colleges | No minimum required |

¹ Additional weighting (1.5) will be added to GPAs of students who take Advanced Placement and higher-level Intercollegiate courses.  
² Students meeting the following requirements under each admission option will be placed on a waiting list and evaluated according to stated policy:  
Option 1—students with the required ACT score but less than a 3.0 GPA and lower than the top 50 percent of the high school class;  
Option 2—students in the top 20-30 percent of their high school class with at least a 3.0 GPA; and  
Option 3—all students.  
³ Nonresident students not meeting these standards but otherwise meeting admission standards for resident students may be placed on a waiting list and evaluated according to stated policy.  
⁴ Cognitive: Note: academic standards: quality, quantity and level of coursework throughout the entire high school program; completion of a progressively challenging math sequence, demonstrated by performance; and class rank taken in courses with academic rigor and class size of high school attended.  
Non-Cognitive: Student must demonstrate strengths in non-cognitive factors such as positive self-concept, realistic self-appraisal, long-term goals, leadership experience, community, and knowledge in an acquired field.
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (1):

   Annual Reports.


RECOMMENDATION:

   This is an information item only.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents allocated $37,404 from appropriations made by the 2011 Oklahoma Legislature for the 2011-2012 Chiropractic Education Assistance Scholarship. The purpose of the program is to provide scholarships to students approved by the Board of Chiropractic Examiners for programs leading towards a Doctor of Chiropractic. Because Oklahoma does not have a school of chiropractic, the students attend schools in other states. Eligible Oklahoma residents who are making satisfactory progress toward a degree at an accredited chiropractic college can receive financial assistance of up to $6,000 annually, for a maximum of four annual scholarships.

ANALYSIS:

The Oklahoma Board of Chiropractic Examiners approved students for participation in the Chiropractic Education Assistance Program for the 2011-2012 academic year. The award distribution to each participating institution for the 2011-2012 academic year is indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Awardees</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,537.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield, Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport, Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$19,924.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Chiropractic College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,537.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State Chiropractic College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$615.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,989.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (2):

Annual Reports.


RECOMMENDATION:

This item is information only.

BACKGROUND:

The State Regents allocated $93,510 from appropriations made by the 2011 Oklahoma Legislature for the 2011-2012 Future Teachers Scholarship. The purpose of the scholarship is to encourage the preparation of teachers in critical shortage areas for Oklahoma public schools. To the extent that funds are available, scholarships up to $1,500 per year, renewable for up to three additional years, are awarded to help cover the costs of tuition, fees, books, materials and room and board.

ANALYSIS:

The critical teacher shortage areas for the 2011-2012 academic year were Science, Early Childhood Education, Mathematics, Music, and Social Studies. Eighty students at fifteen institutions were approved for program participation for the 2011-2012 academic year. Expenditures totaled $79,907.95.

The attached report reflects the award distribution to each participating institution for the 2011-2012 academic year.

Attachment
### Future Teachers Scholarship 2011-2012 Year End Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Students in Program</th>
<th>Total Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10,007.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,242.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern State University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,040.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,459.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Baptist University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,284.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Christian University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Roberts University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Tulsa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Nazarene University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,907.95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (3):

Annual Reports.


RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

The 2001 Oklahoma Legislature passed the “1921 Tulsa Race Riot Reconciliation Act of 2001” which created the Tulsa Reconciliation Education and Scholarship Program (TRESP). During the 2002 session, the Legislature passed HB 2238 which amended the statutes creating the scholarship program. One of the amendments authorized the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to annually award scholarships to two senior students at each high school in the Tulsa Public School district. The scholarships are one-time awards of $1,000.

ANALYSIS:

Seven students received awards during the 2011-2012 academic year at an award level of $1,000 each. The recipients attended four different Oklahoma institutions: 3 attended Oklahoma State University, 2 attended Tulsa Community College, 1 attended The University of Tulsa, and 1 attended Oral Roberts University. The total awards made during 2011-2012 was $7,000.
# TULSA RECONCILIATION EDUCATION AND SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
## 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Shaffer</td>
<td>Thomas Edison High School</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Aguayo</td>
<td>Daniel Webster High School</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebulon Peterson</td>
<td>Daniel Webster High School</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherron Daniels</td>
<td>Memorial High School</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Garvin</td>
<td>Booker T. Washington High School</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Lee</td>
<td>Booker T. Washington High School</td>
<td>TU</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Townsend</td>
<td>Central High School</td>
<td>ORU</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $7,000
Meeting of the
OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
May 25, 2012

AGENDA ITEM #23-c (4):

Annual Reports.


RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

The provisions of Title 70 O. S. 1991, Sections 2291-2292, authorize the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to establish and maintain a program for the purpose of providing scholarships to low-income, full-time undergraduates enrolled at institutions in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. Up to twenty-eight students are nominated for awards each year by the presidents of Oklahoma State System institutions. Interest accrued from the William P. Willis Scholarship Trust provides each of the nominees an award amount proportional to the cost of attending institutions in each tier.

ANALYSIS:

The attached report shows the award distributions to eighteen students totaling $38,800 for the 2011-2012 academic year.

Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Anna Holdridge</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Jordan Pace</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>William Fredericks, III</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Deann Lanman</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Jackie Martin</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston University</td>
<td>Eleanor Zachary</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Panhandle State University</td>
<td>Gaycheree Turley</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers State University</td>
<td>Heather Farquharson</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Erin Miears</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Albert State College</td>
<td>Victoria Jones</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>Chris Jones</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State College</td>
<td>Carl Lewis, II</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Oklahoma A&amp;M College</td>
<td>Daniel Asch</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Oklahoma College</td>
<td>Keisha Branson</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>Brenda Risenhoover</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose State College</td>
<td>Shawn Ogle</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>Morgan Martinez</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connors State College</td>
<td>Hallie Johnson</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$38,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominees were not submitted by Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Cameron University, Oklahoma State University – Institute of Technology, Tulsa Community College, Redlands Community College, Seminole State College, East Central University, Northeastern State University, and Oklahoma State University – OKC.
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (5):

Annual Reports.


RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

The 1999 Oklahoma Legislature authorized the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) to establish the George and Donna Nigh Scholarship as a part of the George and Donna Nigh Public Service Institute. The goal of the institute is to provide scholarship opportunities to outstanding students who are preparing for careers in public service. Oklahoma public and private colleges and universities are authorized to nominate one student from their institution. A component of the scholarship program is participation in seminars on public service offered by the institute.

Institute officials select the scholarship recipients. The OSRHE staff disburses scholarship funds to the universities on behalf of the recipients.

ANALYSIS:

For the Spring 2012 semester, each recipient of the George and Donna Nigh Scholarship was awarded $1,000 and participated in leadership academies offered through the Nigh Institute. Attached is a roster of recipients who received awards totaling $30,000.

Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron University</td>
<td>Cody Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Albert State College</td>
<td>Austin Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connors State College</td>
<td>Lee Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central University</td>
<td>Kassandra Kelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>Blake Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston University</td>
<td>Christen Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Oklahoma A&amp;M College</td>
<td>Jordan Hessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Thomas Teague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Oklahoma College</td>
<td>Johanna Schooley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Amanda Moyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Baptist University</td>
<td>Daniel Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Christian University</td>
<td>Kaley White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>Angela Gutierrez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City University</td>
<td>Owen Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Panhandle State University</td>
<td>Emma Valez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Angela Colwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University - OKC</td>
<td>Scott Chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands Community College</td>
<td>Corey Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers State University</td>
<td>Rachel Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose State College</td>
<td>Jeaton Cary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole State College</td>
<td>Kate Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Matthew Sitton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Nazarene University</td>
<td>Chase Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Amy Outhier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gregory's University</td>
<td>Michael Sith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Community College</td>
<td>Patrick Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>Danielle Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Michael Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Science &amp; Arts of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Robert Heidlage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>Kaycee Lookingbill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (6):

Annual Reports.


RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

At the May 1994 meeting, the State Regents delegated authority to the Chancellor to approve minor exceptions and clarifications to Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Educations’ (OSRHE) policy that will not result in a broad scale circumvention of policy. All exceptions are requested by the President and supported by extenuating circumstances and are to be reported to the State Regents on a quarterly basis. This is the 52nd report of exceptions to academic policy granted by the Chancellor.

POLICY ISSUES:

Four exceptions to OSRHE academic policies were granted by the Chancellor since the January 26, 2012 report.

ANALYSIS:

University of Oklahoma (OU)

January 31, 2012 and March 20, 2012

Two exceptions to the OSRHE Undergraduate Degree Requirements policy, which states that baccalaureate degrees shall be based upon a minimum of 60 hours, excluding physical activity courses, at a baccalaureate degree granting institution, was granted to two OU students. Both students were within 5 hours of the policy requirement and meet the policy requirements for the baccalaureate degree. These policy exceptions were necessary due to academic advising errors and were recommended by the department and the president.

Connors State College (CSC)

February 2, 2012

An exception to the OSRHE Institutional Admission and Retention policy, which states that a student who is academically suspended twice from the same institution may not return to the suspending school until the student has demonstrated the ability to succeed academically by raising his or her GPA to the retention standards by attending another institution, was granted to a CSC student. The exception will allow readmission of this student and was based on documentation of the student’s commitment to successfully completing her college degree, the recommendation of the CSC Academic Appeals Executive Council, and the president.
April 30, 2012

An exception to the OSRHE Undergraduate Degree Requirements policy, which states that associate degrees shall be based upon a minimum of 15 hours, excluding physical activity courses, at an associate degree granting institution, was granted to a TCC student. The student meets other OSRHE associate degree requirements. The policy exception was based on advising and clerical errors and was recommended by the president.
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (7):

Annual Reports.

SUBJECT: State Regents’ Policy Reporting Requirements Survey.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

As a measure of accountability for both the State System institutions and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE), most OSRHE policies require data collection and reporting. Among these policies are the following:

- Academic Forgiveness Provisions (3.12.6)
- Special Admission (3.10.6)
- Retention Standards (3.10.8)
- International Student Admission and Admission of Non-native Speakers of English (3.10.5)
- Student Demonstration of Competencies (3.21.4)

Since the data requested are not available through other sources such as the Unitized Data System (UDS), one survey was designed to minimize reporting demands on institutions for these five policies. This is the twelfth year of data collection.

POLICY ISSUES:

**Academic Forgiveness Provisions**

A student may request an academic reprieve or academic renewal from public State System institutions consistent with OSRHE policy. The explanation of grades section of the transcript will note the courses and semester(s) reprieved or renewed. Institutions granting academic reprieves or renewals must submit an annual report to the State Regents.

**Special Admission**

Students who wish to enroll in courses without intending to pursue a degree may be permitted to enroll in up to nine credit hours without submitting academic credentials or meeting the academic curricular or performance requirements of the institution of desired entry. The president or his/her designee may allow non-degree-seeking students to exceed this initial nine credit-hour limit on an individual student basis. Such exceptions may be made only for non-degree-seeking students who meet the retention standards and must be appropriately documented and reported to the OSRHE annually.

