



Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) Meeting

Kansas Board of Regents

2026-05-05 10:30 - 12:00 CDT

Table of Contents

I. Call to Order

A. Roll Call & Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes

A. March 31, 2026.....4

III. Board Consent Agenda Items

A. Act on Request for Approval on Two New Systemwide Transfer Courses.....8

Presenters: Trey Hill

The Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) reviewed reports from two Kansas Core Outcomes Groups, who met in March 2026 to finalize conversations from the October 2025 KCOG Conference. Faculty developed learning outcomes for two new Systemwide Transfer (SWT) courses. TAAC recommends that these two newly developed courses be recognized for transfer across the Kansas Board of Regents system. Board staff recommends approving the two new courses recommended by TAAC for inclusion in systemwide transfer, effective summer 2026.

IV. Board Discussion Agenda Items

A. Act on AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreement.....10

Presenters: Jennifer Bonds-Raacke

Board of Regents policy requires the development of performance agreements tied to institutional improvement plans and the receipt of new state funds. As the current cycle concludes in Academic Year (AY) 2026, Board staff is proposing a one-year Bridge Performance Agreement for AY 2027 to maintain continuity while the next phase of performance agreements is developed.

The proposed Bridge Performance Agreement continues existing requirements related to math pathways, corequisite support, and systemwide placement measures, while advancing institutional responsibilities to include the development of student-level data reporting systems to support systemwide evaluation and improvement. The proposal was discussed at the March SCOCAO and BAASC meetings, and institutions were invited to provide feedback.

Board staff recommends approval of the one-year Bridge Performance Agreement for AY 2027 and the updated Performance Agreement Guidelines & Procedures, as revised to align with the Bridge Performance Agreement.

B. Act on Request to Change Threshold for One Program Review Metric for

Regional Universities.....22

Presenters: Sam Christy-Dangermond

Board policy requires that "in cooperation with the universities, the Board will maintain a program review cycle and a review process that will allow the universities to demonstrate that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. Regular program review is institutionally based and follows the departmental or unit structure of the institution." (Board Policy Manual, Chapter II., A.5.)

In June 2023, the Board approved changes to the KBOR program review framework for AY 2025 - AY 2028. In December of 2024 and March of 2025, some adjustments were made to the metrics based on institutional feedback. (Attachment A includes the approved framework.) One of those changes, "establishing institution-specific thresholds based on Carnegie classifications..." was not finalized. At this time, a change to one of the thresholds for the regional universities is being proposed. Board staff recommends approval.

C. Act on RCBD Policy Element Recommendations & Updated Policy.....28

Presenters: Jennifer Bonds-Raacke

In response to national conversations regarding degree affordability, workforce alignment, and time to completion, the Kansas Board of Regents has explored the development of Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degrees (RCBDs) as a potential pilot initiative. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) charged an RCBD Work Group to develop policy element recommendations grounded in Higher Learning Commission guidance and informed by national best practices.

The proposed policy elements establish a framework that maintains academic rigor and alignment with existing Board policy while allowing for institutional innovation in program design. The recommendations were developed through a collaborative process with broad institutional representation and are presented to support BAASC discussion and next steps.

Board staff recommends approval of the RCBD recommendations and the updated policy, as revised to align with the RCBD pilot recommendations.

V. Other Matters

A. Act on Recommendations from KU 2025 Program Review Follow-Up.....44

Presenters: Sam Christy-Dangermond, Arash Mafi

Board policy requires that "in cooperation with the universities, the Board will maintain a program review cycle and a review process that will allow the universities to demonstrate that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission." In June of 2023, the Board approved changes to the KBOR program review process. For Academic Year (AY) 2025, the University of Kansas (KU) and the University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC) were required to review all programs. As a result, the Board approved placing five programs on action plans, two programs to be phased out, two programs to be merged at KU, and one program to be phased out at KUMC. KU is providing information on these programs today, as well as three programs from the AY 2024 Program Review that the Board approved to place on action plans and one program that was to be merged. Board staff recommend approval of the recommendations.

B. Act on Proposal to Apply Doctoral Minima to MFA for Program Review.....46

Presenters: Sam Christy-Dangermond

In June 2023, the Board approved changes to the KBOR program review framework for AY 2025 – AY 2028. In December of 2024 and March of 2025, some adjustments were made to the metrics based on institutional feedback. At the BAASC meeting on March 11, 2026, there was an informal proposal to consider the Master's in Fine Arts (MFA) degree programs as terminal degrees, and as such, applying the doctoral metric thresholds to these degree programs for Program Review. Based on the common understanding that the MFA is the terminal degree in studio arts, Board staff recommends approval to consider MFA degree programs as terminal degrees for the purposes of Program Review.

C. Act on WSU Request to Remove Two Programs from Action Plans - 2024

Program Review.....47

Presenters: Sam Christy-Dangermond, Monica Lounsbery
At the March 11, 2026, BAASC meeting, Wichita State University (WSU) presented findings from AY 2026 Program Review, including updates on programs reviewed in AY 2024. WSU requests to remove the BS in Forensic Science and the BS in Physics from the action plans to which they were assigned in 2024, as the most recent data indicate improvement – from meeting two of the four metrics in 2024, to meeting three of the four currently.

D. Academic Affairs Updates

Presenters: Jennifer Bonds-Raacke

VI. Announcements

VII. Adjournment

March 31, 2026 Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Chair Alysia Johnston at 10:30 a.m. on March 31, 2026. The meeting was held virtually via Zoom. Proper notice was given according to the law.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alysia Johnston, Chair
 Diana Mendoza
 Peter Johnston

Approval of Minutes

Regent Peter Johnston moved to approve the minutes of the March 11, 2026, meeting. Regent Mendoza seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Board Consent Agenda Items

Academic Calendar

Sam Christy-Dangermond, Director for Academic Affairs, presented proposed academic calendars for Academic Years 2029 through 2031 and outlined the Board of Regents’ policy requirements governing state university calendars. She explained that KBOR policy requires each state university to maintain an academic calendar consisting of two 16-week semesters, at least 146 instructional days per academic year, and five examination days per semester, while also adhering to board-approved holidays and breaks. She noted that universities must submit three-year calendars for board approval and follow them unless the board approves changes. Although institutions retain some flexibility, prior board actions have resulted in substantial consistency across universities, with remaining differences reflecting administrative needs and campus traditions. She also emphasized that, beginning in 2020, the board required state universities to adopt a common spring break coordinated with the K–12 system.

Regent Mendoza moved to approve the academic calendars for Academic Years 2029 through 2031. Regent Peter Johnston seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Board Discussion Agenda Items

Academic Year 2027 Bridge Performance Agreements

Jennifer Bonds-Raacke, Vice President for Academic Affairs, provided an overview of the proposed Academic Year 2027 Bridge Performance Agreements, noting that Board policy requires performance agreements, which are aligned with institutional improvement plans and tied to new state funding. As the current cycle concludes, a one-year bridge agreement is proposed to maintain continuity while the next phase is developed. She explained that the bridge year would give institutions additional time to assess system-level reforms related to math pathways and co-requisite support, collect more meaningful data, and ensure the measures appropriately reflect desired outcomes. She also noted that the approach allows time for the onboarding and engagement of the incoming Board president before launching the next three-year cycle.

Vice President Bonds-Raacke explained that the bridge agreement would continue existing requirements while expanding institutional responsibilities to include developing student-level data reporting systems to support systemwide evaluation and improvement. She noted that the proposal was discussed at the System Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCCAO) meeting in March and that institutions were invited to provide feedback. Vice President Bonds-Raacke highlighted that the rubric format remains unchanged, with ongoing efforts reflected in items one through four and new items five through seven focused on evaluating multiple placement measures and co-requisite models. Institutions would use Academic Year 2027 to build reporting systems, with

student-level data collection beginning in summer 2027 and included in Academic Year 2028 reporting. In discussion, Regent Peter Johnston agreed that the bridge year provides flexibility to reassess metrics and reporting approaches, which Vice President Bonds-Raacke confirmed is critical to evaluating policy effectiveness. She emphasized that no action was requested at this time and that staff welcome feedback ahead of a final proposal in May.

Other Matters

SARA Report

Jennifer Armour, Associate Director for Private Postsecondary, presented a report on the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA), which enables degree-granting institutions to offer distance education across member states without obtaining separate state approvals. She explained that the KBOR serves as the state portal entity and reported that state membership and institutional participation remained flat, with 52 states and territories involved and California as the only non-member. Nationwide, more than 2,400 institutions participate in SARA, including 47 Kansas institutions.

Associate Director Armour summarized 2024 data submitted to the National Council for SARA (NC-SARA), noting that more than 11,000 out-of-state students were enrolled in participating Kansas institutions, while over 14,000 Kansans were enrolled in out-of-state participating institutions. She also reported more than 5,100 out-of-state students placed in Kansas and over 4,600 students placed out of state, primarily in health professions programs. During discussion, she clarified that the data reflect headcount rather than full-time equivalent enrollment and that data elements are determined by NC-SARA. She further explained that a previous enrollment decline was tied to a private for-profit institution leaving Kansas following its acquisition by the University of Arkansas.

Associate Director Armour also provided an update on the SARA policy environment, noting that the 2026 annual policy modification process is underway. She reported that the NC-SARA Board approved nine proposals in October that clarified policy language, strengthened state oversight, increased institutional transparency and accountability, and improved student complaint processes. She concluded by highlighting an updated cost-savings study estimating that Kansas institutions save more than \$4.6 million annually through SARA participation.

Credit for Prior Learning Annual Report

Trey Hill, Director for Academic Affairs, reported on credit for prior learning (CPL), which awards academic credit for learning that occurs outside the traditional classroom, including military service, work experience, portfolios, and standardized examinations such as AP and CLEP. For Academic Year 2025, institutions awarded just under 100,000 CPL credit hours statewide, with the majority granted by state universities, followed by community colleges, technical colleges, and the municipal university. Trend data showed a steady increase in CPL credit hours since a temporary decline in 2022, with sector proportions remaining relatively consistent over time.

Director Hill also summarized CPL headcount data, reporting that just under 10,000 students received some form of CPL in Academic Year 2025, again primarily at state universities. He reviewed institution-level trends across state universities, community colleges, and technical colleges, noting overall growth across sectors and highlighting Johnson County Community College (JCCC) and Wichita State University Campus of Applied Sciences and Technologies (WSU Tech) as significant contributors within their sectors. He also explained sector differences in CPL mechanisms, with AP exams and industry-recognized credentials dominating at state universities, institutional exams and credentials more prevalent at technical colleges, and limited AP usage in that sector. Director Hill concluded by noting that CPL removes barriers for students and supports progress toward credentials and degrees. Regents expressed interest in future analysis of trends by CPL category, including potential growth related to policy changes such as expanded military credit.

Dual Credit Annual Report

Director Hill presented a report on dual credit enrollment and outcomes across Kansas. He reported that approximately 40,000 Kansas students participated in dual credit during Academic Year 2025, representing an increase of nearly 59 percent over the past decade and marking the highest participation level to date. Community colleges accounted for nearly two-thirds of all dual credit students, followed by technical colleges and state universities. Institution-level data showed varied participation patterns, with JCCC and WSU Tech serving as the largest providers within their respective sectors.

