

Coordinating Board for Higher Education

Agenda of Meeting

**9:00 AM
Thursday
June 10, 2010**

**Pillsbury Chapel and Dale Williams Fine Arts Center
Missouri Baptist University
St. Louis, MO**

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Lowell C. Kruse, Chair, St. Joseph

Mary Beth Luna Wolf, Vice Chair, St. Louis

Doris J. Carter, Secretary, Florissant

David Cole, Cassville

Greg Upchurch, St. Louis

Jeanne Patterson, Kansas City

Kathryn Swan, Cape Girardeau

Craig Van Matre, Columbia

TIME: 9:00 AM
Thursday
June 10, 2010

PLACE: Pillsbury Chapel and Dale Williams Fine Arts Center
Missouri Baptist University
One College Park Drive
St. Louis, MO 63141-8660

Directions to Missouri Baptist University

From Columbia / Kansas City

- Take I-70 E toward St. Louis
- Take Exit 201A for I-64E/US-40 toward Chesterfield
- Take the Exit toward Mason Road
- Merge onto South Outer Forty Road
- Turn left onto South Mason Road
- Turn right onto North Forty Drive
- Turn left onto College Park Drive

From St. Louis

- Take I-64 W / US-40 W West toward Kansas City
- Take Exit 26 at MO-JJ
- Turn slightly left onto MO-JJ/S New Ballas Road
- Turn left onto Conway Road
- Turn left onto North Forty Drive
- Turn right onto College Park Drive

From Springfield

- Take I-44 E toward Rolla
- Merge onto I-270 North via Exit 276 toward Chicago
- Take Exit 12B-A toward St. Louis (I-64 E / US-40 E / US-61W)
- Take Exit 26 at MO-JJ
- Turn slightly left onto MO-JJ/S New Ballas Road
- Turn left onto Conway Road
- Turn left onto North Forty Drive
- Turn right onto College Park Drive

Institution Web Site: <http://www.mobap.edu>

Campus Map – Missouri Baptist University



Schedule of Events June 9 - 10, 2010

Wednesday, June 9, 2010

12:00 – 5:00 pm **CBHE Work Session / Executive Session (if necessary)**
Pillsbury Chapel and Dale Williams Fine Arts Center
Missouri Baptist University
One College Park Drive
St. Louis, MO 63141-7596

6:00 – 8:30 pm **Reception and Dinner**
Doubletree Hotel and Conference Center
16625 Swingley Ridge Road
Chesterfield, MO 63017

Thursday, June 10, 2010

7:30 am – 8:30 am Breakfast with Paul Lingenfelter
Chaucer's Restaurant
Doubletree Hotel and Conference Center
16625 Swingley Ridge Road
Chesterfield, MO 63017

9:00 am – 12:00 pm **CBHE / President Advisory Committee Meeting / Executive Session (if necessary)**
Pillsbury Chapel and Dale Williams Fine Arts Center
Missouri Baptist University
One College Park Drive
St. Louis, MO 63141-7596

Executive Session

RSMo 610.021(1) relating to “legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys.”

RSMo 610.021(3) relating to “hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public governmental body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded.”

Other matters that may be discussed in closed meetings, as set forth in RSMo 610.021.

Individuals needing special accommodations relating to a disability should contact Laura Vedenhaupt, at the Missouri Department of Higher Education, 3515 Amazonas Drive, Jefferson City, MO 65109 or at (573) 751-2361, at least three working days prior to the meeting.

**COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Representatives by Statute

Public Four-Year Universities

Dr. Henry Givens, Jr., President
Harris-Stowe State University

Dr. Carolyn Mahoney, President (COPHE President)
Lincoln University

Dr. Bruce Speck, President
Missouri Southern State University

Dr. Michael Nietzel, President
Missouri State University

Dr. John Carney III, Chancellor
Missouri University of Science and Technology

Dr. Robert Vartabedian, President
Missouri Western State University

Dr. John Jasinski, President
Northwest Missouri State University

Dr. Ken Dobbins, President
Southeast Missouri State University

Dr. Troy Paino, President
Truman State University

Dr. Aaron Podolefsky, President
University of Central Missouri

Mr. Gary Forsee, President
University of Missouri

Dr. Brady Deaton, Chancellor
University of Missouri-Columbia

Mr. Leo Morton, Chancellor
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Dr. Thomas George, Chancellor
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Public Two-year Colleges

Dr. Alan Marble, President
Crowder College

Dr. Edward Jackson, President
East Central College

Dr. Raymond Cumiskey, President
Jefferson College

Dr. Jackie Snyder, Chancellor
Metropolitan Community Colleges

Dr. Steven Kurtz, President
Mineral Area College

Dr. Evelyn Jorgenson, President
Moberly Area Community College

Dr. Neil Nuttall, President
North Central Missouri College

Dr. Hal Higdon, President
Ozarks Technical Community College

Dr. John McGuire, President
St. Charles Community College

Dr. Zelema Harris, Chancellor
St. Louis Community College

Dr. Marcia Pfeiffer, President (MCCA President)
St. Louis Community College – Florissant Valley

Dr. Marsha Drennon, President
State Fair Community College

Dr. Devin Stephenson, President
Three Rivers Community College

Public Two-year Technical College

Dr. Donald Claycomb, President
Linn State Technical College

Independent Four-year Colleges and Universities

Dr. Mark Lombardi, President
Maryville University of St. Louis

Dr. Marianne Inman, President
Central Methodist University

Dr. Dennis Golden, President
Fontbonne University

Dr. Mark S. Wrighton, Chancellor
Washington University

Four-year alternate:

Dr. James Evans, President
Lindenwood University

Independent Two-year Colleges

Dr. Judy Robinson Rogers, President
Cottey College

Two-year alternate:

Col. William Sellers, President
Wentworth Military Academy and Junior College

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

TIME: 9:00 am
Thursday
June 10, 2010

PLACE: Pillsbury Chapel and Dale Williams Fine Arts Center
Missouri Baptist University
Chesterfield, MO

AGENDA

- | | <u>Tab</u> | <u>Presentation by:</u> |
|---|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| I. Introduction | | |
| A. Call to Order | | Lowell Kruse, Chair |
| B. Confirm Quorum | | Board Secretary |
| C. Welcome from Host Institution | | Alton Lacey |
| D. Committee Reports | | |
| 1. Audit Committee | | |
| 2. Student Loan / Financial Aid Committee | | |
| 3. Strategic Planning Committee | | |
| 4. Strategic Communications Committee | | |
| E. Interim Commissioner Update | | Lowell Kruse |
| II. Presidential Advisory Committee | | |
| A. FY 2011 Budget Update | A | Paul Wagner |
| B. Capital Prioritization Guidelines Update | B | Paul Wagner |
| C. Final Summary of Legislation | C | Paul Wagner |
| D. Mission Review Update | D | Tim Gallimore |
| E. <i>Imperatives for Change</i> Report | E | Tim Gallimore |
| III. Action Items | | |
| A. Minutes of the April 22, 2010 CBHE Meeting
Minutes of the April 28, 2010 Conference Call
Minutes of the May 19, 2010 Conference Call | | Lowell Kruse |
| B. Recertification of Institutional Eligibility to Participate in
State Student Financial Assistance Programs | F | Leroy Wade |
| C. LAMP Update | G | Tim Gallimore |