**Retention Standards**

Institutions have the discretion to establish an academic suspension appeals procedure. Such procedures
should allow appropriate discretion in deserving cases and require that the suspended student document any extraordinary personal circumstances that contributed to his/her academic deficiencies. Suspended students can be readmitted only one time. Such students are readmitted on probationary status and must maintain a 2.0 GPA average each semester attempted while on probation or raise their retention GPA to the designated level. Students suspended a second time from the same institution cannot return to the suspending school until they have demonstrated the ability to succeed academically by raising their GPA to the retention standards at another institution.

**International Student Admission and Admission of Non-native Speakers of English (ESL)**

ESL students seeking enrollment at a State System college or university must present evidence of proficiency in the English language prior to admission, either as first-time students to the system or by transfer from another non-system college or university. Exceptions may be made if the applicant demonstrates proficiency in English prior to admission. Such exceptions must be documented and reported.

**Student Demonstration of Competencies**

The OSRHE policy requires students to successfully remediate basic skills course requirements within the first 24 hours attempted or have all subsequent enrollments restricted to deficiency removal courses until the deficiencies are removed. The president or his/her designee may allow a deserving student who failed to remediate a basic skills deficiency in a single subject to continue to enroll in collegiate level courses in addition to remedial course work beyond the 24 hour limit providing the student has demonstrated success in collegiate courses to date. Such exceptions must be appropriately documented.

**ANALYSIS:**

A comprehensive survey was conducted to gather data regarding exceptions to the above mentioned policies. Results were tabulated and are reported by institutional tier (research, regional, and community college). Information was gathered for the academic year from all State System institutions.

**Academic Forgiveness Provisions**

Circumstances may justify students being able to recover from academic problems in ways which do not forever jeopardize their academic standing. The policy recognizes _there may be extraordinary situations in which a student has done poorly in an entire enrollment due to extenuating circumstances, which, in the judgment of the appropriate institutional officials, warrant excluding those grades in calculating the student’s retention and graduation GPAs_. Students must meet specified criteria to be considered for an academic reprieve. Specifically, to request an academic reprieve, three years must have elapsed between the time the grades being requested reprieved were earned and the reprieve request. Prior to the request, the student must have earned a GPA of 2.0 or higher with no grade lower than a “C” in a minimum of 12 hours of course work excluding activity or performance courses.

A new provision, adopted in December 2003, allows a student who has had academic trouble in the past and who has been out of higher education for a number of years to recover without penalty and have a fresh start. Under academic renewal, which is optional for all State System institutions, course work taken prior to a date specified by the institution is not counted in the student’s graduation/retention GPA. An institution’s academic renewal policy must follow these guidelines: 1) At least five years must have elapsed between the last semester being renewed and the renewal request; 2) Prior to requesting academic renewal, the student must have earned a GPA of 2.0 or higher with no grade lower than a “C” in all regularly graded course work (a minimum of 12 hours) excluding activity or performance courses; 3) The request must be for all courses completed before the date specified in the request for renewal; 4) The student must petition for consideration of academic renewal according to institutional policy; and 5) All courses remain on the student’s transcript, but are not calculated in the student’s retention/graduation
GPA. Neither the content nor credit hours of renewed course work may be used to fulfill any degree or graduation requirements.

The student may not receive more than one academic reprieve or renewal during his/her academic career.

**Approval Rate of Academic Reprieves Granted by Tier**  
**2001-02 to 2010-11**

![Graph showing approval rates of academic reprieves by tier from 2001-02 to 2010-11.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Grade Reprieves by Tier**  
**2001-02 to 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Req.</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Req.</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Req.</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Req.</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Req.</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Req.</th>
<th>Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The number of requests for academic reprieves system wide averaged 517 per year for the past ten years. In 2010-2011, there were 701 requests.
- Approximately sixty-two percent of all 2010-2011 requests for academic reprieves were for one semester rather than two.
- In 2010-2011, the greatest numbers of requests (45.6 percent) were at the community colleges; 47.5 percent at the regional universities; 6.8 percent were at the research universities.
- System wide in 2010-2011, 83.9 percent of reprieve requests were granted. From 2001-02 to 2010-2011 reprieve requests granted averaged 80.1 percent.
- Community colleges granted the lowest percentage of academic reprieves in 2010-2011, 80.3 percent, up from 68.2 percent in 2009-2010. Regional universities granted 86.3 percent of requested reprieves in 2010-2011, down from 88.2 percent in 2009-2010. Research universities granted 93.8 percent of requested reprieves in 2010-2011, up from 82.9 percent in 2009-2010.
Forty-six renewals were requested in 2010-11 with 33 (71.7 percent) granted.

Since 2004-05 the average rate of renewals granted is 71.2 percent.

Students requesting reprieves must meet specific OSRHE academic requirements. Thus, it is expected that a high percentage of requested reprieves would be granted. Academic renewals have been in place since December 2003.

**Special Admission**

This policy provision allows institutional flexibility to meet individual student goals for specific personal enrichment or job related courses with appropriate academic control.

In 2010-2011, 15 institutions reported a total of 949 students enrolled as non-degree seeking students with more than nine credits, up from 713 students in 2009-2010. Community colleges reported 37.3 percent of the exceptions; research universities, 32.1 percent; and regional universities, 30.6 percent.

Since 2001-2002 the number of non-degree seeking students enrolled in more than nine hours has averaged 989. The number enrolled at research universities averaged 363. At the regional universities the number averaged 62 and at the community colleges, 564.

Explanations for exceptions included courses for personal enrichment, courses for specific
certifications, clerical errors, and continuing education courses. Exchange and Cooperative Alliance students and those seeking degrees at other institutions were granted exceptions as were those meeting admission and retention standards.

**Retention Standards**
Institutions have the discretion to establish an academic suspension appeals procedure. By OSRHE policy, suspended students requesting appeals must document extraordinary personal circumstances that contributed to his/her academic deficiencies. Such events must be highly unusual and appeal decisions should be made only following the thoughtful deliberation of an appropriate committee that may include faculty, students, and administrators.