Director Hill reviewed participation trends by race and ethnicity, noting that students identifying as white comprised the largest group, followed by Hispanic students, while five-year trend data showed shifts in participation rates across demographic groups. He also reported steady growth in dual credit hours over the past decade, largely proportional to headcount growth, indicating students are taking similar credit loads over time. Sector-level trends showed that community colleges continue to provide the majority of dual credit hours, with a modest increase in the share delivered by technical colleges, driven primarily by WSU Tech. Finally, Director Hill reviewed student success outcomes, explaining that success includes degree completion, retention, or completion within or outside the Kansas public system. Success rates for dual credit students remained high, with a temporary decline during the COVID period followed by a gradual rebound.

Reduced-Credit Baccalaureate Degree Update

Vice President Bonds-Raacke provided an update on the work of the Reduced Credit Baccalaureate Degree (RCBD) Work Group, which was charged with developing policy recommendations for a pilot framework to be presented to BAASC by the end of the academic year. Since February, the work group has met three times for focused discussion and has made substantial progress advancing key policy conversations. As part of this effort, Director Hill developed an RCBD dashboard that tracks national and state developments related to reduced credit degrees in a dynamic and accessible format, with regular updates available for ongoing review.

Vice President Bonds-Raacke reported that the work group has discussed core policy elements and reached preliminary consensus on several recommendations, while continuing to finalize the full set of proposed policy elements. Topics under consideration include total degree credit hours, general education requirements, institutional residency, and upper-division coursework. She indicated that a draft of the policy recommendations will be brought to the Committee for consideration in May.

Building a Future in Corequisite Innovation: A Systemwide Faculty Leadership Initiative

Vice President Bonds-Raacke presented an update on Building a Future in Co-requisite Innovation, a new system-wide faculty leadership initiative supported by a grant secured through Kansas's participation in the Strong Start to Finish Community of Practice. She explained that the initiative supports ongoing math and English reform efforts through three components designed to recognize faculty leadership, strengthen collaboration, and advance co-requisite innovation.

Vice President Bonds-Raacke explained that the system will provide \$3,000 to sponsor the 2026 Co-requisite Symposium, scheduled for October 23, 2026, at Barton Community College, reinforcing the value of faculty collaboration and shared learning. She also shared that the Sunflower Award for Co-requisite Innovation will recognize faculty leaders advancing student success through co-requisite reform. Vice President Bonds-Raacke announced the 2026 recipients; Stephanie Joiner, Kathy McCoskey, Brooke Istes, Whitney Turner, Gabe Kerr, Melanie Burdick, and John Hammond; each of whom will receive a certificate of recognition and a \$100 honorarium. Vice President Bonds-Raacke further explained that the Sunflower Scholarship Fellows program will support cross-institutional teams in exploring effective online co-requisite supports, with priority given to

proposals involving both math and English faculty. Two teams will receive \$2,500 stipends and will present their findings at the fall co-requisite symposium and executive implementation team meeting.

Vice President Bonds-Raacke concluded that the symposium sponsorship, faculty awards, and fellowship program collectively demonstrate the system's commitment to faculty leadership and evidence-based co-requisite reform. Chair Johnston commended the initiative and congratulated the award recipients, noting continued interest in advancing practices that improve gateway course success.

Academic Affairs Updates

Vice President Bonds-Raacke provided two system-level updates focused on national engagement and rural workforce development. First, she reported on her participation in the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) annual conference in Chicago, highlighting sessions relevant to Kansas priorities, including reduced-credit baccalaureate degrees, artificial intelligence, and HLC's new strategic plan. She emphasized the strong representation from Kansas institutions, noting that faculty and leaders delivered well-attended presentations on topics such as AI, data-informed decision-making, and strategic planning. She concluded that Kansas institutions are not only actively engaged in these areas but are also helping to lead conversations at the national level.

Vice President Bonds-Raacke also provided an update on Kansas's participation in the Rural Talent Lab, a multi-state initiative focused on strengthening rural talent development through data-informed strategies, including middle-skill pathways, stackable credentials, and closer alignment between education and workforce needs. She explained that the first phase includes regional listening tours designed to better understand local needs and opportunities, using a structured, data-informed process facilitated by Kansas State University Extension. The work group selected Dodge City, Hays, and Emporia as regional hubs, with listening tours scheduled for the second week of May. Looking ahead, she noted that the initiative will move into a collaborative, system-wide phase to identify middle-skill pathways, with implementation anticipated to begin in Fall 2027. She concluded by offering to provide additional updates, including follow-up on related rural health funding questions raised by committee members.

Adjournment

Chair Alysia Johnston adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Act on Request for Approval on Two New Systemwide Transfer Courses

Background and History

To facilitate the ongoing process of seamless transfer among public postsecondary institutions, the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) established the Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) to provide oversight and implementation of the Board's transfer and articulation policy. TAAC members consist of 10 representatives from the universities and 10 representatives from the two-year colleges with one Board member liaison. TAAC members are listed on the Transfer and Articulation Council website. https://www.kansasregents.org/academic_affairs/transfer-articulation/transfer_articulation_council

TAAC hosts an annual conference for faculty representatives to meet within discipline-based Kansas Core Outcomes Groups (KCOG) and articulate core outcomes for specified courses recommended for systemwide transfer. Since 2012, faculty have articulated outcomes for 130 selected courses that transfer seamlessly among any public university or college in Kansas offering an equivalent course.

KBOR policy states:

b. Systemwide Transfer and Articulation

To facilitate transfer and articulation across the Kansas public postsecondary education system, the Board shall provide for a Transfer and Articulation Council with oversight responsibility for implementing the Board's systemwide transfer and articulation policy. The Council's mission is to create structures and processes that facilitate student transfer and degree completion within Kansas higher education. The Council provides status reports, as appropriate, to the System Council of Chief Academic Officers.

i. The Transfer and Articulation Council shall:

- 1. Charge the Kansas Core Outcomes Groups with developing specific course articulations;*
- 2. Adjudicate disagreement from the Kansas Core Outcomes Groups;*
- 3. Provide final recommendation on systemwide transfer of specific courses; (The Board of Regents approves specific courses to be accepted for systemwide transfer from any public postsecondary educational institution in Kansas. Each course approved and accepted for systemwide transfer by the Board is identified by a shared course number that supports a student-first philosophy, and is designed to enhance educational planning and effortless course transfer. A Kansas Regents Shared Number (KRSN) uses a 3-letter prefix and a 4-digit course number to differentiate the KRSN number from individual institution course prefixes and numbers. Each institution retains its own unique course prefix and course number.)*
- 4. Assure quality and adherence to the agreed-upon learning outcomes of courses articulated across the institutions; and*
- 5. Review proposed revisions to Board policies and bring forward issues and trends that affect transfer and articulation.*

ii. In addition, the Transfer and Articulation Council shall:

- 1. Identify courses acceptable for systemwide articulation and transfer with a focus on lower division general education courses and introductory courses to majors;*
- 2. Create an effective, faculty-led structure for discipline level course articulations based on learning outcomes;*
- 3. Ensure that appeals processes exist: (a) for individual students at the institutional level; and (b) at the system level to ensure equitable resolution of transfer concerns between institutions;*
- 4. Address barriers to inter-institutional cooperation as they arise;*

5. *Use learning outcomes to determine course equivalency; and*
6. *Implement a clear and ongoing transfer structure.*

TAAC reviewed reports submitted by the KCOG Co Chairs and approved outcomes for two new courses recommended for Board approval for systemwide transfer.

Courses Presented for Approval

TAAC presents the following courses to the Board as recommended for systemwide transfer effective summer 2026:

- CSC1050 INTRODUCTION TO DIGITAL LOGIC DESIGN
- MAT2040 DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Staff Recommendation

Board staff recommends approval of the two new courses for systemwide transfer. If approved, the number of courses that transfer seamlessly among any university or college in the Kansas Board of Regents System offering an equivalent course would increase from 130 to 132.

Act on Academic Year 2027 Bridge Performance Agreements

Background

K.S.A. 74-3202d provides that “the state board shall have authority to review and approve institutional improvement plans and, on the basis of each plan, shall develop and implement a performance agreement with each postsecondary educational institution.” Additionally, “each postsecondary educational institution’s receipt of new state funds shall be contingent on achieving compliance with its performance agreement.”

In May 2023, the Board approved the current project-based performance funding model, which is grounded in institutions implementing four evidence-based practices aligned with the *Building a Future* strategic plan. These practices were selected to advance systemwide progress on key student success priorities and include:

- Corequisite support developmental education
- Math pathways
- Systemwide course placement measures
- Academic degree maps

As AY 2026 concludes, a transitional, or “bridge,” performance agreement is necessary to maintain continuity while the next generation of performance agreements is developed under the direction of a new Board President in the coming year.

AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreements

Building on this foundation, the system has progressed from planning and pilot implementation to full-scale adoption of these practices. As institutions enter the next phase of this work, the proposed AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreement is intended to provide continuity and stability while allowing time to assess implementation, refine practices, and align future performance metrics with system priorities. This approach ensures that institutions are supported during full implementation while maintaining accountability for continued progress on the Board’s strategic goals.

Pages 1–4 of the performance agreement were previously approved by the Board and outline the foundational elements of the current model. Page 5 reflects the proposed AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreement and represents the next phase of performance funding, balancing continuity in expectations with progression in institutional responsibilities. Pages 6 and beyond contain the updated Performance Agreement Guidelines & Procedures, as revised to align with the Bridge Performance Agreement.

For the proposed AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreement, items 1-4 represent a continuation of requirements established in AY 2026, including the scheduling of gateway math courses aligned with math pathways, the offering of corequisite math and English support, and institutional compliance with systemwide placement measures.

Items 5-7 advance the work by requiring institutions to develop and operationalize internal reporting systems that capture student-level data for mathematics placement, English placement, and corequisite support models. These requirements move the system beyond implementation to a more robust, data-informed phase, enabling consistent statewide reporting and evaluation of student outcomes.

Under the proposed AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreement, institutions would have Academic Year 2027 to build and operationalize these systems, with student-level data collection beginning in Summer 2027 and included in the AY 2028 data reporting cycle. The proposed Bridge Performance Agreement was discussed at the March SCOCAO and BAASC meetings, and members were encouraged to provide feedback to Academic Affairs staff by mid-April.

Staff Recommendation

Board staff recommends approval of the one-year Bridge Performance Agreement for AY 2027 (page 5) and the updated Performance Agreement Guidelines & Procedures (page 6), as revised to align with the Bridge Agreement.

AY 2024 – AY 2026 Performance Agreement	Institution:
Contact:	Email:

Project Timeline

AY 2023: Starting the Foundation		
Fall 2022 Semester	Spring 2023 Semester	Summer 2023 Semester
Acceptance into Dana Center’s Launch Year’s Initiative	Establish timeline	Establish the gateway math courses that will be used for math pathways (math task force will work with associate deans and/or department chairs in various disciplines)
Math task force attends the Dana Center’s Launch Year's Initiative in November 2022.	Develop Charge Document	
Develop Charge Document	Establish the gateway math courses that will be used for math pathways (math task force will work with associate deans and/or department chairs in various disciplines)	
Performance Funding Implications		
N/A existing system still in place. (Review of AY 2021 Performance Reports was completed by the Board in Spring of 2023; any new funding to be awarded in July of 2023.)		