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Distribution of Community College Funds	H	Paul Wagner
B. Legislation Implementation Update	I	Paul Wagner
C. Proprietary School Certification Actions and Reviews	J	Leroy Wade
D. Academic Program Actions	K	Tim Gallimore
E. CAI Update	L	Tim Gallimore
F. Higher Education Subcommittee Update	M	Tim Gallimore
G. COTA Update	N	Tim Gallimore

V. Items for Discussion, Consideration, and Possible Vote

A. Discussion re Cape Girardeau Partnership	O	Robert Stein
B. Student Loan Program Update	P	Leanne Cardwell
C. Future Issues in Higher Education	Q	Paul Wagner
D. Report of the Commissioner		Robert Stein

Executive Session

RSMo 610.021(1) relating to “legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives and its attorneys.”

RSMo 610.021(3) relating to “hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public governmental body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded.”

Other matters that may be discussed in closed meetings, as set forth in RSMo 610.021.

Individuals needing special accommodations relating to a disability should contact Laura Vedenhaupt at the Missouri Department Higher Education, 3515 Amazonas Drive, Jefferson City, MO 65109 or at (573) 751-1876 at least three working days prior to the meeting.

COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF MEETING
April 22, 2010

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) met at 11:25 am on Thursday, April 22, 2010, at the Capitol Plaza Hotel in Jefferson City, MO.

Acting Chair Mary Beth Luna Wolf called the meeting to order. A list of guests is included as an attachment. The presence of a quorum was established with the following roll call:

	Present	Absent
Doris Carter		X
David Cole	X	
Lowell Kruse		X
Jeanne Lillig-Patterson	X	
Mary Beth Luna Wolf	X	
Kathryn Swan	X	
Greg Upchurch	X	
Craig Van Matre	X	

Ms. Luna-Wolf advised that, in light of a proposed merger between the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), the CBHE suspended its search for a new commissioner of higher education effective March 18, 2010.

Mr. Craig Van Matre made a motion to **formally close the commissioner search, to notify candidates of this fact, and to finalize arrangements with the executive search firm for final payment of any funds due.** Mr. Greg Upchurch seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Luna-Wolf briefed members on the Wednesday, April 21, 2010 dinner with representatives of the Coordinating Board for Early Childhood, State Board of Education, and the General Assembly. She opened discussion on this subject by stating that the CBHE provides another level of advocacy for institutions and ensures that both public and non-public institutions have a voice in the future of higher education in the state.

Dr. James Evans of Lindenwood University emphasized that postsecondary education and P-12 education are different. Individualized missions and diversity are notable in Missouri higher education institutions as opposed to P-12 schools which seek more conformity. In addition, postsecondary institutions serve substantial numbers of adults. There is concern that higher education will not have an adequate voice if a merger occurs.

Dr. Mike Nietzel advised that Missouri's outcomes in terms of educational attainment are behind the national average, and our remediation rate is nearly 38 percent. There may be an advantage to having a single board that would have the ability to "fix leaks" in the P-20 pipeline. In

addition, resources are scarce and will only become more so; however, the primary purpose of the merger proposal is not saving money but rather to develop a structure that has more coordination and avenues for success.

Dr. Marcia Pfeiffer stated that the way this proposal has unfolded does not inspire confidence that due consideration of the distinct role of each education sector has been undertaken. Dr. John Jasinski agreed that the proposal does not feel well thought out. Dr. Marianne Inman added that DESE and the State Board of Education's roles are more compliance-oriented, a system which may not bode well for diversity and creativity.

Ms. Luna-Wolf advised that Senator Charlie Shields, author of the resolution, will not be with the legislature next session. There is some concern that the person leading this change next year will not be the same person who conceived the vision.

Mr. Van Matre stated that higher education needs to be a vocal part of the process or be condemned to sit on the sidelines. We do not have the results to support continuation of the current structure. Perhaps a consolidated board would have more influence to improve quality.

Commissioner Robert Stein stated that it would be valuable if the sector organizations would confer and forward their thoughts and/or position statement to the CBHE.

Committee Reports

Ms. Luna-Wolf advised that due to staff reductions, only one committee report is available for this meeting.

Audit Committee

Ms. Zora Mulligan advised that the state auditor will be contacting individual institutions regarding its ongoing audit on separation and retention contracts. The US Department of Education audit regarding the student loan program is complete, and there were no findings regarding the department.

Presidential Advisory Committee

Budget Update

Mr. Paul Wagner briefed attendees that the conference committee is currently meeting and some items were resolved while others are still to be finalized.

- The House and Senate agreed with the Governor's recommendation of a 5.2% reduction to institutional operating budgets.
- The MDHE internal budget for FY 2011 has nominal cuts to spending lines – no FTE reductions or carryover of those withholds from FY 2010.
- There is currently a \$6.5 million difference between the House and Senate regarding funding for Access Missouri.

- There will be no funding increase in Bright Flight this year; however, a language issue remains regarding awards to students in the 4th and 5th percentiles.
- The MDHE will administer the scholarship portion of A+ effective August 28, 2010.
- UM-related items remain in conference and are likely to receive cuts.

2010 Legislative Session

Ms. Mulligan stated that Senate Joint Resolution 45 had been adopted by the Senate and includes language on the length of terms (6 years) and would have the Commissioner of Education appointed by the board with the advice and consent of the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 44 was third read in the Senate this morning.

House Bill 1473 regarding Access Missouri award equalizations and changes to the GPA requirement for renewal has been third read by the House.

Senate Bill 733 extends the period that students may defer Bright Flight awards for military service and provides a prioritization mechanism for situations when Bright Flight is not fully funded.

Ms. Mulligan advised that the MDHE has fielded several questions regarding implementation of the CBHE policy on the Higher Education Student Funding Act (“tuition stabilization”). One pertains to specific deadlines by which petitions for tuition waivers must be submitted. Due to the varied timelines institutions use to make tuition and fee decisions, a single deadline for all institutions is not practicable.

A second question involves the appeals process should the commissioner position be vacant. The CBHE and MDHE staff will work with institutions to ensure that any appeals are processed within established timeframes and that the duties of the commissioner are fulfilled.

