Kansas Board of Regents Board Meeting Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Chair Blake Benson at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 14, 2026. The meeting was held at the Board office, Curtis State Office Building, 1000 SW Jackson, Ste. 520, Topeka, Kansas. Proper notice was given according to the law.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Blake Benson, Chair	John Dicus	Neelima Parasker
	Diana Mendoza, Vice Chair	Matt Crocker	Kathy Wolfe Moore
	Alysia Johnston	Pamela Ammar	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regent Parasker moved to approve the minutes of the Board's December 10, 2025, special meeting; December 11, 2025, special meeting; and December 17, 2026, meeting. Regent Dicus seconded the motion. The motion carried.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Benson introduced Dr. Taylor Kriley, interim president of Emporia State University (ESU) and Dr. Susan Bon, Provost for Pittsburg State University (PSU), who was filling in for President Newsom. Provost Bon introduced David Weaver, President of the PSU Faculty Senate.

GENERAL REPORTS

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Chair Benson noted that the legislative session had begun and reaffirmed the Board's view that the Legislature is a vital partner in advancing higher education in Kansas. He emphasized the Board's commitment to collaborating with legislators to strengthen the state's higher education system. Chair Benson also welcomed students and faculty back to campuses following the winter break and was optimistic for a successful semester ahead.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT & CEO

Blake Flanders, President and CEO, recognized Dr. Rusty Monhollon, Vice President of Academic Affairs, at his final Board of Regents meeting prior to retirement. He recognized Vice President Monhollon's extensive career in higher education leadership, including service as a state higher education commissioner, assistant commissioner, faculty member, and academic program director. President Flanders also highlighted Vice President Monhollon's nontraditional path from skilled trades to academia, his outstanding academic achievements, and his work as a published author. He commended Vice President Monhollon for his meaningful contributions to the academic community and the Board of Regents, and the Board joined in expressing its appreciation and congratulations.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENTS

Rochelle Rowley, Faculty Senate President at ESU, presented the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents' report. She reported that the Council is reviewing the potential impact of HB 2428, the Kansas Freedom from Indoctrination Act. She also noted that the Council is continuing its international baccalaureate (IB) program review and remains on track to submit recommendations to the Board by May. In addition, she noted discussions regarding the recent changes to faculty workload, tenure, and post-tenure review policies.

REPORT FROM STUDENTS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Azwad Zahraan, Students' Advisory Committee Chair, shared the Committee's focus on the planning and coordination for the upcoming Higher Education Day. He explained during the Committee's meeting earlier in

the day, there were discussions about building continuity and refining priorities and goals for the event scheduled for February 4, with a contingency date of February 24 in the event of inclement weather. He concluded by noting the Committee's goals of actively observing the Board meeting and participating in a Capitol tour.

STANDING COMMITTEE AND OTHER REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Regent Johnston reported that the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) reviewed three new academic program proposals; two appear on the consent agenda and one, a proposed Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity at ESU, is on the discussion agenda. She noted that Vice President Monhollon presented proposed amendments to tenure, post-tenure review, and workload policies, and that the Committee intends to recommend revisions to the draft policies during the Board discussion. Regent Johnston also reported on discussions led by Dr. Jenn Bonds-Raacke regarding the need for more formal systemwide oversight of associate transfer degrees to ensure seamless 60 credit hour transfer from community colleges to universities. BAASC tasked the Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) with developing policy recommendations. Additionally, Vice President Monhollon provided an update on reduced credit bachelor's degree policy considerations, with a work group scheduled to meet for further discussion. Finally, Dr. Cynthia Lane, Director of Literacy, updated the Committee on the Blueprint for Literacy initiative, highlighting progress in training educators in structured literacy and the science of reading, as well as efforts to expand clinical experiences while maintaining compliance with the 120 credit hour limit for a Bachelor's degree in Education.