AY 2024: Continue Building the Foundation		
Fall 2023 Semester	Spring 2024 Semester	Summer 2024 Semester
Establish the gateway math courses that will be used for math pathways (math task force will work with associate deans and/or department chairs in various disciplines). Upon completion of this work, revise Board policy to include math pathway options with a Fall 2026 implementation date.	Establish systemwide math course placement measures (Math task force members and systemwide math course placement measures committee will work on this).	Establish systemwide math course placement measures (Math task force members and systemwide math course placement measures committee will work on this).
Establish systemwide math course placement measures (Once it is understood what gateway math courses will be used for math pathways, this work will begin). Math task force members and a soon-to-be-created systemwide math course placement measures committee will work on this.	Establish systemwide English course placement measures (A soon-to-be systemwide English course placement measure committee will work on this).	Establish systemwide English course placement measures (A soon-to-be systemwide English course placement measure committee will work on this).
Contemporary Math course outcomes and Elementary Statistics course outcomes might be revised at the Fall 2023 Kansas Core Outcomes Group Meeting.		Establish math pathways advising one-pager to outline what, when, and the alignment between majors and math pathway courses.
Institutions will work on creating degree maps for students who begin in Fall 2024 or Spring 2025.	Institutions will work on creating degree maps for students who begin in Fall 2024 or Spring 2025.	
Performance Funding Implications		

N/A existing system still in place. (Review of existing AY 2022 Performance Reports turned in by June 30, 2023, will be completed by the Board in Spring of 2024; any new funding to be awarded in July of 2024.)

AY 2024 performance is based on creating a plan for AY 2025, including the below activities. Any new funding to be awarded in July of 2025.

AY 2025: Professional Development and Preparation		
Fall 2024 Semester	Spring 2025 Semester	Summer 2025 Semester
Math faculty design gateway math courses for math pathways (if needed) and establish any institutionally designated math course placement measures	Math faculty design gateway math courses for math pathways (if needed) and establish any institutionally designated math course placement measures	
Math faculty design corequisite math support developmental education for each math pathway course that applies to the degree offerings on campus	Math faculty design corequisite math support developmental education for each math pathway course that applies to the degree offerings on campus	
English faculty design corequisite English support developmental education on campus (if needed) and establish any institutionally designated English course placement measures	English faculty design corequisite English support developmental education on campus (if needed) and establish any institutionally designated English course placement measures	
KBOR Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corequisite Support Developmental Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction: English and Math Faculty ○ Advising: Academic Advisors ○ Data Reporting: Institutional Research • Math Pathways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction: Math Faculty ○ Advising: Academic Advisors • Course Placement Measures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction: Math Faculty ○ Advising: Academic Advisors ○ Data Reporting: Institutional Research ○ Assessment: Testing Center Personnel 	KBOR Professional Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corequisite Support Developmental Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction: English and Math Faculty ○ Advising: Academic Advisors ○ Data Reporting: Institutional Research • Math Pathways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction: Math Faculty ○ Advising: Academic Advisors • Course Placement Measures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruction: Math Faculty ○ Advising: Academic Advisors ○ Data Reporting: Institutional Research ○ Assessment: Testing Center Personnel 	Some of the professional development may also be conducted in Summer 2025.
Institutions will work on updating degree maps for students beginning in Fall 2025 or Spring 2026	Institutions will work on updating degree maps for students beginning in Fall 2025 or Spring 2026	
Performance Funding Implications (AY 25 Funding Cycle; any new funding awarded July of 2025)		
By July 1, 2024, each institution submits a plan document (template to be provided by KBOR in Spring of 2024) for the above activities for AY 2025, including:		
1. A commitment to implementing math pathways, which will include detailing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process and estimated timing that is required on campus to create and approve gateway math courses for math pathways into degree programs; and • the list of the group members that will lead this work on campus. 		1 Point
2. A commitment to implementing corequisite math support developmental education, which will include detailing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process and estimated timing that is required on campus to create and approve corequisite math support developmental education; and • the list of the group members that will lead this work on campus. 		1 Point
3. A commitment to implementing corequisite English support developmental education, which will include detailing (its understood that many are currently doing corequisite English) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process and estimated timing that is required on campus to create and approve corequisite English support developmental education; and • the list of the group members that will lead this work on campus. 		1 Point
4. A commitment to having faculty and staff participate in KBOR sponsored-professional development, which will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the list of the individuals that will participate in professional development; and 		1 Point

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a plan to ensure that faculty and staff who are unable to attend professional development meeting will receive the information missed (e.g., watch video recordings, review professional development documentation, etc.). 	
5. A link to all its academic degree maps for students starting in Fall 2024 or Spring 2025.	1 Point

AY 2025 performance is based on creating a plan for AY 2026, including the below activities. Any new funding to be awarded in July of 2026.

AY 2026: Soft Launch		
Fall 2025 Semester	Spring 2026 Semester	Summer 2026 Semester
Offer at least one section of each gateway math course that applies to the degree programs on its campus for math pathways.	Offer at least one section of each gateway math course that applies to the degree programs on its campus for math pathways.	
Offer at least one section of corequisite math support developmental education for each gateway math course that applies to the degree programs on its campus for math pathways.	Offer at least one section of corequisite math support developmental education for each gateway math course that applies to the degree programs on its campus for math pathways.	
Offer at least one section of corequisite English support developmental education.	Offer at least one section of corequisite English support developmental education.	
Institutions will work on updating degree maps for students beginning in Fall 2026 or Spring 2027	Institutions will work on updating degree maps for students beginning in Fall 2026 or Spring 2027	
Performance Funding Implications (AY 26 Funding Cycle; any new funding awarded July of 2026)		
By July 1, 2025, each institution submits a plan document (template to be provided by KBOR in Spring of 2025) for the above activities for AY 2026, including:		
1. A schedule showing at least one section of each gateway math course that applies to degrees on its campus for Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 and a plan to implement math pathways full scale in 2026-2027 (Identify the number of students and course sections that are estimated to be taught in each respective gateway math course per year when this initiative is fully scaled in 2026-2027);		1 Point
2. A schedule showing at least one section of corequisite math support developmental education for each gateway math course that applies to degrees on its campus for Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 and a plan to implement corequisite math support developmental education full scale in 2026-2027;		1 Point
3. A schedule showing at least one section of corequisite English support developmental education for Fall 2025 and Spring 2026 and a plan to implement corequisite English support developmental education full scale in 2026-2027;		1 Point
4. A plan to implement the systemwide English and math course placement measures for the soft launch and full-scale in 2026-2027; and		1 Point
5. A link to all its academic degree maps for students starting in Fall 2025 or Spring 2026.		1 Point

AY 2026 performance is based on creating a plan for AY 2027, including the below activities. Any new funding to be awarded in July of 2027.

AY 2027: Full Implementation		
Fall 2026 Semester	Spring 2027 Semester	Summer 2027 Semester
Math pathways full scale	Math pathways full scale	Math pathways full scale
Corequisite English and math support developmental education are full scale	Corequisite English and math support developmental education are full scale	Corequisite English and math support developmental education are full scale
Systemwide English and math course placement measures are full scale	Systemwide English and math course placement measures are full scale	Systemwide English and math course placement measures are full scale
Performance Funding Implications (AY 27 Funding Cycle; any new funding awarded July of 2027)		
By July 1, 2026, each institution submits a plan document (template to be provided by KBOR in Spring of 2026) for the above activities for AY 2027, including:		
1. A schedule of Fall 2026 and Spring 2027 gateway math courses for math pathways;		1 Point
2. A schedule of Fall 2026 and Spring 2027 corequisite math support developmental education sections (no prerequisite math developmental education courses will be offered);		1 Point
3. A schedule of Fall 2026 and Spring 2027 corequisite English support developmental education sections; (no prerequisite English developmental education courses will be offered);		1 Point
4. An institutional policy demonstrating compliance with the systemwide English and math course placement measures and any institutionally designated English and math course placement measures that will be used (ALEKS, homegrown math assessment, plan to evaluate non-cognitive factors, etc.); and		1 Point
5. A link to all its academic degree maps for students starting in Fall 2026 or Spring 2027.		1 Point

AY 2027 performance is based on creating a plan for AY 2028, including the below activities. Any new funding to be awarded in July of 2028.

AY 2027: Full Implementation		
Fall 2027 Semester	Spring 2028 Semester	Summer 2028 Semester
Math pathways full scale	Math pathways full scale	Math pathways full scale
Corequisite English and math support developmental education are full scale	Corequisite English and math support developmental education are full scale	Corequisite English and math support developmental education are full scale
Systemwide English and math course placement measures are full scale	Systemwide English and math course placement measures are full scale	Systemwide English and math course placement measures are full scale
Student level data for math placement full scale	Student level data for math placement full scale	AY data collection* with student level data for math placement
Student level data for English placement full scale	Student level data for English placement full scale	AY data collection* with student level data for English placement
Student level data for corequisite section type full scale	Student level data for corequisite section type full scale	AY data collection* with student level data for corequisite model
Performance Funding Implications (AY 28 Funding Cycle; any new funding awarded July of 2028)		
By July 1, 2027, each institution submits a plan document (template to be provided by KBOR in Spring of 2027) for the above activities for AY 2028, including:		
1. A schedule of Fall 2027 and Spring 2028 gateway math courses for math pathways;		0.5 Point
2. A schedule of Fall 2027 and Spring 2028 corequisite math support developmental education sections (no prerequisite math developmental education courses will be offered);		0.5 Point
3. A schedule of Fall 2027 and Spring 2028 corequisite English support developmental education sections; (no prerequisite English developmental education courses will be offered);		0.5 Point
4. An institutional policy demonstrating compliance with the systemwide English and math course placement measures and any institutionally designated English and math course placement measures that will be used (ALEKS, homegrown math assessment, plan to evaluate non-cognitive factors, etc.);		0.5 Point
5. Documentation demonstrating the development and operationalization of the internal reporting system for mathematics placement, including a description of the data elements captured at the student level and evidence of alignment with system-level annual reporting guidelines;		1 Point
6. Documentation demonstrating the development and operationalization of the internal reporting system for English placement, including a description of the data elements captured at the student level and evidence of alignment with system-level annual reporting guidelines; and		1 Point
7. Documentation demonstrating the development and operationalization of the internal reporting system for corequisite support, including a description of the approved corequisite section type data elements captured at the student level and evidence of alignment with system-level annual reporting guidelines.		1 Point

*AY 28 data collection includes student level data from summer 2027, fall 2027, and spring 2028.



Performance Agreement Guidelines & Procedures

Effective for Academic Year 2027

Approved _____

★ LEADING HIGHER EDUCATION ★

Introduction

In 1999, the Kansas legislature adopted K.S.A. 74-3202d which established improvement plans for public higher education institutions in Kansas and tied the awarding of new state funds to these improvement plans. These plans are commonly known as performance agreements.