Student Financial Assistance Update

Mr. Leroy Wade provided an update on state student financial assistance programs. The scholarship portion of the A+ program is being transferred to the MDHE. Staff held several meetings with DESE to better understand how the program operates and what issues and policies need to be addressed as the process moves forward. There will be no major changes to the process for fall 2010. MDHE has involved a representative group of postsecondary institutions to discuss short-term and long-term issues, how to restructure the program and what might be done to make the program function more efficiently. The MDHE also wants to make this program more automated.

Student Loan Program Update

Ms. Leanne Cardwell provided an update on the effects of recent federal legislation to end the Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP). The MDHE, as the state’s guaranty agency for FFELP, will cease guaranteeing loans June 30, 2010. The MDHE will continue to service the approximately 900,000 student loans in the department’s portfolio; therefore, the department

expects to retain its current level of service for the next three to five years. The MDHE is looking at options such as other federal funding sources and holding discussions with potential partners such as the Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority (MOHELA). The department will provide the CBHE with specific proposals and options for a post-FFELP loan program at a future meeting.

Commissioner Stein advised that of the MDHE's 75 employees, 44 are paid 100% via loan funds. Of the remaining employees, 27 are paid at least partially through the loan program. Ms. Cardwell added that loan funds are also used to underwrite administration of state financial assistance programs, outreach efforts, and default prevention services.

Mission Review Update

Dr. Rusty Monhollon advised that the MDHE has received responses to draft reviews from several institutions and have used those comments and concerns to review and revise the reports. The MDHE is encouraging institutions that have not responded to do so. Mission review has revealed both the depth and breadth of excellence in Missouri's public institutions in meeting student needs and the needs of the state. There are, however, several areas that may benefit from further discussion.

- It may be necessary to review the viability of retaining mission selectivity categories.
- The department's work has revealed impressive and extensive collaboration between institutions, but there is room for greater regional partnerships between institutions and between institutions and the private sector.
- There is strong conceptual alignment between the state coordinated plan (*Imperatives for Change*) and the mission and strategic plans of institutions. However, there are opportunities for stronger measureable alignment specifically in areas such as programmatic emphasis and areas of institutional excellence.

The MDHE is committed to working with institutions and to present a final report on mission review at a future meeting of the CBHE.

Action Items

Minutes

Ms. Kathy Swan made a motion to **approve the minutes of the February 8, 2010 conference call, the February 10, 2010 meeting, the February 26, 2010 conference call, and the March 18, 2010 conference call.** Mr. Van Matre seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

MWSU Associate Degree Update

Dr. Monhollon advised that a joint agreement and an addendum to the agreement was signed by Missouri Western State University (MWSU), Metropolitan Community College (MCCCKC), and North Central Missouri College (NCMC). The agreement specifies certain associate degree

programs that will be offered by MWSU, programs that will be discontinued, and programs that will be offered jointly with the community colleges.

Ms. Swan made a motion to recommend that **the Coordinating Board for Higher Education commend the presidents of Missouri Western State University and North Central Missouri College and the chancellor of Metropolitan Community College, along with the boards and staff of each institution for their dedication to the implementation of a model collaborative agreement.**

It is further recommended that the Coordinating Board approve the proposed program discontinuations and approve the retentions. All institutions are expected to follow through jointly with the stipulations outlined.

Mr. Van Matre seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Consent Calendar

Ms. Swan made a motion **to accept the items on the Consent Calendar.** Mr. Upchurch seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Items for Discussion, Consideration, and Possible Vote

Report of the Commissioner

Commissioner Stein introduced Joe Cornelison, the new counsel for the loan program. The Commissioner also thanked Ms. Mulligan for all of her hard work and congratulated her on her new position with the Missouri Community College Association. Ms. Swan also thanked Ms. Mulligan for her efforts on behalf of the department and the Board and wished her well in her future endeavors.

Commissioner Stein acknowledged that morale is down at the MDHE but that staff continues to be dedicated to students and committed to working with the Board and with institutions.

Commissioner Stein advised that there is increased interest in a Missouri-Panama partnership for students. There will be a major international recruitment conference in Kansas City in June 2010. A delegation from Panama will be in attendance and is interested in visiting several Missouri campuses.

Ms. Luna-Wolf advised that the Board will be developing a process and timeline for identification of an interim commissioner.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.

**COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF CONFERENCE CALL
April 28, 2010**

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) met at 8:30 am on Wednesday, April 28, 2010 via conference call.

Mr. Lowell Kruse, Chair, called the meeting to order. The presence of a quorum was established with the following roll call vote:

	Present	Absent
Doris Carter	X	
David Cole		X
Lowell Kruse	X	
Jeanne Patterson		X
Mary Beth Luna Wolf	X	
Kathryn Swan	X	
Gregory Upchurch	X	
Craig Van Matre	X	

Others present included Commissioner Robert Stein, Executive Assistant Laura Vedenhaupt, and President Mike Nietzel.

Executive Session

Kathy Swan made a motion **to go into closed session per RSMo 610.021(3) relating to “hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public governmental body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded.”**

Craig Van Matre seconded the motion, and the motion carried with the following roll call vote: Doris Carter – aye; Lowell Kruse – aye; Mary Beth Luna Wolf – aye; Kathy Swan – aye; Greg Upchurch – aye; and Craig Van Matre – aye.

Closed Session

Ms. Swan made a motion **to go into open session**. Mr. Greg Upchurch seconded the motion, and the motion carried with the following roll call vote: Doris Carter – aye; Lowell Kruse – aye; Mary Beth Luna Wolf – aye; Kathy Swan – aye; Greg Upchurch – aye; and Craig Van Matre – aye.

Open Session

Ms. Swan made a motion **to adjourn**. The motion carried with the following roll call vote: Doris Carter – aye; Lowell Kruse – aye; Mary Beth Luna Wolf – aye; Kathy Swan – aye; Greg Upchurch – aye; and Craig Van Matre – aye.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 am.

**COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF CONFERENCE CALL
May 19, 2010**

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) met at 9:00 am on Wednesday, May 19, 2010 via conference call.

Mr. Lowell Kruse, Chair, called the meeting to order. The presence of a quorum was established with the following roll call vote:

	Present	Absent
Doris Carter	X	
David Cole	X	
Lowell Kruse	X	
Jeanne Patterson		X
Mary Beth Luna Wolf	X	
Kathryn Swan	X	
Gregory Upchurch	X	
Craig Van Matre	X	

Others present included Commissioner Robert Stein, Executive Assistant Laura Vedenhaupt, and President Mike Nietzel.