FISCAL AFFAIRS & AUDIT

Regent Dicus reported that the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee approved the December meeting minutes and reviewed several updates related to state funded university initiatives. The Committee received presentations on state investment projects from Dr. Susan Metzger of Kansas State University's Water Institute, Dr. Roy Jensen of the KU Medical Center regarding progress on the Cancer Center building, and Dr. John Tomlin of Wichita State University's National Institute for Aviation Research. In addition, the Committee reviewed internal audit plans for fiscal years 2025 and 2026 from Kansas State University, Pittsburg State University, and Fort Hays State University. Regent Dicus also noted discussion of upcoming Board agenda items related to bonding proposals at the University of Kansas, an update on the Unified Appropriations Request and the state legislative and gubernatorial budget processes, and review of a university specific item from the Kansas Annual Comprehensive Financial Report, which the Committee determined had been satisfactorily addressed.

GOVERNANCE

Chair Benson reported that the Governance Committee received an overview regarding the Board leadership nomination process for the upcoming academic year and received Wichita State University's (WSU) Annual Campus Safety, Security, and Information Technology report.

RETIREMENT PLAN COMMITTEE

Chair Benson reported that the Retirement Plan Committee approved amendments to the voluntary retirement plan documents to ensure compliance with Section 603 of the Secure 2.0 Act and to enable the implementation of in-plan Roth rollover features. The Committee's investment consultant provided fiduciary training for members and presented a snapshot of fund performance for the mandatory plan, with a comprehensive performance review of both retirement plan fund lineups scheduled for the Committee's May meeting. In addition, the Committee received presentations from TIAA and Voya outlining their participant engagement activities across Kansas Board campuses in 2025 and their planned engagement strategies for 2026.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Regent Crocker moved to approve the consent agenda. Regent Ammar seconded the motion. The motion carried and the following items were approved:

Academic Affairs

ACT ON REQUEST TO APPROVE BS IN APPLIED & INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES, KSU

Kansas State University received approval to offer a 120 credit hour Bachelor of Science in Applied and Interdisciplinary Studies.

ACT ON REQUEST TO APPROVE BS IN PHARMACEUTICAL & BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE, KU

The University of Kansas received approval to offer a 120 credit hour Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Science.

CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA

Academic Affairs

ACT ON REQUEST TO APPROVE BS IN CYBERSECURITY, ESU

Provost Brent Thomas presented Emporia State University's (ESU) proposal for a new bachelor's degree in Cybersecurity. He emphasized the growing and urgent demand for cybersecurity professionals at the state, national, and global levels. He noted that cybersecurity threats affect every industry, including higher education, and that the number of available positions in Kansas far exceeds the current supply of graduates. The proposed program is designed to complement, rather than duplicate, existing programs within the state system and will emphasize collaboration and resource sharing across institutions. Provost Thomas highlighted ongoing and planned discussions with system partners to ensure the program supports statewide workforce needs. Provost Thomas was joined by Dr. Will Phillips, who addressed questions regarding curriculum content, including the integration of information security and identity management concepts within the cybersecurity program.

Regent Parasker moved to approve the Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity at ESU. Regent Ammar seconded the motion. The motion carried.

ACT ON AY 2025 PERFORMANCE REPORTS

Vice President Monhollon presented the academic year 2025 Performance Reports, noting that state statute requires the Board to maintain performance agreements with state universities and community colleges. Over the past three years, these agreements have focused on implementing Board approved initiatives, including math pathways, corequisite academic support in math and English, systemwide course placement standards, and the development of academic degree maps. For the 2025 academic year, institutions were responsible for the soft implementation of math pathways, corequisite developmental support for gateway math and English courses, and systemwide placement measures across both subject areas. Institutions also updated all certificate and degree program maps to align with the systemwide general education framework where appropriate. Staff reviewed all submitted performance reports and recommends awarding each institution 100% of eligible funding under the program.

Regent Johnston moved to approve the recommendation for funding as presented. Vice Chair Mendoza seconded the motion. The motion carried.

ACT ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BOARD'S POLICIES ON TENURE, POST-TENURE REVIEW, AND WORKLOAD (SECOND READ)

Vice President Monhollon and Regent Johnston outlined revisions of the proposed amendments to the Board's policies on tenure, post tenure review, and workload, developed through several months of consultation with

faculty, provosts, university leaders, legislators, and Board stakeholders. Vice President Monhollon explained that the policies serve as a systemwide framework, allowing each institution to develop procedures consistent with shared principles while preserving campus level flexibility. Staff incorporated clarifying language, strengthened definitions, and addressed concerns related to due process, shared governance, and the appeals structure. Key updates include replacing automatic dismissal after two consecutive unsatisfactory reviews with broader options such as reassignment or other personnel actions, adjusting language to reflect institutional discretion, and incorporating BAASC's recommendation to maintain the current rule that tenure decisions made by a chief executive officer remain final and not subject to Board appeal.