**Total Suspensions**
**2001-02 to 2010-11**

- From 2009-10 to 2010-11, the number of suspensions increased 31.6 percent, from 7,060 to 9,294. The number of suspensions appealed decreased 9.3 percent from 854 to 775. The number of appeals that were granted decreased 18.1 percent from 675 to 553.
- Over the past ten years the percentage of suspensions appealed ranged between 8.3 percent in 2010-11 to 16.0 percent in 2002-03.
- Generally, the highest appeals percentages were found at the regional tier (13.6 percent in 2010-11). In 2010-11, the research universities reported an appeal rate of 8.9 percent, and the community colleges reported a rate of 5.6 percent.
- Over the past ten years granted appeals system wide have averaged 73.7 percent. In 2010-11, 71.4 percent of appeals were granted.
Regional universities granted the highest percentage of appeals at 76.7 percent in 2010-11, down from 76.8 percentage points from 2009-10; community colleges granted 67.6 percent of appeals in 2010-11, down from 85.3 percent in 2009-11; and research universities granted 53.8 percent in 2010-11, up from 49.2 percent in 2009-10.

As previously noted, students must document extraordinary circumstances that lead to suspension. Thus, a high percentage of granted appeals is appropriate to give a second-chance opportunity for deserving students documenting circumstances beyond their control which contributed to or caused academic difficulties.

International Student Admission and Admission of Non-native Speakers of English

The majority of exceptions to the minimum Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) score admission requirement were granted for ESL students who were military personnel or dependents, had alternative testing or examination, or were participating in exchange programs with foreign institutions which certified the students’ proficiency.

The number of undergraduate ESL exceptions decreased system wide from 370 in 2009-10 to 287 in 2010-11. From 2009-10 to 2010-11, research universities reported a decrease of 36.7 percent (330 to 209); regional universities increased 37.5 percent (8 to 11); and community colleges increased 109.4 percent (32 to 67).

Graduate exceptions at research universities increased by 25.7 percent, from 35 in 2009-10 to 44 in 2010-11. Regional universities reported one graduate exception in 2010-11.

The majority of undergraduate and graduate ESL exceptions were granted at the research universities during the last ten years. Research institutions granted between 71.5 and 89.2 percent of the undergraduate exceptions and granted between 89.5 and 100 percent of graduate exceptions in each of the past ten years.
• In 2010-11, the research universities, two regional universities, and six community colleges granted undergraduate exceptions.

Among the reasons cited for granting ESL exceptions were graduation from English-speaking high schools, active military duty, satisfactory COMPASS scores, and previous successful work at other colleges or universities.

**Student Demonstration of Competencies**
Generally, students were given exceptions if they were making satisfactory progress toward removing deficiencies, were a transfer student, or were given a second-chance opportunity.

**Remediation and Removal of High School Curricular Deficiencies – Exceptions from Credit Hour Limit**
*2001-02 to 2010-11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• From 2001-02 to 2010-11, the number of exceptions has averaged 1,958. In 2010-11, the number of exceptions was 3,789, an increase of 86.7 percent over 2001-02 (2,029).
• At the research universities, the number of exceptions granted has decreased since 2001-02, from 62 to 34 in 2010-11.
• The number of time limit exceptions granted at regional universities increased from 495 in 2001-02 to 1,017 in 2010-11. From 2009-10 to 2010-11, the regional universities experience an increase of time limit exceptions of 113.9 percent, from 1,280 to 2,738.
• The number of exceptions granted at community colleges has been variable over the last ten years, averaging 1,410 per year.
• In 2010-11, the research universities, ten regional universities, and nine community colleges reported exceptions.
• From 2001-02 to 2010-11, the number of students granted exceptions averaged 520 at the regional universities and 27 at the research universities.

Among the reasons given for exceptions were: satisfactory progress in other college level work, transferred with deficiencies, advisor or clerical errors, multiple remediation needs, multiple failed attempts at remediation, schedule conflicts, exchange agreements, having only a History deficiency, enrollment in Associate in Applied Science programs, military and auxiliary credits, and demonstrated success in their major field of study.
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (8):

Annual Reports.

SUBJECT: Teacher Education Program Admission Study.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

In response to the legislature in 1985, the State Regents selected the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) as one criterion for admission to teacher education programs. The test has been required since 1990, initially of all students. In September 1997, a general education teacher certification test was added as a licensing requirement by the legislature. In May 2002, this Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET) was added to the admission criteria.

Currently, the admission criteria are 1) earning a GPA of 3.00 or higher in all liberal arts and sciences courses (a minimum of 20 hours), 2) passing all three sections of the PPST, 3) passing the OGET, or 4) holding a baccalaureate degree from an accredited university in the United States.

This is the twelfth study of teacher education program admission since the policy was implemented in 1990. This report focuses on the period of time from 2001-2002 to 2010-2011, the most recent data available.

POLICY ISSUES:

The State Regents' policy, Criteria for Admission to Teacher Education (3.21.3) regulates admission standards to teacher education programs and requires a review of data to evaluate its impact.

FINDINGS:

During 2010-2011, the twelve Oklahoma public universities with teacher education programs reported a total of 1,701 students to teacher education programs were admitted (Chart 1). The number of students admitted decreased 17.9 percent from 2,072 in 2001-2002 to 1,701 in 2010-2011.

Most of the students admitted were White (80.2 percent). The next largest ethnic group, Native Americans, comprised 11.9 percent of admissions, a decrease of 17.1 percent from 2009-2010 (Chart 2). Males comprised 20.3 percent of admissions with females making up 78.7 percent. Gender was unknown for 1.1 percent of admissions (Chart 3).