CBHE/MDHE Next Steps

Interim Commissioner

Chair Kruse appointed Craig Van Matre, Mary Beth Luna Wolf, and Kathy Swan to a subcommittee for review of candidates for the position of interim commissioner. The subcommittee will make a recommendation to the full Board no later than mid-June.

Higher Education Initiatives / P-20 Agenda for FY 2011

Commissioner Stein advised that he had met with the Governor and provided documents outlining ideas for higher education initiatives and P-20 agendas for FY 2011. The governor was engaged in the discussion and had pertinent questions and comments concerning the role of community colleges and the importance of independent institutions and the proprietary sector. Areas of particular interest to the Governor were the extent to which local boards do not see the “big picture” (re: statewide needs) and issues or programs regarding student loan debt management.

President Nietzel stated that the governor’s office felt the conversation was very valuable and that it was helpful to see the scope of issues to be addressed. Commissioner Stein reinforced that there may be efficiencies and cost-savings that could be achieved without a Constitutional amendment.

MDHE Relocation

The MDHE will move to the Jefferson Building – where DESE is located – in the fall. This move may offer opportunities to integrate functional areas such as data. Commissioner Stein held an initial meeting with representatives of OA Facilities Management to discuss floor plans and space needs. A formal walkthrough will be conducted on May 25, 2010. MDHE will develop a draft plan by July 1st; the new commissioner will have an opportunity to review suggested revisions and submit a final floor plan to OA by August 1st.

Public Policy on Associate Degree Delivery

Commissioner Stein advised that there were growing tensions once again in the southeast region of the state. Southeast Missouri State University intends to submit a proposal to offer associate degrees at three off-site locations within the Three Rivers Community College (TRCC) voluntary service region. TRCC has already submitted its proposal for offering associate degrees in the same locations. The TRCC proposal is posted on the MDHE website for review and comment. It is important for the CBHE to take a leadership role as conflict resolution is one situation for which the Coordinating Board was designed to address.

Kathy Swan stated that such tensions are an opportunity for discussion. Institutional boards tend to be territorial and do not always act with the needs of the state in mind.

Executive Session

Mr. Upchurch made a motion **to go into closed session per RSMo 610.021(3) relating to “hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public governmental body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded.”**

Ms. Swan seconded the motion, and the motion carried with the following roll call vote: Doris Carter – aye; David Cole – aye; Lowell Kruse – aye; Mary Beth Luna Wolf – aye; Kathy Swan – aye; Greg Upchurch – aye; and Craig Van Matre – aye.

Closed Session

Mr. Upchurch made a motion **to go into open session**. Ms. Swan seconded the motion, and the motion carried with the following roll call vote: Doris Carter – aye; David Cole – aye; Lowell Kruse – aye; Mary Beth Luna Wolf – aye; Kathy Swan – aye; Greg Upchurch – aye; and Craig Van Matre – aye.

Ms. Luna-Wolf departed the call.

Open Session

Ms. Swan made a motion **to adjourn**. The motion carried with the following roll call vote: Doris Carter – aye; Lowell Kruse – aye; David Cole – aye; Kathy Swan – aye; Greg Upchurch – aye; and Craig Van Matre – aye.

Other

Mr. Upchurch asked about the pending term expirations of three Board members. Commissioner Stein advised that the members, if they choose, may continue to serve until such time as the Governor appoints replacements. Mr. Upchurch advised that he is also a member of the MOHELA board and expressed his willingness to continue to serve on both boards. Ms. Swan has also expressed her willingness to continue her service with the CBHE.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 am.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

FY 2011 Budget Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this item is to update the Board on the status of the state appropriations for the FY 2011 operating and capital budget. All budget bills have been passed by the General Assembly and await action by the Governor.

Department Budget – House Bill 3

The Truly Agreed and Finally Passed (TAFP) House Bill 2003 includes some cuts for the MDHE internal budget beyond the governor's recommendations for FY 2011. The governor's recommendations include some core reductions and a core transfer from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) that net to a reduction of \$17,020 in personal service and 1.0 FTE, and \$96,576 in expense and equipment. The FTE reduction is evenly split between general revenue and loan program funds and represents unused FTE authority. The TAFP bill includes additional expense and equipment cuts of \$11,511 (less than 2%).

With regard to the MDHE internal budget, the TAFP bill did not carry forward the FY 2010 expenditure restrictions put in place by the governor. On an annualized basis these restrictions total over \$171,548 (20%).

Student Financial Assistance Programs

Access Missouri

The TAFP version of HB 2003 includes a cut of \$13 million in the Access Missouri Program. This cut mirrors the FY 2010 withholding, meaning that the actual amount available for spending in FY 2011 is, at this point, the same as was available in FY 2010.

A+

The TAFP version of HB 2003 includes the A+ Program which will be administered by the MDHE beginning with the 2010-11 academic year. The appropriation includes a cut of \$2.9 million from the FY 2010 amount. This amount reflects an anticipated lapse since savings are expected to be achieved in this program due to an increase in the federal Pell Grant.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

Bright Flight

There were no changes to the appropriation level for the Bright Flight Program despite newly effective legislative provisions (in SB 389 from 2007) that increased the current maximum award amount for students scoring in the top three percent on the ACT or SAT and instituted a new award for students scoring in the fourth and fifth highest percentiles.

In addition, there was language added to the Bright Flight section of HB 2003 stating that the appropriation is only for awards of up to \$2,000 for students scoring in the top three percent on the ACT or SAT. This language could potentially conflict with new legislation passed this session (SB 733) that specifies that the maximum award amount shall be up to \$3,000 for these students if the appropriation is sufficient to fund more than \$2,000 for students in the top three percent.

Other MDHE Student Financial Aid Programs

HB 2003 provides for continued level funding for other MDHE-administered student aid programs. These are:

- Marguerite Ross Barnett Program, \$403,750;
- Kids' Chance Scholarship, \$27,750;
- Minority Teaching Student Scholarships, \$169,000;
- Minority and Underrepresented Environmental Literacy Program, \$82,964;
- Public Service Survivor Grant Program, \$100,000;
- Vietnam Veterans Survivors Scholarship Program, \$50,000; and
- the new Veteran's Survivors Grant Program, \$281,250.

College and University Operating Budgets

With regard to institutional operating budgets, the TAFP version of HB 2003 is consistent with the Governor's recommendations in that they reflect the agreement that in exchange for a commitment to receive a cut no greater than 5.2% from the FY 2010 appropriation level, each public college and university has agreed to not raise tuition or education-related fees for the 2010-11 academic year.

The FY 2011 budget represents the final year in which some general revenue (GR) in institutions' core budgets will be supplanted with federal budget stabilization (FBS) funds. This step is necessary to draw down those stabilization funds. For each institution, the TAFP appropriation equals each institution's proportional share of the remaining FBS money, plus the amount of GR necessary to bring the total back to within 5.2% of the FY 2010 appropriated level. The total amount of the remaining FBS funding that is included in the FY 2011 budget is approximately \$36 million.