Additional amendments refine post tenure review procedures, including allowing department chairs or deans to form review committees for small departments and clarifying that faculty may appeal post tenure review outcomes to the Board solely on procedural grounds. Regent Johnston emphasized the importance of aligning the framework to work effectively for both research universities and regional institutions. She highlighted the foundational expectations that faculty develop annual work plans, undergo annual evaluations, and generate consistent benchmarks that inform review processes, including early post tenure review when warranted. She also stressed that the revised policies will, for the first time, enable the system to collect meaningful data to demonstrate the rigor and accountability of tenure, post tenure review, and workload oversight. Members of the Board noted appreciation for the extensive collaborative work behind the revisions and acknowledged the value of the workload framework for supporting public accountability. Clarification was given that institutions with existing agreements specifying six or seven year post tenure review cycles will retain those timelines until the agreements expire, after which the new five year cycle will apply.

Regent Ammar moved to approve the proposed amendments to the Board's policies on tenure, post-tenure, and workload. Regent Parasker seconded the motion. The motion carried, and the following amendments were approved:

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES

A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

. . .

12 FACULTY ~~TENURE AND TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL~~ WORKLOAD POLICY

~~a. It shall be the responsibility of the Provost (Chief Academic Officer) to prepare and implement, in consultation with the faculty through regular institutional shared governance procedures, an instructional workload standard policy for tenure and tenure track faculty.~~

~~b. At minimum, the instructional workload policy standard shall be:~~

~~i. structured in accordance with the university's Carnegie Classification (Doctoral Universities: Very High Research Activity; Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity; or Master's Colleges and Universities);~~

~~ii. measured in section credit hours or student credit hours; and~~

~~iii. defined on a on a per semester or per academic year time parameter.~~

~~c It is understood that the instruction at the University of Kansas Medical Center is significantly different compared to campuses that serve large undergraduate populations. Thus, the University of Kansas Medical Center is permitted to develop a workload standard that is based on alternative criteria.~~

Faculty are crucial in developing a higher education system in Kansas that focuses on access, excellence, accountability, research, and service. Their influence on the quality and value of a university education is clear in areas like curriculum design, teaching strategies, program development, and creating a vibrant learning environment. Additionally, faculty shape this experience through their research, scholarship, creative work, service to the university, community, and profession, as well as their engagement with students inside and outside the classroom, including advising. The Kansas Board of Regents' workload policy is designed to cover all these aspects by establishing standards for workload expectations, acknowledging faculty contributions in each area, and ensuring accountability to both the university and the state.

Within this policy framework, each university will develop workload policies and procedures, based on their specific mission and classification. The policies and procedures must establish consistent expectations for all full-time and full-time equivalent faculty across the institution, reduce conflicts over workload expectations, and promote reliable performance evaluations. Additionally, the policy aims to improve accountability and transparency.

The Kansas Board of Regents recognizes that workload types vary across campuses, departments, colleges, and disciplines. It also acknowledges that faculty workloads differ among individuals—both across the campus and within departments or divisions, based on the specific needs of each unit. With the adoption of this policy, the Board is not imposing an immutable workload standard that applies equally to each institution. The Board expects each university to develop faculty workload expectations that are equitable, fair, and balanced, and aligned with the unique needs of each department and the whole institution.