The Board of Regents is responsible for reviewing and approving performance agreements and for providing technical assistance to institutions as they develop, implement and revise their performance agreements.

The Board is also responsible for determining the amount of new state funds awarded, as defined in K.S.A. 74-3202d. The awarding of new state funds is based on an institution's level of compliance with its performance agreement and the funds available for distribution.

Establishing an Improvement Plan

At least once every three years, institutions negotiate a new performance agreement with the Board. [Building a Future](#), the Board's strategic plan for the System, provides the foundation for each institution's performance agreement. The three pillars of Building a Future are Family, Business, and Economic Prosperity. Performance metrics will be drawn predominantly from the Family pillar, which includes three areas of focus: Affordability, Access, and Success.

The project-based performance funding model is based upon an institution employing proven practices that will position the system to move the needle on the Board's [Building a Future](#) strategic plan.

Annual Evaluation of Compliance and Funding

To be eligible for any new funding appropriated by the Legislature and approved by the Governor, each institution annually submits a performance report that updates the Board on an institution's progress toward implementing the proven practices as outlined in the performance agreement. The performance report provides the Board a basis for awarding any new funding.

Awarding of new funding is based on progress in the following seven projects/components included in the performance agreement, all in accordance with amended Board Policy [Chapter III.A.14](#), unless otherwise noted in the Project-Based Performance Funding table below.

- Math Pathways
- Corequisite Math Support Developmental Education
- Corequisite English Support Developmental Education
- Systemwide Course Placement Measures (for both math & English)
- Reporting System for Math Placement
- Reporting System for English Placement
- Reporting System for Corequisite Support

Project-Based Performance Funding	Project	Points per Project
	Math Pathways	.5 point
	Corequisite Math Support Developmental Education	.5 point
	Corequisite English Support Developmental Education	.5 point
	Systemwide Math & English Course Placement Measures	.5 point
	Reporting System for Math Placement	1 point
	Reporting System for English Placement	1 point
	Reporting System for Corequisite Support	1 point

It should be noted that when new legislative dollars are allocated to higher education, an institution will receive a performance funding allocation by participating in and meeting basic conditions for the seven components above, in accordance with the reporting specifications outlined in the AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreement, and as generally depicted below. ***The below graphic is based upon full completion of the given components. Please refer to the AY 2027 Bridge Performance Agreement for the specific expectations and reporting requirements for each component of the agreement.***

Tier	Points Earned	Funding Allocation
Tier 1	5	100%
Tier 2	4.0 - 4.5	80%
Tier 3	3.0 - 3.5	60%
Tier 4	2.0 - 2.5	40%
Tier 5	1.0 - 1.5	20%
Tier 6	0	0%

Definition of New State Funds

Pursuant to K.S.A. 74-3202d, each public postsecondary educational institution’s receipt of “new state funds” shall be contingent upon achieving compliance with its performance agreement, as determined by the Kansas Board of Regents. Except as otherwise specifically required by statute or appropriation proviso, only those funds that are appropriated by the Legislature to a specific postsecondary educational institution for a specific purpose by using a separate line item shall be exempted from performance funding.

Accordingly, the Board has determined that the following line items are subject to performance: (1) State university and Washburn University operating grants; (2) community college, technical college and Washburn Institute of Technology Postsecondary Tiered Technical State Aid and Non-Tiered Course Credit Hour Aid; (3)

eligible institutions' Career Technical Education Capital Outlay Aid and Technology Grant Funding; (4) Tuition for Technical Education (secondary students); (5) Postsecondary Education Performance-Based Incentive Special Revenue Fund; and (6) any other state funding consistent with the statutes. "New state funds" received by any postsecondary institution under the original 1999 Senate Bill 345 provisions for 2% performance grant funding, codified in K.S.A. 76-771, will also be subject to performance.

Pursuant to K.S.A. 74-3202d, the Board of Regents will determine the amount of new state funds to be received by each institution, taking into account the institution's level of compliance with its performance agreement and the funds available for distribution. For the purpose of this statute, "new state funds" means the amounts of additional state funding each institution received for the fiscal year from a particular line item that is in excess of state funding that institution received for the previous fiscal year from that line item. The Board will determine the amount of new state funds each institution is eligible to receive for each line item if the institution is determined to be in full compliance with its performance agreement. If the Board determines that an institution is not in full compliance with its performance agreement, the Board may allocate to the institution none or a portion of the new state funds for which the institution would otherwise be eligible. Any portion not allocated to an institution in the fiscal year shall not be reallocated to any other institution. Except for those funds that never become a part of the institution's base, any portion not allocated to an institution will be deemed to be part of the institution's base budget for the purpose of determining the following fiscal year's allocation. This provision precludes an institution from permanently losing multi-year state funding due to noncompliance with its performance agreement. The intended effect of this provision is that such loss of funds would be only for one fiscal year.

Alignment with [Building a Future](#)

[Building a Future](#) is the Board's strategic plan for the System and provides the foundation for each institution's performance agreement. Much more information is collected for strategic plan purposes than can be used in any single performance agreement. A data dashboard has been incorporated into the Kansas Board of Regents website. Taken together, the dashboard and the annual institutional performance reports will provide a comprehensive picture of where the system stands on the critical components of [Building a Future](#) and of the progress individual institutions are making on their performance agreements.

Attachment A**Performance Agreement Statute**

Statute 74-3202d: Same; performance indicators, review; core indicators of quality performance; selection of determinants for state moneys; institutional improvement plans; performance agreements; new state funds, requirements for receipt. (a) During the 2000 fiscal year, the state board of regents (1) shall review the performance indicators developed by the postsecondary educational institutions, including the municipal university; (2) after consideration of the core indicators of quality performance identified by the respective commissions and with the active involvement of the postsecondary educational institutions, shall approve those indicators that the state board determines should be implemented; and (3) shall select from among the indicators approved for implementation those indicators that will become determinants for the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance. The indicators selected may vary among the postsecondary educational institutions and among institutional sectors and, if feasible, shall include indicators developed and adopted by the governing bodies of each postsecondary educational institution based on the needs of each such postsecondary educational institution.

(b) During the 2001 fiscal year, the postsecondary educational institutions, including the municipal university, shall develop institutional improvement plans showing how they will implement the performance indicators applicable to their institution and how they will measure performance on the basis of each indicator. Institutional improvement plans shall be revised and submitted to the state board of regents by each institution at least every three years. The state board of regents shall provide technical assistance to institutions in the development, implementation, and revision of their improvement plans.

(c) Commencing on July 1, 2001, institutional improvement plans shall be implemented for each postsecondary educational institution, including the municipal university. Each postsecondary educational institution shall begin the data collection, measurement, or other documentation necessary in order for its performance to be evaluated with regard to each indicator.

(d) Commencing on July 1, 2004, the state board shall have authority to review and approve institutional improvement plans, and, on the basis of each plan, shall develop and implement a performance agreement with each postsecondary educational institution. Performance agreements shall incorporate the goals, priorities, policies and mission objectives identified in the institutional improvement plans, and the performance measures, which will be used to demonstrate compliance and progress.

(e) Commencing on July 1, 2005, each postsecondary educational institution's receipt of new state funds shall be contingent on achieving compliance with its performance agreement. As used in this subsection, "new state funds" means that amount of state funds by which the amount received by a postsecondary educational institution for a fiscal year exceeds the amount received by that postsecondary educational institution for the preceding fiscal year. The state board shall determine the amount of new state funds to be received by each postsecondary educational institution, taking into account the postsecondary educational institution's level of compliance with its performance agreement and the funds available for distribution. Any new state funds received by a postsecondary educational institution pursuant to a performance agreement shall be deemed to be part of the state funds received in the preceding fiscal year for the purposes of determining new state funds for the postsecondary educational institution pursuant to a performance agreement for the ensuing fiscal year. If a postsecondary educational institution is not allocated any portion of new state funds in a fiscal year, the new state funds which the institution was eligible to be allocated by the state board in such fiscal year shall be deemed part of the state funds received by such institution in such fiscal year for the purpose of determining such institution's base budget and any new state funds for the ensuing fiscal year. The failure of a postsecondary educational institution to enter a performance agreement with the state board shall prevent that postsecondary educational institution from receiving any new state funds. Any funds designated by the legislature for a specific postsecondary educational institution or purpose shall be exempt from the provisions of this section.

History: L. 1999, ch. 147, § 12; L. 2001, ch. 94, § 3; L. 2002, ch. 188, § 3; July

Act on Request to Change Minimum Threshold for One Program Review Metric for Regional Universities

Background and History

Per Board policy, Ch. II Section A.5.a.,

In cooperation with the state universities, the Board will maintain a regular program review cycle and process that will allow the universities to demonstrate on an ongoing basis that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. Regular program review is institutionally based and follows the departmental or unit structure of the institution. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall provide guidelines for Program Review and, as part of the review of institutional reports, will include consideration of the Board-approved minima tables.

Historically, state universities were required to review programs at least once every eight years, a frequency the Board established in 1997. As appropriate, universities would establish their review schedules to align generally with accreditation reporting requirements and site visits.

In June of 2023, the Board approved a one-year program review framework for AY 2024 and a program review framework for AY 2025–AY 2028. After the AY 2024 Program Review, and in response to concerns raised by university provosts, the Board’s Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) agreed to review the metrics used for program review. In December of 2024, some adjustments were made to the metrics based on institutional feedback, and in March of 2025, one of those adjustments was refined. The final adjustments are listed below. The bolded item below is the metric under consideration today, as we discuss a suggested change to the number of juniors and seniors majoring in bachelor’s programs to gauge student demand at the regional universities (Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, and Pittsburg State University).

Approved Changes to the AY 2025 – AY 2028 Program Review Metrics

- Exempting interdisciplinary programs without a formal departmental or administrative structure from minimum requirements for the number of majors and graduates.
- Reducing from 20 to 12 students the minimum enrollment for master’s programs, and allowing programs that offer both master’s and doctoral degrees to be reviewed as a single program.
- **Establishing institution-specific thresholds based on Carnegie Classifications^{®1} to account for differences in size and mission.**
- Students who pursue graduate study immediately upon completion of a bachelor’s degree can be included in the “Talent Pipeline” metric. Additionally, these students should not be included in the wage metric five years postbaccalaureate.

Proposal

The proposed number of junior and senior majors to gauge student demand for bachelor’s programs at the three regional universities is 20 (a reduction from 25).

Rationale

The Carnegie institutional classifications are based on the types of degrees awarded, the fields of study in which degrees are awarded, and the size of the institution. The reduction of the threshold number of junior and senior majors in bachelor’s program from 25 to 20 reflects the differences in Carnegie classifications of the three regional universities (Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, and Pittsburg State University) from the three research universities (Kansas State University, the University of Kansas, and Wichita State University). The size of the regional universities is categorized as “large/medium” while the size of two of the research universities is categorized as “large.” (WSU is categorized as “medium”.) Further, the Kansas Higher Education

Statistics ([KHEStats](#)) website indicates the average number of undergraduate students at the three regional universities in AY 2025 was 6,873, while the average number of undergraduate students at the three research universities was 18,768. The large difference in these averages appears to support reducing the threshold number of junior and senior majors in bachelor's programs at the regional institutions from 25 to 20.