In 2010-2011, 89.7 percent of the students were admitted to teacher education programs by passing the OGET, 9.2 percent by achieving a GPA of 3.00 or higher, 0.1 percent by passing the PPST, and 0.8
percent had at least a bachelor’s degree (Chart 4). The OGET was not used as an admission criterion until 2002-2003.

An analysis of 2010-2011 OGET test-takers by the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation shows that over half (64.0 percent) are getting their initial license/certification and 23.5 percent an alternative certification (Chart 5). In 2009-2010, 58.1 percent of OGET test-takers were getting their initial license/certification and 29.8 percent an alternative certification.

CONCLUSIONS:

- Admissions to teacher education programs have decreased 17.9 percent from 2,072 in 2001-2002 to 1,701 in 2010-2011.
- Male admissions continue to decline from a high of 529 in 2002-2003 to 345 in 2010-2011.
- Black admissions have decreased by 6.1 percent from 49 in 2009-2010 to 46 in 2010-2011.
- Minority admissions have mostly decreased over 2010-2011 with gains only found in Hispanic student admissions.
- Due to the importance of good preparation, students should continue to be advised to pass courses in the general education core curriculum before taking the OGET or PPST. Students are provided with remediation if needed. The subject matter competency course requirements in English, math, sciences, and social studies for early childhood, elementary, and special education students should continue to increase the general academic preparation of many teacher education students.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Phase out the use of PPST as an admission option. Only six students were admitted through PPST in the last three years.

2. Continue to monitor the effects of alternative certification on teacher education admissions.

3. Increase emphasis on minority teacher recruitment to meet the demands of changing student demographics.
CHART 1
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES
2001-02 TO 2010-2011
CHART 2
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY ETHNIC GROUP
2001-2002 TO 2010-2011

[Bar chart showing the number of students admitted by ethnic group from 2001-2002 to 2010-2011]
CHART 3
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY GENDER
2001-2002 TO 2010-2011
Chart 4
Number of Students Admitted to Teacher Education Programs by Admission Criterion
2004-05 to 2010-2011
CHART 5
OGET TEST TAKERS BY ROUTE TO CERTIFICATION
2006-07 TO 2010-2011
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (9):

Annual Reports.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma National Guard Tuition Waiver 2011-12 Year End Report.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

For the 2011-12 academic year, the State Regents allocated $1,892,829 million for the Oklahoma National Guard Tuition Waiver, based on the number of hours waived during the 2010-11 academic year. The State Regents established the tuition waiver as an incentive for qualified young men and women to join the Oklahoma National Guard and as a means to retain skilled, productive citizens within the state. Oklahoma residents who are members of the National Guard are eligible for tuition waivers for up to eighteen credit hours per semester. Each participating institution is responsible for waiving a minimum number of credit hours each academic year based on the total undergraduate enrollment. The tuition waiver policy provisions related to financial need, to distribution of awards across fields of study and levels of students and the limit of 3.5 percent of E&G budget do not apply to this program.

POLICY ISSUES:

This report is consistent with the State Regents’ policy.

ANALYSIS:

For the 2011-12 academic year, National Guard members received waivers totaling $2,264,768, a decrease of 10.02 percent or $252,298 from 2010-11. The total number of hours waived decreased by 14.3 percent. Of the total dollar amount waived, $1,451,629 was waived in excess of the minimum required for institutional reimbursement and is the basis for the FY13 allocation to be approved along with the FY13 E&G budget item. The current allotment will be sufficient to cover the total dollars waived in FY12, thus no pro-rated reductions are necessary for FY13 allocations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arndmore Higher Ed. Center</td>
<td>$532</td>
<td>$924</td>
<td>$392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron University</td>
<td>$109,013</td>
<td>$133,657</td>
<td>$24,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Albert State College</td>
<td>$7,068</td>
<td>$5,044</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connors State College</td>
<td>$19,974</td>
<td>$5,621</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central University</td>
<td>$90,203</td>
<td>$90,922</td>
<td>$719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>$3,917</td>
<td>$5,827</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston University</td>
<td>$4,710</td>
<td>$10,123</td>
<td>$5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State College</td>
<td>$40,153</td>
<td>$5,621</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Oklahoma A&amp;M College</td>
<td>$1,323</td>
<td>$5,827</td>
<td>$4,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Community College</td>
<td>$111,136</td>
<td>$97,689</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Panhandle State University</td>
<td>$6,069</td>
<td>$1,385</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>$406,516</td>
<td>$378,295</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University - OKC</td>
<td>$107,650</td>
<td>$107,196</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University - Okm</td>
<td>$55,601</td>
<td>$44,338</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands Community College</td>
<td>$19,909</td>
<td>$19,747</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers State University</td>
<td>$58,205</td>
<td>$378,295</td>
<td>$320,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole State College</td>
<td>$76,397</td>
<td>$67,877</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>$50,153</td>
<td>$101,134</td>
<td>$51,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Community College</td>
<td>$189,698</td>
<td>$163,238</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>$422,915</td>
<td>$355,422</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>$373,459</td>
<td>$327,750</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma Health Sciences</td>
<td>$9,072</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Science and Arts</td>
<td>$16,332</td>
<td>$9,822</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oklahoma State</td>
<td>$23,392</td>
<td>$8,752</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Consortium - UCO</td>
<td>$1,174</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,517,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,264,768</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,298</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (10):

Annual Reports.