Faculty includes a diverse group of institutional staff. It encompasses tenured and tenure-track professors, as well as those not on the tenure track. It may also include clinical and research faculty, librarians, teaching, and others. Faculty members have various responsibilities, which are outlined below.

a Each institution shall develop and implement a workload standard policy for all full-time and full-time equivalent faculty.

i The institution’s chief academic officer, in consultation with the faculty through regular shared governance processes, is responsible for developing and implementing the workload policy.

ii The institution’s workload policy must establish guidelines that enable each department chair (or head of a comparable academic unit), under the supervision of the dean (or an appropriate supervisor), to manage faculty workload within the department effectively to support student success and align with the missions of both the department and the university.

iii Institution-specific faculty workload policies, at a minimum, shall include:

(1) the types of assignments and how effort is allocated for each faculty member across teaching; research, scholarship and creative activity; and service and engagement;

(2) clear statements of expectations and accountability that recognize merit and hold faculty responsible when they fall short, and also hold department chairs or division heads accountable for evaluating faculty based on these expectations.

(3) a process for assessing faculty performance relative to workload expectations and presenting the outcomes of these evaluations to the faculty member and the appropriate dean;

(4) assurances that faculty members meet their workload obligations properly and within acceptable performance standards;

(5) provisions for equitable workload variations within departments and schools, and among individual faculty.

iv All faculty should have assigned teaching loads, although exceptions are permitted for clinical and research faculty, librarians, and others with non-instructional roles. The table below shows typical workload percentage ranges by institution type, setting fair expectations for teaching, research, and service, although these ranges are not intended to apply to every faculty member in all cases. Teaching loads, for example, Variations in teaching loads will vary among individuals within departments, schools, or colleges depending on the type of course (e.g., introductory or upper-division undergraduate, graduate seminars, directing theses and dissertations). The provost, on the recommendation of department chairs or division heads, may approve variations to these ranges based on the needs of both individual faculty and the institution as a whole. Some programs' accrediting standards might change the usual teaching load, and others may differ due to the program's intensity, such as studio programs in art and music. The Board's expectation is not for uniform workloads across the entire institution or among all state universities but for fair and equitable workload assignments at each campus based on its mission and classification.

Average Faculty Workload across Academic Units Percent of Total Effort				
Institution Type	**Teaching**	**Research**	**Service**	**Typical Teaching Load Per Semester**
Doctoral Universities	40-55%	35-45%	5-20%	6-9 credit hours
Master's Colleges and Universities	60-75%	15-30%	5-20%	12 credit hours

v Instruction at the University of Kansas Medical Center and the Kansas State University College of Veterinary Medicine differs significantly from that at other schools and colleges within the system. These institutions are permitted to establish workload standards for their faculty based on criteria that differ from those outlined in this policy.

b Essential elements of the workload policy

i Teaching

Teaching and instruction are essential components of faculty workload expectations. Faculty teach both undergraduate and graduate courses, but they also have additional instructional duties such as developing new courses and materials, updating existing content, creating courseware or other resources for technology-based teaching, supervising individual courses like directed readings, overseeing undergraduate research, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations, among other responsibilities. They also mentor students in co-curricular activities like plays, exhibits, and preparing and setting up new laboratories. Furthermore, they manage teaching assistants, oversee internships, and offer academic advising, mentoring, and other support activities that promote student success.

ii Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

(1) Institutional policies should clearly define how research, scholarship, and creative activities contribute to a faculty member's total workload and specify the extent of their impact. These expectations may be higher at institutions where research is a primary mission.

(2) Research productivity measures vary by discipline and subdiscipline within the same academic units and across colleges and schools. Therefore, institutional workload policies must clearly specify the research activities expected of faculty within the context and expectations of their specific discipline, such as writing and securing grants; applying for and receiving fellowships; innovation, partnerships, and licensure; the impact and importance of the research; supervising graduate students or postdoctoral associates, or both; and sharing scholarship through peer-reviewed journal articles, book reviews, monographs, book chapters, textbooks, conference papers and presentations, and producing other educational materials.

iii Service and Engagement

(1) Faculty members engage in service that advances the institution's goals and supports its role in serving Kansas and beyond.