Another indicator that would support the reduction in the threshold number is number of faculty. The average number of faculty classified as "General Academic Instruction" at the regional universities, according to the data reported by each institution for FY 2026, was 362. The average number of faculty with the same classification at the research universities for the same time period, excluding the University of Kansas Medical Center and Kansas State University Veterinary Medicine, was 1,549 (KBOR, 2026). The regional universities employ fewer faculty overall than the research universities, suggesting they are able to accommodate smaller student populations overall.

Finally, according to KBOR's Program Inventory, the average number of undergraduate academic programs also supports the reduction in the threshold number of juniors and seniors in each bachelor's degree program. The current average number of bachelor's programs at the regional universities is 47, while the average number of bachelor's programs at the research universities is 89. The regional universities typically serve smaller student populations, with appropriately scaled faculty and program offerings compared to research universities. These differences should be reflected in the threshold for the student demand metric.

Recommendation

Board staff recommends approval to reduce the threshold number of juniors and seniors in each bachelor's program from 25 to 20 at the regional universities for program review purposes.

References

Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (n.d.). About Carnegie Classification. Retrieved April 3, 2026, from <https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/>.

Kansas Board of Regents (n.d.). Program Inventory Database.

Kansas Board of Regents (January, 2026). State University Data Book. Retrieved April 14, 2026, from https://www.kansasregents.gov/resources/PDF/Data/2026_State_University_Data_Book/State_Universities_2026_Section_4_FINAL.pdf.

Kansas Higher Education Statistics (n.d.). Enrollment Summary by Student Level. Retrieved April 3, 2026, from https://submission.kansasregents.gov/ibi_apps/portal/BIP_Public2/KHEStats.

End Notes

¹The Carnegie Classification® system uses federally collected and published data to group and study similar institutions of higher education.

AY 2025 – AY 2028

Below is the Program Review Framework for AY 2025 through AY 2028.

a. Purpose of Academic Program Review

- i. Ensure that state university makes appropriate adjustments based on student demand, capacity of programs, employment demand, student return on investment, and costs;
- ii. Assign responsibility for regular academic program review to institutions and make process responsive and meaningful;
- iii. Identify opportunities for program growth as well as for program elimination;
- iv. Strengthen system as a whole by providing KBOR-coordinated consultation for program development, alignment, and collaborations;
- v. Simplify and align reporting burden so it better addresses needs for academic program review from campuses, KBOR, and external stakeholders;
- vi. Provide stories Regents and State officials need in clear ways that can be messaged beyond KBOR to support higher education in Kansas;
- vii. Recognize and celebrate success of institutions, programs, faculty/staff, and students; and
- viii. Demonstrate alignment with the Board’s Strategic Plan.

b. Regular Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures for AY 25-28

- i. Each university shall establish and publish clearly defined policies and procedures to review all its academic degree programs.
- ii. At minimum, university academic program review policies and procedures must analyze and assess:
 - (1) Market demand for the program;
 - (2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;
 - (3) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;
 - (4) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;
 - (5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and
 - (6) The program’s cost-effectiveness.

c. Regular Academic Program Review Report for AY 25-28

- i. The documentation from each university during its review year shall include:
 - (1) A copy of the state university’s academic program review policies and procedures; and
 - (2) The information detailed in the Academic Program Review Guidance Sheet (**see Section e**), most of which will be provided by Board staff.
- ii. A verbal report from each university during its academic program review year shall include:
 - (1) A description of the academic program review process; and
 - (2) Examples of how the academic program review process was successful and where opportunities for improvement exist.

d. Regular Academic Program Review Cycle AY 25-28

- i. Effective AY 25, the following academic program review cycle shall apply:

- (1) Year One: The University of Kansas and Kansas State University submits the required academic program review report and presents the report to the Board.
- (2) Year Two: Wichita State University submits the required academic program review report and presents the report to the Board.
- (3) **Year Three: Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, and Pittsburg State University submits the academic program review report and presents the report to the Board.**
- (4) Year Four: The Board of Academic Affairs Standing Committee will evaluate the effectiveness of the academic program review system.
- (5) One year after its regular review, the university will provide an update on the status of each action phase-out plan, merger plan, or action plan.

e. Academic Program Review Guidance (AY 25-28) (directly below)

Academic Affairs staff developed the Guidance below to provide guidelines aligned with specific elements in the Board’s strategic plan, *Building a Future*.

Families		
Will Include Data for Each Major		
Affordability		
Metric	Source of Data	Metric Minima
Percentage of Full-Time Junior and Senior Majors that Enrolled in at least 30 Hours Per Year or Graduated	KBOR	not established
Maximum Number of Transfer Credit Hours that Apply Toward the Baccalaureate Program from Two-Year Colleges ¹	Universities provide list of courses and total hours	not established
Success		
Metric	Source of Data	Metric Minima
Number of Junior and Senior Majors, Master's Majors, and Doctoral Majors to Gauge Student Demand	KBOR	Junior/Seniors: 25 Master's: 12 Doctoral: 5
Undergraduate Median Wage Data 5 Years After Graduation to Measure Student Return on Investment	KBOR	\$42,160
Completion		
Metric	Source of Data	Metric Minima
Number of Undergraduate Completions, Master's Completions, and Doctoral Completions	KBOR	Undergraduates: 10 Master's: 5 Doctoral: 2
Junior Graduation Rate ²	KBOR	not established

Businesses		
Talent Pipeline		
Metric	Source of Data	Metric Minima
Percentage of Undergraduate Degree Completers Employed in the Region Within One Year for Each Major	KBOR	51 percent
Meeting Workforce Needs		
Metric	Source of Data	Metric Minima
Each State University provides a brief narrative articulating how multiple programs meet critical Kansas economic needs through workforce development and/or research.	University	n/a

As indicated in the Academic Program Review Guidance above, the metrics in bold have approved minima that are set forth below in items a through d. The remaining metrics, the percentage of full-time junior and senior majors who enrolled in at least 30 hours per year or graduated, the maximum number of transfer credit hours that apply toward the baccalaureate program from two-year colleges, and the junior graduation rate are all new metrics for this Program Review cycle. Since this data has not been reviewed before across all institutions, minima have not been established. However, for the metric on the maximum number of hours from two-year colleges that apply toward a baccalaureate program, consideration should be given to the fact that Board policy requires a minimum of 60 credit hours for an associate degree (Ch. III.A.9.b.ii.). When fewer than 60 hours are listed for a program, there is a potential for lost credit for associate degree graduates who transfer to the given baccalaureate program.

Approved Minima

a. Criteria for Number of Majors

- i. Baccalaureate programs should have an annual average of 25 or more junior, senior, and 5th year majors, computed over the most recent four-year period
- ii. Master’s programs should have an annual average of 12 or more majors, computed over the most recent four-year period
- iii. Doctoral programs should have an annual average of five or more majors, computed over the most recent four-year period
- iv. Programs offered at both the master’s and doctoral levels may be reviewed as a single program
- v. Interdisciplinary programs without a formal departmental or administrative structure are exempted from minimum requirements

b. Criteria for Number of Completions (Graduates)

- i. Baccalaureate programs should have an annual average of 10 or more graduates, computed over the most recent four-year period
- ii. Master’s programs should have an annual average of five or more graduates, computed over the most recent four-year period
- iii. Doctoral programs should have an annual average of two or more graduates, computed over the most recent four-year period

- iv. Programs offered at both the master's and doctoral levels may be reviewed as a single program
- v. Interdisciplinary programs without a formal departmental or administrative structure are exempted from minimum requirements

c. Student Return on Investment – Baccalaureate Degrees

- i. 2024 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary is \$42,160 or more (280% or more of the 2024 federal poverty level)
- ii. Students who immediately pursue graduate studies immediately after graduating with a baccalaureate degree are excluded from this metric

d. Talent Pipeline – Baccalaureate Degrees

- i. Of the students who graduated, 51% or more are employed in the Region within one year (four-year average) OR enter graduate school upon graduation³

End Notes

¹ It is understood that the maximum number of transfer credit hours from two-year colleges that apply toward the baccalaureate degree will vary among programs. This is intended to understand common practices and differences among programs.

² Percentage of full-time undergraduate junior majors in the Fall of a given year that graduated within three years with a baccalaureate degree in any major (e.g., Fall 2020 psychology juniors who graduated with a baccalaureate degree in any major by Spring 2023.)

³ Change to include graduate school in this metric approved by Board on 3/12/25.

Act on RCBD Policy Element Recommendations & Updated Policy

Background

In response to national conversations around degree affordability, workforce alignment, and time to completion, the Kansas Board of Regents has been exploring the development of Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degrees (RCBDs). These programs are designed to maintain the academic rigor and learning outcomes of a traditional bachelor's degree while offering a more efficient pathway for students.

To support this work, the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) charged the RCBD Work Group with developing policy element recommendations to inform a potential pilot. The work group, composed of representatives from two-year and four-year institutions, met regularly from Fall 2025 through Spring 2026 and served in an advisory capacity to develop actionable, system-aligned recommendations grounded in Higher Learning Commission (HLC) guidance and informed by national best practices.

Throughout this process, the work group focused on balancing institutional flexibility with clear expectations to ensure academic quality, transparency, and alignment with workforce needs. The group also considered implications for transfer, accreditation, student communication, and systemwide consistency.

Discussion

The proposed policy elements are intended to establish a structured pilot framework that allows institutions to explore innovative degree design while maintaining alignment with Board policy, accreditation expectations, and the Systemwide General Education Framework. The recommendations reflect a comprehensive approach, addressing key areas such as total credit hours, general education, institutional requirements, approval processes, student pathways, and annual reporting.

Importantly, the proposed framework positions the Board to monitor implementation and outcomes over time through a provisional approval period and required annual reporting. This approach allows for thoughtful evaluation of program effectiveness and informs future Board decisions regarding continuation, expansion, or modification of RCBD offerings.

The RCBD Work Group's recommendations were developed through a collaborative process and reflect broad institutional input. The recommendations are presented for BAASC consideration to inform next steps in advancing a potential pilot policy.

Staff Recommendation

Board staff recommends approval of the RCBD recommendations (page 1) and the updated policy (page X), as revised to align with the RCBD pilot recommendations.

Policy Element Recommendation for BAASC

The RCBD Work Group was charged by BAASC to thoughtfully develop policy elements to inform a Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree (RCBD) pilot policy. Serving in an advisory capacity, the work group focused on developing strong, actionable policy options grounded in Higher Learning Commission guidance and informed by the national landscape for BAASC's consideration.

As part of this work, Dr. Trey Hill developed a RCBD Dashboard (<https://ksrcbd.netlify.app/>) to ensure institutions across the state remain informed of key national and state developments related to RCBD programs. The RCBD Work Group met regularly from October 2025 through April 2026 to develop the recommendations presented below.