Capital Improvements

There were no capital improvement appropriations for higher education in the FY 2011 budget.

Other Items

The House and Senate have made several changes to the Governor's FY 2010 core recommendations for items listed as University of Missouri-related.

- Missouri Telehealth Network – the TAFP bill includes a \$17,409 reduction from the governor's recommendation (10% of the general revenue remaining after the governor's reduction of approximately 25%).
- MOREnet – the TAFP carries forward the FY 2010 expenditure restriction of \$1,742,242 (20.3% of the amount remaining after the governor's recommended reduction of approximately 33%).
- University Hospitals and Clinics – the TAFP bill includes a \$939,437 reduction from the governor's recommendation (10% of the general revenue remaining after the governor's reduction of approximately 25%).
- Missouri Rehabilitation Center – the TAFP bill includes a reduction of \$1,148,652 (10%).
- Missouri Institute of Mental Health – the TAFP bill includes a \$500,000 reduction from the governor's recommendation (50% of the general revenue remaining after the governor's reduction of approximately 40%).
- Missouri Kidney Program – the TAFP bill includes a \$320,033 reduction from the governor's recommendation (10% of the general revenue remaining after the governor's reduction of approximately 40%).
- State Historical Society – the TAFP bill reflects the governor's reduction of \$230,000 (a reduction of approximately 16%).
- Spinal Cord Injury Research – same as FY 2010 (no change from Governor's recommendation).

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Sections 173.005(2), 173.030(7) RSMo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT(S)

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Capital Prioritization Guidelines Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

With the cooperation of representatives from COPHE, MCCA, and Linn State, MDHE staff has begun a review and revision of the CBHE's guidelines for prioritizing capital improvement projects. This agenda item provides an update on this project.

Background

Over the past few years, there has been a great deal of activity regarding the capital improvement needs of Missouri public higher education. This activity included the partial continuation of Lewis and Clark Discovery Initiative construction, the influx of ARRA funds that were at various times considered for capital improvement needs, the MDHE facility review process, and the work of the Joint Committee on Capital Improvements in evaluating capital improvement needs across state government and beyond, as well as persistent efforts to build support for and move forward with a statewide bond issue to fund capital projects.

During this time period, the needs of higher education institutions were often at the forefront of conversation. This is due in part to the historical neglect of these needs by the state, the incomplete status of the LCDI projects, and the importance of higher education facilities to economic development.

However, as these conversations broadened, increasingly questions were raised about the relative importance of higher education projects within higher education, and among all statewide capital improvement needs. In this context it was not helpful that in the previous few years, the Board had largely ceased in prioritizing higher education projects beyond compiling a list of institutional top priorities. At least part of the explanation for this deviation from previous practice was that the Board's existing guidelines for prioritizing capital projects were commonly considered to be outdated and in need of a thorough review.

For the FY 2010 budget request, the Board, using its existing guidelines, established a prioritized list of all institutional top priorities. While there was general agreement that the result of this process was reasonable and valid, there was also a general belief in the need for improvement in the underlying policy, and therefore in the value and utility of a prioritized list. Updating criteria and standards for prioritizing projects was seen as an important step in creating a viable prioritized list that could be used to secure available funding for higher education projects in competition with other statewide needs.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

Current Status

MDHE staff began work on evaluating and revising the policy guidelines with 14 sector representatives who were chosen by COPHE, MCCA, and Linn State.

The committee met on November 19, 2009, and discussion centered on the potential criteria, ideas for funding sources, and other areas of policy revision. The committee also discussed the scoring matrix used by MDHE staff in the production of the prioritized lists for the Joint Committee and the FY 2011 budget recommendations. In addition, the committee considered the possibility of utilizing a thematic priority for requests, such as a statewide request for science lab renovations, in addition to an annual prioritized list of top campus priorities.

There were basic agreements in terms of initial criteria that a project must meet in order to be eligible for ranking. These included the need to:

- Serve a non-auxiliary function. Athletic facilities, student housing, or parking lots for example, would not be eligible for state funding. The committee clarified that there should be some accommodation for facilities such as student unions, which may serve a dual purpose, with the non-auxiliary portion of a dual-use facility being eligible.
- Serve approved academic programs. The committee agreed that approval of an academic program must precede state funding for a facility designed to support a particular program.
- Be a part of a campus master plan or overall facility plan.

Additionally, the following key issues were identified as needing additional clarification in any new public policy on capital projects:

- The myriad of perspectives involving local matching funds. There is a customary rule that all community colleges must have a 50% match on all projects, and universities must have a 20% match on new construction. There is common agreement that there should be some additional discussion and sophistication added to parameters, levels, and other conditions surrounding matching funds.
- Questions about accounting and providing support for on-going operating costs, especially in requests for new construction. Currently, there is no mechanism by which the state provides additional operating funds for a new building. In the current fiscal environment it may be important to consider whether or not an institution can support additional operating costs associated with a proposed project, or if there is any wisdom in prioritizing projects that increase operational costs.

Next Steps

In light of the state's continued fiscal deterioration as well as the dedication of significant staff time and energy regarding the potential DESE/MDHE consolidation, there has not been a continued focus on this initiative since the February CBHE meeting. The appointment of an interim commissioner and clarification on intentions regarding the possibility of a renewed push for a merger from statewide leaders could provide an opportunity to reengage this process.

It should also be noted that the higher education community is keenly aware of the challenges in making a new policy operational as there is no reliable (or unreliable) source of state funding for capital projects. In addition, if a funding source were identified, competition would be fierce for those resources across all areas of state government, and higher education would not necessarily be the recipient. While the need for significant investment is commonly understood, the difficulty of actually securing funding for capital projects will likely present a greater challenge than developing an improved and agreed-upon prioritization policy.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 163.191, RSMo, State aid to community colleges

Chapter 33.220, RSMo, submission of annual appropriation requests

Section 173.020, RSMo, CBHE statutory responsibility to plan systematically for the state higher education system

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT(S)

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Final Summary of Legislation
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

Several higher education-related bills were passed by the Missouri legislature during the 2010 legislative session, including several bills that impact state financial aid programs, a bill to enhance the MOST College Savings Plan, and provisions to improve and protect research at higher education institutions.

The following bills were truly agreed and finally passed this session. As of May 28, 2010, these bills are under review by the Governor and have not yet been signed into law.

[SB 733 Pearce](#) (R-Warrensburg)

Bright Flight

SB 733 makes several changes with regard to the Bright Flight Program. These include extending the deferment period for certain students who enter the military, clarifying the distribution of funding among eligible students when the program is not fully funded, clarifying the eligibility of home-school students and GED recipients, and codifying current practice with regard to the timing of the determination of “cut scores”.