(2) Faculty service activities may include efforts that strengthen the university or discipline's scholarly community, enhance the quality of life or society, or support the overall well-being of the institution, professional and academic societies, the community, the state, the nation, or the international community.

iv Faculty members may also have administrative duties, such as serving as department chair or head, program director, or center director, that impact their workload. Institutional policies should specify how and to what extent these responsibilities are included in a faculty member's total workload.

v Institutions may assign different weights to each of these activities and to other activities it considers essential parts of faculty workloads based on department, discipline or subdiscipline, and other considerations.

vi Institutions must create a process for reviewing and evaluating workload assignments.

c Annual Evaluation

i Each full-time and full-time equivalent faculty member is required to have an annual work plan and undergo an annual evaluation by the department chair or division head.

ii During the annual review, the department chair or head shall evaluate the faculty member's work against their approved work plan and decide whether the faculty member has met or not met the expectations outlined in the plan.

iii The work plan should clearly delineate the expected outcomes and efforts a faculty member needs to achieve in the upcoming academic year, noting that these items may be part of longer-term or multi-year projects. Its objectives should support and align with the criteria for an upcoming summative or comprehensive review, such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. The plan must specify expectations for teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activities, as well as service and engagement, including percentage time allocations that correspond to the faculty member's FTE status.

(1) A faculty member who does not satisfactorily meet their workload expectations for the review period will be placed on an improvement plan.

(2) The improvement plan must include specific steps aimed at addressing deficiencies, a timeline for expected progress, and a statement of consequences if improvement does not happen within that period. In the academic year in which a faculty member is on an improvement plan, the assessment of the improvement plan will be the equivalent of an annual review.

(3) Faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory annual evaluation and have not satisfactorily completed their subsequent improvement plan are subject to dismissal, reassignment, an additional one-year improvement plan, or other personnel actions.

iv Institutions are responsible for providing training to supervisors to ensure they have the necessary skills to perform their responsibilities effectively.

v Faculty have the right to appeal the chair's evaluation through an appropriate institutional process based on the principles of shared governance. Final decisions rest with the institution's chief academic officer.

d Annual Reporting

i Beginning with the 2025-2026 Academic year and continuing every other year thereafter, each campus provost will submit a faculty workload report to the Board's vice president for academic affairs. The report shall cover the two prior academic years. The annual report has two primary purposes:

(1) To illustrate the breadth and variety of faculty activities and how these activities contribute to students, the university's mission, the state, and society at large.

(2) To establish a systemwide level of transparency and accountability for how faculty allocate their work time.

ii The Board's vice president for academic affairs, in consultation with the provosts, will create the report format.

(1) The annual report should include a narrative that highlights faculty responsibilities, the quality of their work, and how their efforts benefit students, the university, the state, and the broader community. It should also explain the institution's workload policy and how it ensures faculty perform at a high level.

(2) Annual reporting metrics will include, at a minimum, the following data:

(a) Total credit hours produced, disaggregated by level of the courses taught (lower- and upper-division, undergraduate and graduate).

(b) Percentage of all credit hours produced by full-time tenured/tenure track and full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty, disaggregated by level of courses.

(c) Number of sections taught per semester by full-time tenured/tenure track and full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty, disaggregated by level of courses.

(d) Average student credit hour production for core instructional faculty

(e) The number of bachelor's degrees awarded

(f) Four-year undergraduate graduation rates

(g) Student retention rates

(h) Faculty publication and scholarship

(i) Amount of research funding secured by faculty

(3) This report shall be presented to the Board and shared widely with legislators and other constituents.

. . .

C. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF

. . .

2 APPOINTMENTS

. . .

b Faculty and Staff

. . .

vii Tenure for Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

(1) This policy applies only to faculty who have been given tenure-track appointments. Faculty who have been awarded tenure may be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of program or unit discontinuance or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency. "Adequate cause" is defined as serious misconduct or performance issues that significantly impact the employment relationship. Performance issues should be documented and addressed in the process of annual review or post-tenure review, as may be appropriate.

(2) In the interpretation of the principles contained in paragraph (1) above, the following is applicable:

(a) The terms and conditions of every appointment shall be stated in writing and be made available to the tenure-track faculty member at the time of appointment.