SUBJECT: Oklahoma High School Indicators Project. Reports required by 1989 legislation relating to (1) high school to college-going rate by high school site, (2) performance of college freshmen by high school site, and (3) ACT performance by high school site.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

In Senate Bill No. 183 from the 1989 legislative session, Section 13 set up a program designed to evaluate the performance of individual schools and school districts in the state of Oklahoma. This program not only required multiple types of evaluation by the State Department of Education, but also required that the individual schools and districts be notified of these evaluations, and that the general public also be advised as to the "effectiveness" of individual schools or districts. In response to the directive of SB 183, the State Regents provide the following four reports; (1) High School to College-Going Rates for Oklahoma High School Graduates to Oklahoma Colleges; (2) Headcount, Semester Hours, and GPA Report; (3) Mean ACT Scores by Oklahoma High School Site; and (4) Remediation Rates for Oklahoma High School Graduates in Oklahoma Public Higher Education (beginning in 1995).

POLICY ISSUES:

These reports are consistent with States Regents’ policy.

ANALYSIS:

High School to College-Going Rates for Oklahoma High School Graduates to Oklahoma Colleges

The data describes 2010 Oklahoma high school graduates who entered an Oklahoma college or university as first-time entering freshmen in fall 2010. It lists the following information by county, district, and high school site: (1) the number of high school graduates; (2) the number of high school graduates who went directly to college the following academic year, which is known as the linear college-going rate; and (3) the number of high school graduates who delay entry into college for one year or more.

For 2010, the State Department of Education reported 39,431 students graduated from Oklahoma high schools. Of that amount 21,580 or 54.7 percent entered an Oklahoma college or university the following academic year. This is 4.1 percentage points higher than the previous year.

In compliance with Senate Bill No. 183, the State Regents will transmit these data to the Office of Accountability.
AGENDA ITEM #23-c (11):

Annual Reports.

SUBJECT: Regents Education Program.

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

According to Regents’ policy, the State Regents will publish a Regents Education Program Annual Report each fiscal year. The annual report for FY2011 is attached for acceptance.

POLICY ISSUES:

The Regents Education Program 2011 Annual Report is a routine item for consideration and is consistent with State Regents’ policy.

ANALYSIS:

The Regents Education Program 2011 Annual Report has been prepared in accordance with State Regents’ policy and outlines the courses offered, notable speakers, offering locations, regent/trustee participation, and a summary.
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Minutes of the Seven Hundred Forty-First Meeting
of the
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
April 19, 2012

1. 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 a special meeting at 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 19,
2012, in the State Regents’ Conference Room at the State Regents’ offices in Oklahoma City,
Oklahoma. Notice of the meeting had been filed with the Secretary of State on November 22,
2011. A copy of the agenda for the meeting had been posted in accordance with the Open
Meeting Act.

2. CALL TO ORDER. Regent Glass called the meeting to order and presided. Present for
the meeting were Regents Toney Stricklin, Ron White, Stuart Price, Jody Parker, Ike Glass,
Jimmy Harrel, Mike Turpen, and John Massey.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING. Regent Harrel made a motion, seconded
by Regent Turpen, to approve the minutes of the State Regents’ meetings on February 29, 2012,
and March 1, 2012. Voting for the motion were Regents White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel,
Turpen, Massey, and Stricklin. Voting against the motion were none.

4. REPORTS.
   a. Report of the Chairman. Regent Glass stated that he had no report at that time.
      list of engagements he had attended on behalf of the State Regents. He provided Regents
      with an overview of the Reach Higher reception, held the previous weekend. Chancellor
      Johnson also discussed the presentation of two 2011 Higher Education Distinguished
      Service Awards. The recipients of these awards were Representative Pat Ownbey and
Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives Kris Steele. Finally, Chancellor Johnson recognized Dr. Houston Davis, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Dr. Davis will be leaving the State Regents at the end of April 2012 to assume the position of Executive Vice Chancellor for the Georgia University System.

5. CHANCELLOR HANS BRISCH SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AWARDS. Regent Turpen made a motion, seconded by Regent Parker, to ratify the awards to the following 2012-2013 Chancellor Hans Brisch Scholarship recipients: Micheal Barnes, Lawton MacArthur High School; Lindsay Barron, Classen School of Advanced Studies; Mikaela Hooper, Tushka High School; Mandy Schroeder, Kremlin-Hillsdale High School. Voting for the motion were Regents Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, and White. Voting against the motion were none.

6. NEW PROGRAMS.

a. Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent White, to approve the request from Oklahoma State University to offer the Master of Science in Aviation and Space and the Certificate in Online Teaching. Voting for the motion were Regents Parker, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, White, and Price. Voting against the motion were none.

b. Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the request from the University of Central Oklahoma to offer the Master of Education in Bilingual Education/Teaching English as a Second Language, the Master of Education in Secondary Education, the Master of Arts in Gerontology, the Master of Arts in Human Communication, and the Master of Public Administration in Public Administration. Voting for the motion were Regents Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, White, Price, and Parker. Voting against the motion were none.

c. Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the request from Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College to offer the Certificate in Natural Resources.
Ecology and Management (one-year) and the Certificate in Natural Resources Ecology and Management (two-year). Voting for the motion were Regents Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, White, Price, Parker, and Glass. Voting against the motion were none.

d. Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the request from Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology – Okmulgee to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Pipeline Integrity Technology. Voting for the motion were Regents Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, White, Price, Parker, Glass, and Harrel. Voting against the motion were none.

e. Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Price, to approve the request from Tulsa Community College to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Diagnostic Medical Sonography and the Certificate in Diagnostic Medical Sonography. Voting for the motion were Regents Massey, Stricklin, White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, and Turpen. Voting against the motion were none.

7. **PROGRAM DELETIONS.** Regent Price made a motion, seconded by Regent White, to approve the following requests for program deletions:

- Oklahoma State University requested to delete the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Theatre.
- Cameron University requested to delete the Associate in Applied Science in Computer Aided Design Drafting, Associate in Applied Science in Computer Information Systems, and Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems.