Access Missouri

SB 733 changes the maximum and minimum award amounts for Access Missouri scholarships, starting with the 2014-15 academic year. Beginning with that year, the maximum award will be \$2,850 for eligible students attending any four-year institution, with a minimum award of \$1,500. The maximum award for community college students is increased by \$300 to \$1,300. The bill also removes the sunset provision from this program (scheduled to sunset in 2013).

Open Records Law

SB 733 also creates a new section of law which provides that certain entities in which a public institution of higher education holds an ownership or membership interest will not be considered a public or quasi-public governmental body or otherwise be subject to the Sunshine Law. These provisions apply if the entity is primarily engaged in activities involving commercialization of the knowledge, research, or intellectual property of the institution or its faculty.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

[HB 2147 & 2261 Dan Brown](#) (R-Rolla)

This bill allows a student who is a dependent of a retired military member who relocates to Missouri within one year of the date of his or her parents' retirement from active duty to be exempt from the three-year attendance requirement for the A+ Schools Program. Current law provides this exemption for all active-duty military dependents.

[HB 1858 Zimmerman](#) (D-Olivette)

This bill would officially bring the Minority and Underrepresented Environmental Literacy Program from the Department of Natural Resources to the MDHE, and also move the Minority Teaching Scholarship Program currently assigned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to the MDHE.

[SB 772 Scott](#) (R-Lowry City)

This bill removes the minimum holding time regarding deposits in the Missouri Higher Education Savings (MO\$T) Program which is currently twelve months. This bill would also remove the sunset provision regarding this program.

[SB 987 Stouffer](#) (R-Napton)

This bill increases the award amount the University of Missouri's Board of Curators may award per project from the Spinal Cord Injury Fund from \$50,000 to \$250,000. Projects must advance knowledge of spinal cord injuries and congenital or acquired disease processes.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 160.545, RSMo, A+ scholarship program
Section 161.415, RSMo, Minority Teaching Scholarship Program
Section 166.420, RSMo, MO\$T Savings Program
Section 172.790, RSMo, Spinal Cord Injury Fund research projects
Chapter 173, RSMo, Department of Higher Education
Section 173.240, RSMo, Minority and Underrepresented Environmental Literacy Program
Section 173.250, RSMo, Bright Flight
Section 173.1105, RSMo, Access Missouri award amounts

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT

MDHE Legislative Update



Summary of Legislation Impacting Higher Education
--

[HB 1211](#) [Dusenberg](#) Changes the laws regarding the consent requirements for obtaining an abortion and creates the crime of coercing an abortion.

Remarks: This bill would make it a crime to knowingly coerce a woman into having an abortion by revoking or threatening to revoke a scholarship. This bill is similar to HBs 1327 and 2000.

Last Action: 1- 7-10 H Read second time

[HB 1224](#) [Smith-14](#) Establishes the Missouri National Guard and Missouri Reservists Family Education Grant Program.

Remarks: This bill would create a grant program to benefit the children and spouses of certain veterans. The program would be administered by the MDHE. Grants could be used at public institutions. Award amounts would be up to 100% of a student's tuition, \$4,000 per year for room and board, and \$1,000 a year for books.

Last Action: 2- 3-10 H Referred to House Committee on House-Veterans

[HB 1240](#) [Davis](#) Authorizes a state income tax deduction for tuition costs for any dependent of a resident taxpayer enrolled in any elementary or secondary school or postsecondary education institution in this state.

Remarks: This bill would allow Missouri taxpayers to deduct the full amount of tuition paid for postsecondary education from their adjusted gross income.

Last Action: 2-17-10 H Public hearing completed

[HB 1327](#) [Davis](#) Changes the laws regarding the consent requirements for obtaining an abortion and specifies that anyone performing or inducing an

abortion knowing that she has been coerced will be guilty of a class C felony.

Remarks: This bill would make it a crime to knowingly coerce a woman into having an abortion by revoking or threatening to revoke a scholarship. This bill is similar to HBs 1211 and 2000.

Last Action: 4-19-10 S Voted do pass as substitute from committee on Senate-Judiciary Civil/Criminal Jurisprudence

[HB 1354](#)

[Cunningham](#)

Allows members of the reserves of any branch of the United States armed forces to be eligible for a Missouri National Guard educational assistance grant.

Remarks: This bill would expand eligibility for a program established in 1994. The program is administered by the Missouri National Guard.

Last Action: 1- 7-10 H Read second time

[HB 1428](#)

[Biermann](#)

Allows students participating in the A+ Schools Program to serve as election judges in order to fulfill their community service requirement.

Last Action: 1- 7-10 H Read second time

[HB 1473](#)

[Thomson](#)

Revises the grade required for renewing an Access Missouri Scholarship.

Remarks: The initial version of this bill would allow students who achieve a 2.0 during their freshman year to receive an Access award during their sophomore year. They would be required to bring their GPA up to a 2.5 during their sophomore and junior years to maintain continued eligibility. When the bill was debated on the House floor, additional language was added equalizing Access Missouri award amounts starting in 2014 and removing the sunset clause from the Access Missouri statute.

Last Action: 5-11-10 S Set on the Senate Calendar

[HB 1494](#)

[Schaaf](#)

Removes the expiration date of August 28, 2011, from the provision which allows certain state university boards to convey or transfer real property without authorization from the General Assembly.

Last Action: 4- 1-10 H Third read and defeated (Vote: N: 149/Y: 14)

[HB 1504](#)

[Schaaf](#)

Expands eligibility for the Missouri Returning Heroes' Education Act

scholarship and specifies that homeschooled students must receive the same financial aid consideration as non-homeschooled students.

Remarks: This bill would change two aspects of the Missouri Returning Heroes Education Act (MRHEA). First, it would allow veterans who are Missouri residents at the time they access the benefit to receive the benefit. Current law requires the veteran to have been a Missouri resident at the time he or she entered the service. Second, it would allow veterans who served before or after September 11, 2001, to receive the benefit. Current law only applies to veterans who served after September 11, 2001. Please note that this might have a less significant impact that one might first assume because the benefit must be used within 10 years of the date a veteran is discharged. The original version of the bill also included a provision that would have required home-schooled students to be treated the same as school-schooled students for purposes of financial aid, but that provision was not included in the committee substitute approved by the House Higher Education Committee. ** The House Higher Education Committee heard public testimony about this bill on 2/16. Other than the sponsor, no one spoke for or against the bill. MDHE staff testified for informational purposes to answer some questions raised during the hearing. Committee members had questions about how the MRHEA works and how many students the changes proposed in this bill would impact. Committee members also had several questions about the need for the language pertaining to home-schooled students.