(b) Beginning with the institution's full-time appointment of the tenure-track faculty member, the probationary period shall not exceed seven years. Faculty health care providers whose sole practice is in connection with a KU practice plan, and/or a KU-affiliated VA hospital or pediatric provider, may be considered full-time solely for purposes of appointment to the Tenure Track. Medical school faculty researchers who are employed by the VA or by a pediatric provider to conduct medical research may be considered full-time solely for purposes of appointment to the Tenure Track. Physician faculty whose sole medical practice is in connection with a KU physician practice plan and who are appointed by the chief executive officer of the University of Kansas Hospital Authority ("KUHA") to hold the position of Senior Vice President for Clinical Affairs or Physician in Chief of the KU Cancer Center as part of the Medical Center's clinical integration with KUHA may be considered full-time solely for purposes of appointment to the Tenure Track as determined by the Chancellor to be in the best interest of the Medical Center. The chief executive officer, or the chief executive officer's designee, may at his or her discretion reduce the probationary period at the time of appointment if it has been determined that the faculty member has served a partial probationary period at a comparable institution and such reduction is in the best interests of the institution. In no instance, however, may the probationary period for a tenure-track faculty member be reduced to less than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years. Notices should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the tenure-track faculty member is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.

(c) If an untenured faculty member becomes a parent through birth, adoptive placement, or adoption of a child under the age of 5 prior to May 1st of the fifth year of the probationary period, that faculty member, upon notification to the

institution's chief academic officer, shall be granted a one-year delay of the tenure review. Notification must occur within 90 days of the birth, adoptive placement, or adoption. Faculty members retain the right to opt out of this interruption policy.

(d) Under unexpected special and extenuating circumstances, prior to the sixth year of service, and at the request of the faculty member and the appropriate dean, the chief academic officer of the university may grant an extension of the tenure clock for a maximum of one year.

(e) No more than two extensions of the tenure clock may be granted to a faculty member for any reason. Nothing in this provision shall be construed to guarantee reappointment of an untenured faculty member.

(f) Tenure is a privilege that must be affirmatively granted by the institution in recognition of meritorious performance. Tenure is not a privilege that can be achieved simply through continuous service at the institution, regardless of a faculty member's length of service. Absent an affirmative action by a state university to award tenure, a faculty member shall not qualify for tenure solely by virtue of completing the probationary period.

(g) Tenure and promotion guidelines are required for each academic unit at the institution. The guidelines should reflect expectations consistent with the university's mission and classification. The Board expects these guidelines will insulate faculty from viewpoint-based punishment for in-classroom instruction, unless the instruction/commentary are both not germane to the course and do not take up a significant amount of class time.

(3) Within this general policy, each state university may make such operating regulations as it deems necessary, subject to the approval of the Board.

(4) Any tenure approved by the institution shall be limited to tenure for the recommended individual at the institution consistent with the tenure policies of that institution. (Effective 11/14/2002)

(5) In exceptional cases, the chief executive officer at a state university may hire faculty members with tenure without their having completed a probationary period.

(6) Decisions of the chief executive officer shall be final and are not subject to further administrative review by any office or committee of the institution or by the Board of Regents.

(7) Each university shall submit an annual tenure review report to the Board's vice president for academic affairs. The report shall include, at a minimum, data on the number of tenured faculty, faculty on a tenure-track, faculty awarded tenure in the past academic year, faculty denied tenure in the same period, and tenure-track faculty who have left the university before applying for tenure.

(a) The tenure review report may be combined with the post-tenure review report.

(b) The tenure review report shall include the tenure and promotion guidelines adopted by each academic unit at the institution.

. . .

8 EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents that merit increases for faculty shall be based on the annual evaluation of their performance as it relates to the mission of the institution, college/school and department. The Board of Regents holds the state university chief executive officers accountable for the development and implementation of evaluation systems in accordance with the following guidelines:

a Faculty evaluation criteria, procedures and instruments shall be developed through faculty participation in each department, college or division and recorded to express the performance expectations of faculty therein. They will be documented in annual work plans so that all will understand performance expectations. Criteria, procedures and instruments shall be:

i Sufficiently flexible to meet the objectives of the unit.

ii Sensitive to multi-year faculty activities and outcomes.

iii Approved by the chief academic officer of each university.

iv Compatible with contemporary research and scholarly literature on faculty evaluation. For example, assessment of research, where research is part of the job assignment, should ordinarily include but not be limited to information on the quality of the research, the amount of research, the media in which findings were disseminated, and the reception and importance of the research. Similarly, the assessment of teaching, where teaching is part of the job assignment, should ordinarily include but not be limited to student ratings secured anonymously under standard conditions on norm-referenced instruments that adjust for initial student motivation, assessment of syllabi, and assessment of instructional materials.