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

8. **ACADEMIC POLICY.**
a. Regents reviewed proposed revisions to the State Regents’ Policy 3.25 Professional Programs. This item was for posting only and did not require Regents’ action.

b. Regents reviewed proposed revisions to the State Regents’ Institutional Accreditation policy. This item was for posting only and did not require Regents’ action.

9. EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (EPAS). Dr. Cindy Brown, Director of Student Preparation, provided Regents with a summary of the Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS) annual report. Regent Price made a motion, seconded by Regent White, to accept the 2011-2012 EPAS Annual Report. Voting for the motion were Regents White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, and Stricklin. Voting against the motion were none.

10. E&G BUDGET. Chancellor Johnson recommended changes to the State Regents funding formula, as proposed by the Council of Presidents Funding Formula Task Force and the Council of Presidents. Regent Turpen made a motion, seconded by Regent White, to change the language within the item to reflect that the recommendation was being submitted to State Regents from Chancellor Johnson. Voting for the motion were Regents Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, and White. Voting against the motion were none. Regent Price made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve the recommended changes to the State Regents funding formula. Voting for the motion were Regents Parker, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, White, and Price. Voting against the motion were none. A copy of the revised funding formula is on file at the State Regents’ offices.

11. MASTER LEASE. Regent Turpen made a motion, seconded by Regent White, to approve for submission to the Council of Bond Oversight the 2012A Real Property Master Lease Series, which includes projects from 12 State System entities totaling approximately $155.7 million. Voting for the motion were Regents Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, White, Price, and Parker. Voting against the motion were none.
12. **EPSCoR.** Regent Turpen made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve the appointment of Janet Haggerty, The University of Tulsa, to the EPSCoR Advisory Committee through December 2013. Voting for the motion were Regents Harrel, Turpen, Massey, Stricklin, White, Price, Parker, and Glass. Voting against the motion were none.

13. **CONTRACTS AND PURCHASES.** Regent Turpen made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve the following purchase in excess of $100,000:

1) Stanfield & Odell in the amount of $218,400 for annual financial services audits for FY 2012 and the four subsequent fiscal years.

2) Intelleq in the amount of $40,000 for upgrades to circuits that support the Altus Hub on the campus of Western Oklahoma State College in Altus, Oklahoma.

3) $8,667,100 in federal grant funds for the optical networking components of the Oklahoma Community Anchor Network (OCAN).

4) U.S. Postmaster in the amount of $2,000. This is an increase due to postage rates and handling fees. The new total of the purchase order will be $208,000.

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

14. **DELETED ITEM.**

15. **POLICY.** Regent Parker made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve changes to the Administrative Operations policy within the State Regents’ policy and procedures manual, establishing the position of Higher Education Chief Information Officer. Voting for the motion were Regents Massey, Stricklin, White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, and Turpen. Voting against the motion were none.

16. **FALLINFORBUSINESS.** Mr. Tony Hutchison, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Planning and Analysis and Economic and Workforce Development, presented results of the FallinForBusiness.com survey, which included information from 5,400 business leaders across Oklahoma. The results show that the primary business strength in Oklahoma as determined by
those business leaders was the strength of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. This item was for State Regents’ information only. No Regents action was required.

17. **COMMENDATIONS.** Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Parker, to recognize State Regents’ staff for state and national recognitions. Voting for the motion were Regents Stricklin, White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, and Massey. Voting against the motion were none. Regents recognized Ms. Lisa Walker, who received a Bachelor of Arts in Multidisciplinary Studies from the University of Oklahoma in December 2011. Regents presented Ms. Walker with a certificate and expressed their congratulations for her achievement.

18. **EXECUTIVE SESSION.** Mr. Robert Anthony, State Regents’ General Counsel, indicated that there was not a need for Regents to enter into an executive session.

19. **PERSONNEL.** Regent Harrel made a motion, seconded by Regent Parker, to ratify the appointment of Dr. Phil Moss to the position of Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Voting for the motion were Regents White, Price, Parker, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, and Stricklin. Voting against the motion were none.

20. **CONSENT DOCKET.** Chairman Glass stated that item 20-b (1), a letter of agreement between Oklahoma GEAR UP and Aurora Learning Community Association, would be tabled until a later Regents’ meeting. Regent Parker made a motion, seconded by Regent Massey, to approve the following consent docket items:

   a. **Programs.**
      
      (1) Approval of institutional requests for program modifications.
      
      (2) Ratification of institutional request for program reinstatements.

   b. **GEAR UP.**
      
      (1) *Tabled.*
      
      (2) Ratification of a Letter of Agreement between Battelle for Kids’ and Oklahoma GEAR UP to provide a support system and professional development.

   c. Ratification of capital allotments.
d. Agency Operations. Ratification of purchases in excess of $25,000.

e. Non-Academic Degrees.

(1) Approval of a posthumous degree request from the University of Oklahoma.

(2) Approval of honorary degree requests from the University of Oklahoma.

(3) Approval of honorary degree requests from Oklahoma State University.

(4) Approval of honorary degree requests from Langston University.

(5) Approval of posthumous degree requests from Oklahoma City Community College.

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

21. REPORTS. Regent Price made a motion, seconded by Regent Stricklin, to accept the following reports:

a. Programs. Status report on program requests.

b. Annual Reports.

(1) Oklahoma Elementary Mathematics Specialist Certification Program.

(2) Supplemental Pension Report, FY 2011.

(3) Current Income and Expenditure Report, FY 2011.


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

22. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEES.

a. Academic Affairs/Social Justice and Student Services Committees. Regent Price reported that all of the committee’s items had been acted on.

b. Budget and Audit Committee. Regent Turpen reported that the committee had no additional items to bring forward.
c. Strategic Planning & Personnel and Technology Committee. Regent Harrel reported that all of the committee’s items had been handled.

d. Investment Committee. Regent White reported that the committee had no other items for consideration.