General Policy Framework

The RCBD Work Group recommends that Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals meet the following expectations, which give ample room for institutional innovation:

- Maintain the same rigorous standards for academic quality, student learning outcomes, and alignment with the institution's mission as required of traditional bachelor's degree programs.
- Include clearly defined student learning outcomes and a curriculum map demonstrating how those outcomes will be achieved within the proposed program structure.
- Align with relevant disciplinary accreditation standards, where applicable.
- Demonstrate compliance with federal financial aid regulations applicable to bachelor's degree programs.
- Provide clear evidence of workforce demand, including documentation of support from Kansas and regional employers where appropriate, or admission into graduate programs.

Vote: 10 in favor

Approval Process

The RCBD Work Group recommends that all Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals be considered through the KBOR's standard program approval process for baccalaureate degrees.

For proposals submitted by two-year institutions, the work group recommends that the System Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCOCAO) replace the Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO) in the review process, and the System Council of Presidents (SCOP) replace the Council of Presidents (COP).

This approach maintains alignment with the existing KBOR program approval procedures while ensuring that proposals from two-year institutions are reviewed by groups that include two-year representation.

Vote: 10 in favor, 1 abstention

Provisional Approval Period

The RCBD Work Group recommends that Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals be granted provisional approval for a three-year period. Institutions may enroll new students in the program during each year of the provisional approval period, unless otherwise specified through the annual review process.

Vote: 11 in favor

Total Credit Hours

The RCBD Work Group recommends that total credit hours for Reduced Credit Bachelor's Degrees follow the guidance outlined in the Higher Learning Commission Assumed Practice B.1.a, which states:

"The institution conforms to commonly accepted minimum program length: ... 120 semester credits for bachelor's degrees. Any variations from these minima must be explained and justified."

Consistent with this guidance, the work group recommends that KBOR policy for the RCBD pilot similarly require that any variation from the standard 120-credit-hour bachelor's degree be clearly explained and justified by the proposing institution. Additionally, the work group recommends that RCBD programs approved under the pilot require at least 90 total semester credit hours.

This approach maintains alignment with HLC expectations while providing institutions with flexibility to develop innovative degree structures within clearly defined parameters.

Vote: 11 in favor

General Education Framework

The RCBD Work Group recommends that general education requirements for Reduced Credit Bachelor's Degrees align with the [Systemwide General Education 7-Bucket Framework](#), which consists of 34–35 credit hours of approved general education coursework.

Aligning RCBD programs with the Systemwide General Education Framework ensures consistency with existing KBOR policy, supports transfer and articulation across institutions, and maintains the foundational learning outcomes expected of all undergraduate students in the Kansas system.

Vote: 10 in favor, 1 abstention

Institutional Hours Requirement

The RCBD Work Group recommends that institutional credit hour requirements for Reduced Credit Bachelor's Degrees follow the guidance outlined in the Higher Learning Commission Assumed Practice B.1.b, which states:

"Typically institutions will require that at minimum 30 of 120 credits earned for the bachelor's degree... be credits earned at the institution itself, through arrangement with other accredited institutions, or through contractual relationships approved by HLC. Any variation from the typical minima must be explained and justified."

Consistent with this guidance, the work group recommends that institutions proposing an RCBD clearly document how institutional credit hour requirements will be met and provide justification if the proposed structure varies from the typical expectations outlined by HLC.

This approach maintains alignment with HLC expectations while allowing institutions appropriate flexibility to design innovative program structures within clearly defined accreditation parameters.

Vote: 11 in favor

Scenarios

The Higher Learning Commission identifies three scenarios in which institutions may propose Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degrees:

1. An institution is offering a new bachelor's degree program that it has never offered before and is doing so in a reduced-credit format.
2. An institution currently offers a bachelor's degree program at the typical length of 120 credits and is now also offering the same program in a reduced-credit format.
3. An institution currently offers a bachelor's degree program at the typical length of 120 credits and is now going to cease offering that program and only offer the program in a reduced-credit format.

The RCBD Work Group recommends aligning with HLC guidance and, accordingly, allowing institutions to submit Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals under all three identified scenarios.

Vote: 10 in favor, 1 opposed

Discipline (Subject Area)

The RCBD Work Group recommends allowing institutions to submit Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals in any discipline where the program can demonstrate sufficient market demand and where the proposed curriculum can support the expected student learning outcomes for a bachelor's degree.

Determinations regarding whether a discipline is appropriate for a reduced-credit format should be informed by faculty expertise within the relevant academic field, ensuring that academic rigor and disciplinary standards are maintained.

This approach provides institutions with flexibility to pursue innovative program design while ensuring that program quality and workforce relevance remain central considerations.

Vote: 11 in favor

Upper Division Hours

The RCBD Work Group recommends maintaining consistency with the existing KBOR policy regarding upper-division coursework in bachelor's degree programs. Under current KBOR policy, bachelor's degrees require 45 upper-division credit hours within a 120-credit-hour program, representing 37.5% of the total credit hours.

To maintain this proportional expectation within a Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree structure, the work group recommends that RCBD programs include at least 34 upper-division credit hours within a 90-credit-hour degree.

Maintaining this proportional requirement ensures that RCBD programs preserve the depth and rigor associated with upper-division coursework while allowing institutions flexibility to design reduced-credit program structures.

Vote: 11 in favor

Naming Convention

The RCBD Work Group discussed the importance of clearly distinguishing Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degrees from traditional 120-credit-hour bachelor's degrees to ensure transparency for students, employers, and other stakeholders.

The work group recommends the following:

1. The term "*Accelerated*" should not be used in the degree name, as it does not accurately reflect the reduced-credit structure.
2. The designation *Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree (RCBD)* should be used for programs approved under the pilot phase.
3. Institutions will communicate to students how the degree will be noted on the transcript and the diploma.
4. The work group, or a similar representative body, should be reconvened near the conclusion of the pilot to revisit naming conventions should these degrees be considered for broader implementation beyond the pilot phase.

Vote: 9 in favor, 1 opposed

Public Disclosures

The RCBD Work Group recommends that institutions submitting Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals include information describing how they will clearly communicate the structure and nature of the degree to prospective and current students. This may include a general description of the institution's communication approach or examples of how this information will be conveyed.

In the general description, institutions should outline how key program information, including the nature of the degree and any federal financial aid implications, will be communicated through program webpages, advising resources, and recruitment materials. These communications should ensure that students understand the reduced-credit structure and how it differs from a traditional 120 credit hour bachelor's degree.

This recommendation aligns with expectations from the Higher Learning Commission that institutions provide clear and accurate public information about academic programs, particularly when programs differ from commonly accepted credit hour expectations. Clear disclosures will support informed student decision making and promote transparency for employers, transfer institutions, and other stakeholders.

Vote: 10 in favor

SWADs & RCBDs

The RCBD Work Group recommends that four-year institutions submitting Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals in disciplines with existing Systemwide Transfer Associate Degrees (SWADs), currently Business Administration, Management, and Operations; Computer Science; Elementary Education; Nursing; and Social Work, be required to accept the full 60 credit hours from SWADs offered by Kansas community colleges approved to deliver these degrees (https://www.kansasregents.gov/academic_affairs/systemwide-transfer-degrees).

To maintain alignment with the reduced-credit structure of RCBD programs, institutions may adjust the upper-division credit hour requirement from 34 to 30 to accommodate the full transfer of SWAD coursework. Such adjustments are permissible but not required. Institutions should clearly communicate the total number of credit hours and upper-division requirements within RCBD programs in SWAD disciplines.

This recommendation ensures that existing systemwide transfer pathways remain intact and that students who complete a SWAD at a Kansas community college can transition into a Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree program without loss of credit. It also supports the Board's commitment to transfer efficiency, transparency, and equitable access to bachelor's degree pathways for Kansas students.

Vote: 8 in favor; 2 abstentions

Student Pathways and Transitions

The RCBD Work Group recommends that institutions develop clear, transparent processes to support students who choose to transition between Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree programs and traditional 120-credit-hour programs in the same or a related field.

Consistent with HLC expectations, institutions should:

- *Ensure transparency* by clearly communicating to prospective and enrolled students all aspects of the program, including admissions requirements, prerequisites, program requirements, learning outcomes, and available transfer or transition pathways
- *Provide clear guidance* on options for students to move between reduced-credit and traditional programs, including any implications for credit applicability, time to degree, and additional requirements
- *Establish formal admissions policies* that define requirements for RCBD programs, identify any differences between program formats, and outline processes for students seeking to transition between them

These elements should be incorporated into institutional RCBD proposals to ensure alignment with HLC expectations and to support student success and informed decision-making.

Vote: 10 in favor

Annual Reporting

The RCBD Work Group recommends that institutions submitting Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals provide an annual status report to the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee on the progress and outcomes of each program.

At a minimum, the annual report should include the following:

- **RCBD enrollment:** Total number of students enrolled in the RCBD program, disaggregated by year in the program
- **Program retention:** Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall retention rates for students enrolled in RCBD programs and compared to the average institutional rates for the same time period.

- **Transfer credit hours:** Number of credit hours transferred into the program per student, as applicable.
- **Program completion:** As data becomes available, institutions should report on the number of students completing the program as well as on the number of students who exit prior to completion.
- **Employment or other postsecondary outcomes:** As data become available, institutions should report on job placement and, where feasible, earnings outcomes for program completers. It is recognized that employment and earnings data will not be available during the early years of the pilot. In the absence of longitudinal outcomes data, institutions should report on interim indicators such as internship placement rates, employer partnership agreements, and advisory board engagement. These interim measures will support ongoing program monitoring while longer-term outcome data develop.

These reporting elements will support the Board's ability to monitor implementation, assess program effectiveness, and inform future decisions regarding the continuation or expansion of Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree programs.

Vote: 10 in favor

Limiting Applications

The RCBD Work Group does not recommend establishing a cap on the number of Reduced-Credit Bachelor's Degree proposals during the pilot phase. The work group believes institutions are best positioned to determine whether there is sufficient student demand, workforce need, and curricular opportunity to support the development of these programs. This approach provides flexibility for institutions to respond to local and regional needs while preserving the Board's ability to maintain appropriate oversight and ensure a thoughtful and manageable pilot phase.

Vote: 10 in favor

Program Review at the Conclusion of the Pilot

The RCBD Work Group recommends that at the conclusion of the three-year pilot period, the Board will review the pilot program to assess its viability and effectiveness. Following this review, the Board may elect to:

1. Terminate the program (with appropriate teach out plans in place)
2. Extend provisional approval for an additional year
3. Grant full approval and allow the program to continue without provisional status

This pilot structure provides institutions with the opportunity to test innovative program models while allowing the Board to monitor outcomes and ensure alignment with system goals and academic quality expectations.