b Each state university shall make available to faculty a ratings instrument for securing student ratings of instruction in all appropriate courses. The instrument must be norm-referenced and corrected for major sources of bias as demonstrated by research.

c The evaluation of faculty performance and future expectations, as detailed in each faculty member's annual work plan, *[see Faculty Workload Policy, c. Annual Evaluation]* ~~for the future~~ shall be discussed with them. Documentation recording the sense of the discussion shall be provided to the faculty member.

i The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to add comments to the documentation as part of the official record before it is considered at the next higher administrative level.

ii Each state university shall establish a procedure by which faculty who disagree with their evaluation may request a review.

d Each state university shall implement a plan to supplement its annual faculty evaluation system, and shall adopt and implement a post-tenure review plan consistent with this policy. Each plan shall include procedures and strategies for the following:

i Training of departmental chairpersons in the administration of faculty evaluation.

ii Linkage of the outcomes of faculty evaluation with assistance for renewal and development and, when necessary, reassignment and other personnel actions.

iii Training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants.

~~iv~~ e Regular post-tenure review.

i In addition to the annual evaluation required of all full-time and full-time equivalent faculty, tenured faculty members undergo a post-tenure review five years after receiving tenure. Post-tenure reviews will continue at five-year intervals unless a review for promotion is warranted.

ii The main goal of this ~~primary purpose of this post-tenure review~~ process is to help ~~assist~~ faculty ~~members with~~ identify~~ing~~ opportunities that will allow ~~enable~~ them to reach their full potential for contributing ~~contribution~~ to the university. Post-tenure reviews aim ~~Such review is intended~~ to provide a ~~longer~~ long-term perspective compared to the ~~than is usually provided by an~~ annual review. ~~The expectation is that each tenured faculty member will be assessed five to seven years after award of tenure, and reviews will continue at intervals of five to seven years unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. This review shall be in addition to, not in lieu of, annual evaluations.~~

iii A post-tenure review committee shall conduct the review. ~~The post-tenure review committee must consist of at least five individuals, two of whom must be from outside of the home department of the faculty member under review.~~ The department chair or appropriate dean shall form the post-tenure review committee, which must consist of at least five individuals, no more than half of whom can be from the home department of the faculty member under review.

iv Tenured faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory post-tenure review evaluation will be placed on a one-year improvement plan, developed with input from the faculty to the chair or direct supervisor and approved by the appropriate dean and provost. The one-year improvement plan should set goals that address the deficiencies noted in the post-tenure review and which can reasonably be achieved in one academic year. Faculty who do not satisfactorily complete the improvement plan are subject to an additional one-year improvement plan, dismissal, reassignment, or other personnel actions, as determined by the provost.

v The faculty member under review may appeal the post-tenure review committee's decision to the Board of Regents. Any appeal to the Board of Regents pursuant to this subsection shall be filed with the Board Vice President for Academic Affairs within 30 days of the post-tenure review committee's decision. Such appeal shall be limited to procedural grounds.

f Annual Reporting.

Each university must submit an annual post-tenure review report to the Board's vice president for academic affairs. The report should include, at a minimum, data on the number of faculty subject to a post-tenure review, those placed on an improvement plan, dismissals resulting from post-tenure review, and other faculty departures not directly related to a post-tenure review.

Fiscal Affairs & Audit

ACT ON RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ISSUANCE OF REVENUE BONDS, KU

Chad Bristow, Director of Facilities, presented the University of Kansas' (KU) request for approval of a resolution authorizing the issuance of revenue bonds to support several major capital initiatives. Director Bristow outlined KU's plan to issue up to $100 million in revenue bonds for the Cancer Center research facility, which is part of a $330 million project funded through philanthropy, state allocations, federal grants, affiliated entities, and university resources. Director Bristow then reviewed KU's request to issue up to $100 million in revenue bonds to address student housing needs driven by enrollment growth and aging facilities, including $35 million to acquire Hawker Apartments. Finally, Director Bristow reviewed KU's plan to issue up to $276 million in revenue bonds to refinance the 2016 Central District lease development revenue bonds and to refund $34 million of 2014 series bonds. This combined refinancing of nearly $310 million is expected to save the university approximately $27 million. In compliance with Board policy, Director Bristow reviewed KU's debt burden and coverage ratios, confirming the university remains within acceptable ranges and retains sufficient debt capacity. The bonds will be secured with generally available, unencumbered university funds, supported by various revenue sources. Jeff DeWitt, KU Chief Financial Officer, noted the institution's strong AA2 credit rating, which positions the university to secure interest rates in the low 4% range for both new money and refinancing transactions.