23. NEW BUSINESS. No additional items were brought before the Regents for consideration.

24. ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT REGULAR MEETINGS. Regent Glass announced that the State Regents’ next regular meetings would be held on Thursday, May 24, 2012, at 10:30 a.m., and Friday, May 25, 2012, at 9 a.m., at the State Regents’ offices in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

25. ADJOURNMENT. With no additional items to address, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

______________________________  ______________________________
Julie Carson, Chairman          James D. Harrel, Secretary
1. ANNOUNCEMENT OF FILING OF MEETING NOTICE AND POSTING OF THE AGENDA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETING ACT. The Committee-of-the-Whole met at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 18, 2012, at the State Regents’ offices in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Notice of the meeting was filed with the Secretary of State on November 22, 2011. A copy of the agenda had been posted as required by the Open Meeting Act.

2. CALL TO ORDER. Participating in the meeting were Regents Toney Stricklin, Ron White, Stuart Price, Ike Glass, Jimmy Harrel, Mike Turpen, and John Massey. Vice Chairman Ike Glass called the meeting to order and presided.

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION. Regent Massey made a motion, seconded by Regent Harrel, to go into executive session for confidential communications concerning pending investigations, claims, or actions, and for discussion of the employment, resignation, and appointment of Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Voting for the motion were Regents White, Price, Glass, Harrel, Turpen, Massey, and Stricklin. Voting against the motion were none.

Following executive session discussions, Regents returned to open session.

4. FY2013 HIGHER EDUCATION BUDGET. Chancellor Glen D. Johnson provided Regents with a report on a series of meetings with Oklahoma legislative leaders concerning the higher education budget request for FY2013. He stated that the priorities discussed by State Regents’ staff included the funding of mandatory costs (such as utilities, health care benefits, and retirement contributions and expenses) and annualization of the FY2011 supplemental appropriation of $10 million. Ms. Amanda Paliotta, Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance, Information Technology, Telecommunications, and OneNet, reported that there was no legislative budget agreement at that time. Regents discussed the possible impact of proposed cuts to the state income tax on the FY2013 appropriations. Chancellor Johnson stressed that the impact of the cuts on institutions must be made clear to legislators. Chancellor Johnson also thanked Regent Glass for his efforts in contacting legislators to discuss the impact of the FY2013 budget.

5. FUNDING FORMULA. Chancellor Johnson and Vice Chancellor Paliotta reviewed the proposed changes to State Regents funding formula, as recommended by the Council of Presidents to Chancellor Johnson. Vice Chancellor Paliotta stated that only the constituent agencies suffered minimal losses as a result of the changes. The proposed changes will move the State Regents’ funding formula from a peer-based allocation to a performance-based allocation. In addition, the Council of Presidents requested that a review be done on an annual basis to ensure accuracy in reporting, appropriateness of performance factors, and effectiveness of other measures found within the formula.
Regent Price clarified that the funding formula would only be implemented with the appropriation of new money from the state legislature.

6. **ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY.** Mr. Mike Seney, State Chamber of Oklahoma, provided Regents with an overview of the upcoming economic impact study and presented a sample economic impact study that had been done on manufacturing in Oklahoma. Chancellor Johnson stated that it had been more than four years since the last economic impact study of higher education had been conducted. The upcoming economic impact study will be sponsored by the State Chamber of Oklahoma. The report is expected to be completed by October 2012.

7. **COMPLETE COLLEGE AMERICA.**
   a. Mr. Tony Hutchison, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Planning and Analysis and Economic and Workforce Development, demonstrated the new College Completion Dashboard website, which will access, filter, and provide analysis of information reported by State System institutions. The website is secured and the information accessed is based on the level of permissions the user is given.
   b. Dr. Houston Davis, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, discussed a strategy of transitioning the responsibilities of the Complete College America liaison for Oklahoma from Dr. Davis to Mr. Hutchison after his departure from the agency at the end of April. He also discussed the five statewide initiatives that had been adopted by the State Regents at their regular meeting in October 2011.

8. **ENDOWED CHAIRS PROGRAM.** Vice Chancellor Paliotta provided Regents with an update on the backlog of the endowed chairs program, which has reached $271 million.

9. **MASTER LEASE PROGRAM.** Vice Chancellor Paliotta discussed the request made by Senator Anderson to the Oklahoma Attorney General on April 4, 2012, regarding the constitutionality of the master lease program, both real property and equipment. Chancellor Glen D. Johnson advised Regents that he had met with Attorney General Scott Pruitt to discuss the master lease program, particularly the savings that may be achieved through refinancing debt service for many projects.

10. **POLICY UPDATE.** Regents discussed the exemption provided to higher education from the open records act with regards to the development of patents. Vice Chancellor Hutchison stated that this exemption was approved by the voters of Oklahoma with the passage of State Questions 680 and 681. He noted, however, that institutions must report the status of these patents to the State Regents.

11. **OKLAHOMA’S PROMISE.** Mr. Ben Hardcastle, Director of Communications, presented Regents advertisements for the Oklahoma’s Promise program. In addition to print ads, four 30-second television commercials were also produced. The ads began running publicly in early April and will continue through the Oklahoma’s Promise enrollment deadline of June 30, 2012.

12. **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE.** Chancellor Johnson and Ms. Hollye Hunt, Associate Vice Chancellor for Legislative Relations, provided Regents with updates on pending legislation effecting higher education.
13. **ADJOURNMENT.** With no other items to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

_________________________________  ______________________________
Julie Carson, Chairman    Jimmy Harrel, Secretary