Vote: 8 in favor

Work Group Members

Marc Malone, Butler Community College
Brent Thomas, Emporia State University
Jennifer Brown, Fort Hays Tech North Central
Jill Arensdorf, Fort Hays State University
Jesse Mendez, Kansas State University
Jason Sharp, Labette Community College
Brian Inbody, Neosho County Community College
Sarah Robb, Neosho County Community College

Susan Bon, Pittsburg State University
Jennifer Roberts, University of Kansas
John Fritch, Washburn University
Monica Lounsbery, Wichita State University
Jennifer Seymour, WSU Tech
Jenn Bonds-Raacke, KBOR, Ex Officio
Regent Alysia Johnston, KBOR, Ex Officio

Footnotes:

- This pilot policy would apply to any institution submitting an RCBD proposal, except for Washburn University. Board Policy Ch.III.A.7 shall be used to determine the approval process for Washburn University RCBDS.
- While the pilot program is in effect, the Private Postsecondary Education unit will deny requests for approval of reduced-credit programs, as minimum-hour requirements are set by the Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act. It should be noted that out-of-state institutions authorized under SARA are not subject to KBOR approval and may therefore offer reduced-credit programs to Kansas residents.
- If Work Group Members were unable to attend a meeting, a delegate was permitted to do so.
- Minor variations in total vote counts reflect that a small number of work group members departed prior to the conclusion of the meeting and were not present for all votes.

DRAFT POLICY AMENDMENT
CHAPTERS II.A.7 AND III.A.9

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES

A ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

...

7 NEW ACADEMIC UNITS AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

...

i Requests for reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs

i State universities’ academic program proposals to offer reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs shall be subject to subsection II.A.7.c above, shall comply with subsections II.A.7.d and e above, and shall additionally:

(1) provide a clear explanation and justification for deviation from the 120-credit-hour minimum that is generally applicable to baccalaureate degrees.

(2) document how institutional credit hour requirements will be met or contain the institution’s justification for any deviations therefrom; _____

(3) demonstrate sufficient market demand for the degree;

(4) document that the curriculum can support the expected student learning outcomes for a baccalaureate degree;

(5) document how the university will clearly communicate the structure and nature of the degree to prospective students; and

(6) contain any other items that may be required by the Board Vice President for Academic Affairs.

ii Approval for reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs will be limited to three academic years.

ij Associate Degree Programs:

...

jk Program Discontinuance and Merger

...

kl Accreditation

...

lm Reciprocal agreements

...

CHAPTER III: COORDINATION

A ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

...

5 APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES, TECHNICAL COLLEGES AND WASHBURN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

...

- d Board staff shall compile, analyze and make recommendations to the Board on the information provided. The recommendations and information provided shall be reviewed by the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority to determine whether the program represents unnecessary program duplication before approval will be granted.

...

ii Procedures for Approval of Special Programs

(1) Business and Industry Service Program

The purpose of this program is to allow community colleges, technical colleges, and the Washburn Institute of Technology to design and implement training activities to meet expressed needs of Kansas business and industry. Instructional activities will be approved for a one-year period with an option for reapplication. Forms to be submitted are available on the Kansas Board of Regents website.

(2) Reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs

(a) New academic program proposals to offer reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs shall be subject to subsection III.A.5.c above, shall comply with subsection III.A.5.b above and this subsection III.A.5.d (except as provided in subsection III.A.5.d.(c) below), and shall additionally:

(i) provide a clear explanation and justification for deviation from the 120-credit-hour minimum that is generally applicable to baccalaureate degrees;

(ii) document how institutional credit hour requirements will be met or contain the institution's justification for any deviations therefrom;

(ii) demonstrate sufficient market demand for the degree;

(iii) document that the curriculum can support the expected student learning outcomes for a baccalaureate degree;

(iv) document how the institution will clearly communicate the structure and nature of the degree to prospective students; and

(v) contain any other items that may be required by the Board Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(b) Approval for reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs will be limited to three academic years.

(c) Proposals to offer reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs:

(i) shall not be reviewed by the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Authority, and subsections III.A.5.i.(1)(b) and (c) shall not apply to proposals to offer reduced credit baccalaureate degrees; and

(ii) shall be reviewed and approved by the System Council of Chief Academic Officers, the System Council of Presidents, the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee, and the Board of Regents in a like manner as state university program approval under subsection II.A.7.d.ii.

...

7 APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS FOR WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

The state university process for approval of new academic program proposals, chapter II.A.7.ed., shall apply to the review and approval of all graduate programs, ~~and~~ specialized professional baccalaureate degree programs (e.g., engineering, architecture), and specialized professional reduced credit baccalaureate degree programs for Washburn University, except that in lieu of Council of Chief Academic Officers and Council of Presidents review and approval, such programs shall be reviewed by the System Council of Chief Academic Officers and the System Council of Presidents, on the same day, for informational purposes only, and the programs will then be reviewed by the Board’s Academic Affairs Standing Committee prior to being placed on the Board agenda for approval. Specialized professional reduced credit baccalaureate degree program proposals shall be subject to the additional requirements of chapter II.A.7.i.

The state university expedited program review process, chapter II.A.7.ef., shall apply to the review and approval of Washburn University programs that meet the criteria for expedited review, except that in lieu of Council of Chief Academic Officers and Council of Presidents review and approval, such programs shall be reviewed by the System Council of Chief Academic Officers and the System Council of Presidents.

...

9 DEGREES

The following applies to all institutions governed, supervised, or coordinated by the Board of Regents:

a Definitions of Terms

- i “Office” means the Office of the Kansas Board of Regents, as represented by the administrator or designated agent.
- ii “Program” means an academic plan that is approved by the appropriate governing board and leads to an award, for example, a degree or a career/technical certificate.
- iii “Graduate degree program” or “post-baccalaureate degree program” means a program leading to a master’s or doctor’s degree conferred upon completion of a course of study for which admission can be gained only through possession of a bachelor’s degree satisfactory to the university offering the graduate instruction.
- iv “Professional practice degree program” means a program leading to a master’s or doctor’s degree conferred on completion of a course of study for which admission into some schools may be gained with less than a baccalaureate, but for which pre-admission and professional study together invariably require more time than is required for a bachelor’s degree alone, regardless of how many matriculants already have a bachelor’s degree. While these degrees may contain doctorate in the title, they are not considered research doctoral degrees.

- v “Lower-division instruction” means course content and teaching at a level appropriate for first and second-year postsecondary students generally, but available to more advanced students who have no prior experience in the subject, and “upper-division instruction” means course content and teaching appropriate for third and fourth-year students or others with a strong background in the subject.
- vi "Full-time student" means a student who is engaged in academic study as the primary occupation, thus ordinarily requiring 36 to 48 hours per week divided between interaction with teachers and independent preparation. A full-time student receives "full-time instruction," ordinarily 12 to 18 teacher hours weekly.
- vii “Part-time student” means a student who is not engaged in academic study as the primary occupation, thus ordinarily requiring less than 36 hours per week divided between interaction with teachers and independent preparation. A part-time student receives “part-time instruction,” ordinarily less than 12 teacher hours per week.
- viii “Academic Year” means a period of time approximately 9 months in length commencing with the fall term during which full-term instruction is provided. An academic year is generally divided into two equal length semesters.

b Standards

In order to receive and hold authorization to offer a given degree, an institution must remain open to inspection at all times and continuously satisfy each of the following standard requirements as written, except where the Office approves modification in writing.

i Quality

- (1) All institutions shall justify a degree offer by assuring the quality of all attendant teaching, learning, and faculty-student interaction.
- (2) The quality and content of each course or program of instruction, training, or study shall be such as may reasonably and adequately achieve the stated objective for which the course or program is offered.

ii Curriculum

The curriculum shall have a structure that reflects acceptance of responsibility by the faculty at the degree-granting institution for what is to be learned overall, as well as in each course, and thus for the logical sequence and increasing difficulty of subjects and instructional levels. The curriculum shall reflect the distinction between the liberal disciplines and the occupations and professions, the nature of specialization in study and work, the contribution of liberal arts and sciences, and the relationship between teaching and faculty creativity. A graduate curriculum shall reflect a concept of the graduate school as a group of scholars, the faculty members of which have had extensive collegiate teaching experience and are engaged in the advancement of knowledge. Periods of study and other fundamental requirements for the five levels of academic degree are as follows:

- (1) “Associate degree” means a degree consisting of courses totaling a minimum of 60 semester credit hours. Additional requirements for specific types of associate degrees follow:
 - (a) “Associate in arts degree” means a transfer-oriented degree:
 - (i) Granted to those who successfully complete programs equivalent to the freshman and sophomore level requirements for a bachelor of arts degree; and
 - (ii) In which not less than 30 semester credit hours in general education are required.

- (b) “Associate in science degree” means a transfer- or professional-oriented degree:
 - (i) Granted to those who successfully complete programs equivalent to the freshman and sophomore level requirements for a bachelor of science degree: and
 - (ii) In which not less than 30 semester credit hours in general education are required.
 - (c) “Associate in applied science degree” means a degree:
 - (i) Granted to those who successfully complete programs which emphasize preparation in the applied arts and sciences for careers, typically at the technical or semi-professional level; and
 - (ii) Consisting of a minimum of 60 semester credit hours and a maximum of 68 semester credit hours, in which not less than 15 semester credit hours in general education and not less than 30 semester credit hours in the area of specialized preparation are required. An exception/waiver to the 68 semester credit hour limit may be granted to meet specific criteria such as external program accreditations or other special requirements. Selected courses may transfer to a college or university upon validation of applicable coursework.
 - (d) “Associate in general studies” means a degree:
 - (i) Granted to those who successfully complete programs with an emphasis on a broad range of knowledge; and
 - (ii) In which not less than 24 semester credit hours in general education and not less than 36 semester credit hours in a program of college-level work are required.
 - (e) “Associate in fine arts degree” means a transfer-oriented degree:
 - (i) Granted to those who successfully complete programs equivalent to the freshman and sophomore level requirements for a bachelor of fine arts degree; and
 - (ii) in which not less than 30 semester credit hours in general education are required.
 - (f) Other specific types of associate degrees may be offered upon approval by the Board office.
- (2) “Baccalaureate degree” means a degree:
- (a) Requiring the equivalent of at least four academic years of full-time postsecondary study consisting of courses totaling 120 semester credit hours in the liberal arts, sciences or professional fields. Any baccalaureate degree offered at a state university that exceeds 120 semester credit hours shall require approval by the Board of Academic Affairs Standing Committee.
 - (b) Incorporating in its program design a minimum of 45 semester credit hours in upper division courses. Institutions are not permitted to make programmatic exceptions.
 - (c) ~~The degree shall require~~ **Requiring** distinct specialization, i.e., a “major,” which should entail approximately the equivalent of one academic year of work in the main subject plus one academic year in related subjects, or two academic years in closely related subjects within a liberal arts interdisciplinary program.
- (3) “Reduced credit baccalaureate degree” means a degree:
- (a) Requiring the equivalent of at least three academic years of full-time postsecondary study

consisting of courses totaling at least 90 semester credit hours in the liberal arts, sciences or professional fields.

(b) Incorporating in its program design a minimum of 34 semester credit hours of approved general education coursework, and at least 34 credit hours in upper division courses. Institutions are not permitted to make programmatic exceptions; provided, however, that a reduced credit baccalaureate degree offered by a four-year institution in a discipline with a Systemwide Transfer Associate Degree may incorporate fewer than 34 credit hours in upper division courses, but not less than 30.

(c) Requiring distinct specialization, i.e., a “major” which should entail approximately the equivalent of one academic year of work in the main subject plus one academic year in related subjects.