Last Action: 3- 4-10 H Voted do pass as substitute from committee on House-Higher Education

[HB 1511](#)

[Flook](#)

Establishes the Missouri Science and Innovation Reinvestment Act and the Missouri Science and Innovation Authority.

Last Action: 1-12-10 H Public hearing completed

[HB 1619](#)

[Storch](#)

Establishes the Twenty-first Century Scholars Program.

Remarks: This bill would create a new scholarship program. It would require students enrolled 8th grade in public or private schools in Missouri and who are eligible for the free or reduced lunch program to agree in writing to achieve and maintain certain academic and citizenship standards. Those students would receive scholarships that could be used to attend a public or private institution of higher education. Award amounts would not exceed the resident tuition rate and mandatory fees for the program in which the student is enrolled at a public institution. The program would be administered by the

MDHE.

Last Action: 1-14-10 H Read second time

[HB 1712](#)

[Roorda](#)

Allows employees of any public body to form and join labor organizations to collectively bargain regarding salaries and other conditions of employment.

Remarks: Current state law generally allows that employees of public bodies have the right to join unions and engage in collective bargaining -- with a few exceptions, including "all teachers of all Missouri schools, colleges and universities." This bill would remove the exceptions, allowing many more employees of public bodies to unionize and collectively bargain. This bill is similar to SB 761.

Last Action: 1-20-10 H Read second time

[HB 1773](#)

[Schupp](#)

Allows the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint a student to the University of Missouri Board of Curators.

Remarks: This bill would permit -- but not require -- the appointment of a voting student member of the Board of Curators.

Last Action: 1-25-10 H Read second time

[HB 1812](#)

[Kingery](#)

Changes the amounts of financial assistance awards from the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program.

Remarks: The changes in this bill would not take effect until the 2015-16 academic year. Starting in that year, award amounts would be \$300-1,250 for students at community colleges and \$1,500-2,850 for students at public or private four-year institutions and Linn State. This bill is similar to SB 784.

Last Action: 4-14-10 H Set on the House Calendar

[HB 1829](#)

[Walsh](#)

Establishes the Public Employee Bargaining Act which allows public employees to form, join, or assist a labor organization for the purpose of collective bargaining.

Remarks: This bill would allow public employees to unionize and engage in collective bargaining. "Public employees" is broadly defined and may include public college and university employees.

		Last Action: 1-27-10 H Read second time
HB 1843	Holsman	Prohibits a higher education institution from charging a Missouri resident who is a full-time student a tuition rate that exceeds the amount charged when the student enrolls for the next five years.
		Last Action: 1-28-10 H Read second time
HB 1858	Zimmerman	Transfers the administrative responsibility of the Minority and Underrepresented Environmental Literacy Program and the committee which administers the program to the Department of Higher Education.
		Last Action: 5-14-10 H Truly Agreed to and Finally Passed
HB 1872	Schoeller	Establishes the Fair Influence in Government Act which prohibits the use of public funds for lobbying purposes.
		Remarks: This bill would prohibit state agencies, political subdivisions, and private entities that receive state funds from using public resources to pay lobbyists. It would also prohibit state agencies and political subdivisions from using public resources to pay dues to organizations the purpose of which includes lobbying.
		Last Action: 2- 4-10 H Public hearing completed
HB 1919	Webber	Authorizes an income tax credit for donations to the capital improvements fund of any public university in Missouri for its nursing or allied health professions programs.
		Last Action: 2- 3-10 H Read second time
HB 1956	Schoemehl	Authorizes an income tax deduction for certain individuals for 100% of tuition and fees for up to the last 18 hours required to complete his or her bachelor degree from a public four-year university.
		Remarks: This bill would create a tax deduction for people already have some college credit and who go back to school to complete their degrees.
		Last Action: 5- 6-10 H Voted do pass from committee on House-Higher Education
HB 1999	Pratt	Specifies that if Missouri loses a Congressional district following the 2010 redistricting, the ninth member of the University of Missouri Board of Curators will be a student curator with voting right.

		Remarks: The language in this bill requires -- not permits -- that a voting member of the Board of Curators be a student.
		Last Action: 2- 8-10 H Read second time
HB 2000	Pratt	Changes the laws regarding the consent requirements for obtaining an abortion and creates the crime of coercing an abortion.
		Remarks: This bill would make it a crime to knowingly coerce a woman into having an abortion by revoking or threatening to revoke a scholarship. This bill is similar to HBs 1211 and 1327.
		Last Action: 2-25-10 H Superseded by - see HB 1327
HB 2003	Icet	Appropriates money for the expenses, grants, refunds, and distributions of the Department of Higher Education.
		Last Action: 4-28-10 S Truly Agreed to and Finally Passed
HB 2066	Morris	Establishes the Missouri Clean Energy Technology Center.
		Remarks: This bill would create the Missouri Clean Energy Technology Center, the purposes of which would include promoting research and workforce training in clean energy in the state's colleges and vo-tech schools. The center would be run by a board of directors, the membership of which would include several representatives of higher education. The center would offer funds through competitive grant programs. This bill is similar to SB689.
		Last Action: 2- 9-10 H Read second time
HB 2147	Brown-149	Exempts certain students who are dependents of recently retired military personnel from the three-year attendance requirement under the A+ Program.
		Last Action: 5- 3-10 S Truly Agreed to and Finally Passed
HB 2227	Lampe	Removes the exemption for police, deputy sheriffs, State Highway patrolmen, members of the Missouri National Guard, and teachers from the right to form and join labor unions and to collectively bargain.
		Last Action: 2-24-10 H Read second time
HB 2278	Hobbs	Increases the maximum amount that the University of Missouri

Board of Curators may annually award for a grant for the investigation of spinal cord injuries and other specific disease processes.

Last Action: 3- 3-10 H Read second time

[HB 2326](#) [Gatschenberger](#) Requires public institutions of higher education within the state to adopt policies for the random and for-cause drug testing of faculty, staff, other employees, and applicants for employment.

Last Action: 3-17-10 H Read second time

[HB 2349](#) [Nolte](#) Specifies that any employee of the University of Missouri will be able to take a leave of absence because of military deployment or election to public office.

Last Action: 3-19-10 H Read second time

[HB 2460](#) [Dieckhaus](#) Authorizes an income tax deduction of up to \$250 for the amount of payments made on a student loan to a lending institution for the taxpayer's education expenses at a Missouri college or university.

Last Action: 4- 8-10 H Referred to House Committee on House-Elementary and Secondary Education

[HCR 24](#) [Hoskins-121](#) Encourages students and faculty to promote international education at Missouri colleges and universities.