Regent Wolfe Moore moved to adopt the Resolution. Regent Johnston seconded the motion. The motion carried.

(Presentation on file with official minutes)

Other Matters

RECEIVE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Fred Patton, the Board's government affairs consultant, delivered a legislative update, focusing on the start of the new legislative session. Lawmakers convened on Monday and immediately began moving at a rapid pace with numerous bill hearings already underway. Mr. Patton reported that the Legislature began budget planning months in advance and released its budget proposal earlier in the week, while the Governor began releasing her proposed budget this morning. The Board's budget team is reviewing the Regents-related components and will work closely with legislative budget committees over the next several weeks to highlight priorities. Mr. Patton emphasized that both chambers intend to advance their budgets by February 14, creating an accelerated timeline. In addition to budget matters, he noted that the Board has three non-budget legislative requests related to scholarship programs. Those bills have been drafted, and communication is already underway to schedule hearings. Mr. Patton indicated that legislative activity will intensify next week and that he will continue engaging with committees and responding to issues as they arise.

RECEIVE PILLAR III UPDATE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Kent Glasscock, Board consultant, delivered an update on Pillar 3 of the Board's strategic plan. Pillar 3 focuses on supporting Kansas' economy through direct job creation and investment attraction. He collaborated with April White, Vice President for Workforce Development. Mr. Glasscock reported that five universities submitted significantly improved Pillar 3 reports demonstrating intentional programming aligned with the state's framework for growth. From the 2019 baseline through 2025, universities have generated more than 4,000 direct jobs toward a 10,000 job goal and attracted approximately $877 million in direct investment. Mr. Glasscock emphasized the importance of supporting metrics such as workforce development, community engagement, and talent pipelines, stressing that thriving communities are essential to statewide economic resilience. He outlined the Board's role in maintaining focus, monitoring progress, and aligning initiatives with research and economic development priorities, and he affirmed that universities have established internal systems to track outcomes and report annually. The Board will receive Pillar 3 reports from KU, KSU, and WSU in February, followed by FHSU and PSU in March and ESU in May. Board members expressed strong appreciation for the universities' growing role in economic development, underscoring the value of clear, measurable metrics, collaborative statewide engagement, and storytelling to communicate higher education's impact. The discussion affirmed the universities' strong collaboration with local economic development councils and stressed that talent development remains central to business recruitment, underscoring the value of a coordinated higher education presence in strengthening Kansas' competitiveness and economic growth.

(Presentation on file with official minutes)

BREAK

Chair Benson called for a break at 2:30 p.m. The meeting resumed at 2:41 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Vice Chair Mendoza moved that the Board recess into executive session to discuss personnel matters of non-elected personnel. The subject of the executive session is to discuss personnel items in preparation for evaluation, and the purpose is to protect the privacy of the individual board employee involved. The session would last thirty minutes and would include members of the Board; President and CEO Blake Flanders; KSU President Richard Linton; KSU Vice President for Administration and Finance Ethan Erickson, for a portion; and General Counsel John Yeary. The Open meeting would resume at 3:15 p.m. Regent Parasker seconded the motion. The motion carried.

At 3:15 p.m., the Board returned to open session. Vice Chair Mendoza moved to extend the executive session for ten minutes to 3:25 p.m. Regent Johnston seconded the motion. The motion carried.

At 3:25 p.m., the Board returned to open session. Vice Chair Mendoza moved to extend the executive session for five minutes to 3:30 p.m. Chair Benson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

At 3:30 p.m., the Board returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Benson adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

_____ _____

Blake Flanders, President and CEO Blake Benson, Chair