(34) “Master’s degree” means a degree:

(a) Granted to those who successfully complete an educational program in the liberal arts and sciences or a professional field; and

(b) Requiring not less than one year of academic work or the equivalent in part-time attendance beyond the baccalaureate degree.

(c) The curriculum shall specialize in a single discipline or single occupational or professional area and culminate in a demonstration of mastery such as a research thesis, a work of art, or the solution of a practical professional problem.

(d) A professional practice master’s degree may be authorized for study beyond fulfillment of undergraduate requirements approved by the Office if the total period of study is at least five academic years.

(45) “Educational specialist degree” means a degree granted to those who successfully complete an educational program requiring not less than one year of academic work or the equivalent in part-time attendance beyond the master’s degree in the field of education.

(56) “Doctor’s degree” means a degree:

(a) Granted to those who successfully complete an educational program requiring three or more academic years of full-time study or the equivalent in part-time attendance beyond the baccalaureate degree and may be either a research degree or a professional practice degree. For the research degree and the professional practice degree:

(i) Study for a closely related master’s degree may be counted toward doctoral requirements.

(ii) The doctor’s degree shall represent a student’s ability to perform independently basic or applied research at the level of the professional scholar or to perform independently the work of a profession that involves the highest levels of knowledge and expertise.

(iii) Requirements for the degree shall include demonstration of mastery of a significant body of knowledge through comprehensive examination, unless a graduate must pass a similar examination in order to be admitted to professional practice in Kansas.

(b) In addition, for the research degree:

(i) Evidence of competence in independent research, usually in the form of a doctoral dissertation, is required.

(ii) The curricular program shall be appropriately broad and shall manifest full understanding of the level and range of doctoral scholarship, the function of a dissertation and its defense, the nature of comprehensive examination, and the distinction between matriculation and degree candidacy.

(67) "Honorary degree" is a degree that is awarded as an exceptional honor bestowed upon a person without the fulfillment of the usual requirements. State universities may award honorary degrees upon approval by the Kansas Board of Regents and only in accordance with the following:

(a) Criteria

(i) Honorary degrees may be conferred only upon persons of notable intellectual, scholarly, professional, or creative achievement, or service to humanity. A candidate's qualifications must be deeply grounded in a career of scholarship, research, creative activity, service to humanity or other profession consistent with the academic endeavors of the University awarding the degree.

(ii) Honorary degrees will be awarded only to exceptional candidates. Awarding this degree need not be considered an annual occurrence.

(iii) An honorary degree shall not be awarded for philanthropic activity or service to the University or the State of Kansas.

(iv) An honorary degree shall not be conferred upon any faculty member, administrator, or other official associated with the University until at least five years after such individual has been separated from the institution.

(v) An honorary degree shall not be conferred upon any holder of a Kansas elected or appointed public office until at least five years after such individual has vacated office.

(b) Process

The chief executive officer of the state university shall nominate to the Board for consideration, in accordance with K.S.A. 76-716, the name of any candidate for an honorary degree at least two months before the commencement or other event at which the degree is to be conferred. The nomination shall include such statements or materials demonstrating that:

(i) the nominee's achievements and/or service are of such exceptional character as to merit the award of an honorary degree.

(ii) the honorary degree is not sought to recognize the nominee's philanthropic activity or service to the University or the State of Kansas.

(iii) the nominee has not been a faculty member, administrator, or other official associated with the University, or has been separated at least five years from the institution.

(iv) the nominee has not held a Kansas elected or appointed public office for a least five years.

(c) At the time the agenda item is submitted, the name shall not be included; however, the state university shall send the proposed nomination, statement and materials individually to Regents and the Board President and Chief Executive Officer at least four weeks before the state university sends its agenda material requests to the Board office for the Board meeting at which the nomination is to be considered. No public communication of a proposed nomination shall be made until the name is presented for consideration to the open meeting of the Board. No

candidate for nomination shall be promised an honorary degree before the Board has acted on the nomination.

(78) "Posthumous degree" is a degree that is awarded after the death of a person when the usual requirements have not been completed. Individual institutions may award posthumous degrees consistent with an institution's degree granting authority (e.g., a regional institution normally will not award doctoral degrees). It is the responsibility of each institution ~~may~~ to establish procedures that will identify and evaluate persons nominated for a posthumous degree. The only systemwide requirement is that, normally, the local procedures shall ascertain that the deceased was a degree-seeking student (e.g., declared major, filed plan of study).

...

Act on Recommendations from AY 2025 Program Review Follow-up Report - KU

Background and History

Per Board policy, Ch. II Section A.5.a.,

In cooperation with the state universities, the Board will maintain a regular program review cycle and process that will allow the universities to demonstrate on an ongoing basis that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. Regular program review is institutionally based and follows the departmental or unit structure of the institution. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall provide guidelines for Program Review and, as part of the review of institutional reports, will include consideration of the Board-approved minima tables.

In June of 2023, the Board approved the current program review framework. Part of the current program review framework includes the requirement that one year after its regular review, each university will provide an update on the status of each phase-out plan, merger plan, or action plan. In AY 2025, the University of Kansas (KU) reviewed 247 programs; the University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC) reviewed 51 programs. Of those programs, KU opted to phase out two programs, phase out two individual programs and merge with two existing programs programs, and place five on action plans. KUMC identified one program to phase out. The current institutional recommendation and/or status of each program is listed below.

Program	AY 2025 Board Action	Current KU Recommendation/Status
PhD in Film/Cinema/Media Studies (50.0601) (Film & Media Studies)	Phase Out	Teach Out in Progress
MA in Religious Studies (38.0201)	Phase Out	Phased Out; Teach Out Complete
MS in Engineering Science (14.1301) (Environmental & Water Resources Science)	Merge with Environmental & Water Resources Engineering	Merge Complete
PhD in Engineering Science (14.1301) (Environmental & Water Resources Science)	Merge with Environmental & Water Resources Engineering	Merge Complete
MA in African Studies (05.0101) (African & African-American Studies)	Action Plan	Remove from Action Plan
MA in Classics and Classical Languages, Literatures & Linguistics (16.1200) (Classics)	Action Plan	Remove from Action Plan
MA in East Asian Languages, Literatures, & Linguistics (16.0300) (East Asian Languages & Cultures)	Action Plan	Continue Action Plan
MA in Film/Cinema/Media Studies (50.0601) (Film & Media Studies)	Action Plan	Continue Action Plan
MSE in Social & Philosophical Foundations of Education		

(13.0901) (Education & Social Policy)	Action Plan	Phase Out Request in Process
KU Medical Center - MS in Molecular Biology (26.0204) (Molecular Biotechnology)	Phase Out	Phased Out/Teach Out Complete

Additionally, among the programs reviewed in the AY 2024 Program Review, three of the programs approved to be placed on action plans and the program approved to be merged are listed below, along with the current institutional recommendation and/or status of each.

Program	AY 2024 Board Action	Current KU Recommendation/Status
BS in Atmospheric Sciences & Meteorology (40.0401) (Atmospheric Science)	Action Plan	Continue Action Plan
BS in Engineering Physics (14.1201)	Action Plan	Continue Action Plan
BA/BM in Music	Action Plan	Remove from Action Plan
BSE in Physical Education, Teaching, & Coaching (13.1314) (Physical Education Plus)	Merge with BSE in Secondary Education	Merge Complete

The bolded recommendations in the “Current KU Recommendation/Status columns above are changes to previously approved actions for the given programs. As such, KBOR-generated data on these programs can be found [here](#). While the data for the BA/BM in Music would support removing the program from the action plan, the data for the MA in African and African-American Studies and the MA in Classics do not appear to support the recommendations. However, the KBOR data reflects a four-year average from AY 2022 through AY 2025. KU has more current data (that has not yet been reported to KBOR) from AY 2026. The KU data indicate the MA in Classics meets the minima for master’s programs, which supports removing the program from the action plan. Additionally, KU is planning an administrative merger for the departments of African and African-American Studies and American Studies, and faculty in the merged department will explore options for integrating the master’s programs. As such, the action plan no longer applies.

KU provided an update on the seven programs from AY 2024 Program Review that were placed on action plans with proviso in December of 2025. Today, KU is providing a follow-up presentation to update BAASC on the above programs identified for action in AY 2024 and AY 2025.

Recommendations

Board staff recommends approval of the above recommendations in the “Current KU Recommendation/Status” column.

Act on Proposal to Apply Doctoral Minima to the Master’s in Fine Arts for Program Review

Background and History

At the March 11, 2026, BAASC meeting, there was an informal proposal to consider the Master’s in Fine Arts (MFA) degree programs as terminal degrees for Program Review, and to apply the doctoral metric thresholds to these degree programs. According to the College Art Association, an organization promoting excellence in scholarship, teaching, and practice in the visual arts, the MFA is considered the terminal degree in studio arts (CAA, 2015). Kansas State University, the University of Kansas, and Wichita State University all offer MFA programs and have presented Program Review reports to BAASC. Two of the three programs fell short on at least one of the two applicable metrics at the time of the reviews. Of the regional universities, Fort Hays State University (FHSU) is the only one to offer the program. For the current Program Review cycle, FHSU will report on programs next spring (2027). Additional background and history on Program Review is provided in section IV.B. of the agenda.

Proposal

Please see the table below comparing the current master’s and doctoral thresholds for the two applicable metrics for programs at this level.

Metric	Master’s	Doctoral
Number of students in program	12	5
Number of students completing program	5	2

Based on the common understanding that the MFA is the terminal degree in studio arts, the proposal is to apply the doctoral minima of five master’s students in the MFA and two students completing the program each year for Program Review.

Recommendations

Board staff recommends approval to apply the doctoral minima to the MFA for Program Review.

References

College Art Association, 2015. Statement on Terminal Degree Programs in the Visual Arts and Design. Retrieved April 22, 2026, from <https://www.collegeart.org/standards-and-guidelines/guidelines/terminal-degree-programs>.

Act on WSU Request to Remove Two Programs from Action Plans – 2024 Program Review

Background and History

Per Board policy, Ch. II Section A.5.a.,

In cooperation with the state universities, the Board will maintain a regular program review cycle and process that will allow the universities to demonstrate on an ongoing basis that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. Regular program review is institutionally based and follows the departmental or unit structure of the institution. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall provide guidelines for Program Review and, as part of the review of institutional reports, will include consideration of the Board-approved minima tables.

In June of 2023, the Board approved the current program review framework. For AY 2024 Program Review, all undergraduate programs that fell below the threshold on two or more of the four metrics were reviewed, and were placed on action plans, merged with another program, or discontinued. Wichita State University reviewed five programs, placing four on action plans, and merging one. At the March 11 BAASC meeting, WSU presented AY 2026 Program Review, which included updates on the programs placed on action plans from AY 2024 Program Review. At this time, WSU requests to remove two of those programs from the action plans, as summarized below. Both programs currently surpass the thresholds on three of the four metrics used. That data can be viewed [here](#).

Program	AY 2024 Board Action	Current WSU Recommendation
BS in Forensic Science	Action Plan	Remove from Action Plan
BA/BS in Physics	Action Plan	Remove from Action Plan

Recommendations

As the data support the request, Board staff recommends approval of the above recommendations in the “Current WSU Recommendation” column.