Last Action: 3-16-10 H Voted do pass from committee on House-Higher Education

[HJR 77](#) [Kelly](#) Proposes a constitutional amendment authorizing the General Assembly to issue bonds to fund higher education improvements, construction, landscaping, and land purchases.

Remarks: The bond package would total \$800 million to be used for state building projects. The bill specifies that no less than 15% of the bond proceeds must be allocated to community college buildings. No more than \$250 million may be appropriated for projects other than higher education projects.

Last Action: 1-19-10 H Read second time

[SB 689](#) [Wright-Jones](#) Jones-Creates the Missouri Clean Energy Technology Center.

Remarks: This bill would create the Missouri Clean Energy Technology Center, the purposes of which would include promoting research and workforce training in clean energy in the state's colleges and vo-tech schools. The center would be run by a board of directors, the membership of which would include several representatives of higher education. The center would offer funds through competitive grant programs. This bill is similar to HB 2066 filed by Rep. Morris.

Last Action: 1-19-10 S Referred to Senate Committee on Senate-Commerce, Energy and the Environment

[SB 732](#)

[Cunningham](#)

Requires public higher education institutions to annually report on steps taken to ensure intellectual diversity.

Remarks: This is the "Emily Brooker Higher Education Sunshine Act." It would require public colleges and universities to submit annual reports to the CBHE regarding steps each institution has taken to promote intellectual diversity. The bill contains several areas that institutions' reports may address. It also requires institutions to notify students that measures to promote intellectual diversity are in place and how to report alleged violations.

Last Action: 1-19-10 S Referred to Senate Committee on Senate-Education

[SB 733](#)

[Pearce](#)

Modifies provisions of the Bright Flight Scholarship Program and Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program.

Remarks: Under current law, all students who defer their Bright Flight awards must return to school within 27 months. This bill would allow students who enter the military to defer Bright Flight awards as long as they are in the military, so long as they return to school within 6 months of their separation from the military. ** The Senate Education Committee conducted a hearing on this bill on 2/24. MDHE staff testified in favor of the bill, as did a representative of a veterans' organization. Committee members did not have significant questions about the bill, but did suggest that it may become a vehicle for broader changes to the Bright Flight statute, including how awards should be distributed in a year when insufficient funds are appropriated to fully fund the program.

Last Action: 5-12-10 H Emergency Clause Adopted (Vote: Y: 141/N: 9)

[SB 761](#)

[Green](#)

Institutes procedures for public employee collective bargaining.

Remarks: Current state law generally allows that employees of public bodies have the right to join unions and engage in collective bargaining --

with a few exceptions, including "all teachers of all Missouri schools, colleges and universities." This bill would remove the exceptions, allowing many more employees of public bodies to unionize and collectively bargain. This bill is similar to HB 1712.

Last Action: 1-19-10 S Referred to Senate Committee on Senate-Small Bus./Insurance/Industry

[SB 772](#)

[Scott](#)

Removes the minimum time for holding investments in the Missouri higher education savings program.

Last Action: 5- 3-10 H Truly Agreed to and Finally Passed

[SB 778](#)

[Pearce](#)

Changes an expiration date on state universities being able to convey land without authorization from the General Assembly and allows the Governor to convey certain state property.

Last Action: 5-14-10 H Set on the House Calendar

[SB 783](#)

[Justus](#)

Provides that certain aliens will receive in-state tuition at college and universities that meet certain requirements.

Remarks: This bill parallels Kansas' DREAM Act. ** The Senate Education Committee conducted a public hearing on this bill on 2/24. Other than the sponsor, no one spoke in favor of the bill, although several students showed their support for the bill by raising their hands. No one spoke against the bill. Committee members' questions were very limited.

Last Action: 2-24-10 S Hearing conducted

[SB 784](#)

[Schaefer](#)

Changes amounts of financial assistance awards for the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program.

Remarks: The changes in this bill would not take effect until the 2014-15 academic year. Starting in that year, award amounts would be \$300-1,250 for students at community colleges and \$1,500-2,850 for students at public or private four-year institutions and Linn State. This bill is similar to HB 1812. ** The Senate Education Committee conducted a public hearing on this bill on 2/17. Students and college/university officials filled the hearing room and an overflow area set up for them in the hall. Supporters of the bill included students who receive Access, who testified about the importance of the awards to students like themselves, and about the fairness of giving students at private institutional higher awards. Administrators discussed the political agreements

surrounding the initial passage of the program, as well as the fairness issues raised by students. Students and administrators from independent institutions talked about the importance of Access to themselves and their institutions. MDHE staff also testified against the bill, indicating that the CBHE currently stands by the process it used to develop the original Access Missouri proposal in 2007. MDHE staff also indicated that a group of public and private institution leaders will be meeting to discuss a compromise approach to moving forward. ** When the Senate Education Committee voted this bill out of committee on 2/24, the committee's chair specifically mentioned the meeting MDHE staff referred to during public testimony and indicated that the results of that meeting might inform the bill as it moves forward.

Last Action: 3-24-10 S Set on the Senate Calendar

[SB 895](#)

[Dempsey](#)

Establishes the Missouri Science and Innovation Reinvestment Act.

Last Action: 4- 1-10 S Set on the Senate Calendar

[SB 899](#)

[Pearce](#)

Establishes the Missouri Promise Program to provide financial awards to students pursuing higher education at certain institutions.

Remarks: This bill would expand the A+ scholarship program to include qualified students who graduate from all public high schools. The program would be renamed Missouri Promise. It would also create -- subject to appropriations -- a "completer scholarship" for students who use Missouri Promise to get an associate's degree and then go on to a public university. Those students would receive awards of either their actual tuition or the average tuition at a public university, whichever is lower. The two-year program would be fully funded before the four-year portion became operative. The bill would also change the priority of scholarship programs. Under current law, Access Missouri is the payer of last resort. Under this bill, Missouri Promise would be the payer of last resort. The MDHE would administer Missouri Promise.

Last Action: 3-31-10 S Committee hearing cancelled Senate-Education

[SB 907](#)

[Rupp](#)

Creates the Early High School Graduation Scholarship Program for public high school students who graduate from high school early.

Remarks: The scholarship would be for a student's first year of higher education and could be used at any type of higher education institution. The award amount would be the lesser of the student's actual tuition and required fees or 80% of the state aid attributable to that student at the school district from which the student

graduated. That district would receive an amount equal to 20% of the state aid they would have received for that student. The scholarship program would be administered by the MDHE. ** When the Senate Education Committee heard public testimony about this bill on 2/24, MDHE staff spoke in favor of it. No one else testified for or against the bill. Committee members had questions about the fiscal impact of the program.

Last Action: 3-17-10 S Voted do pass from committee on Senate-Education

[SB 936](#)

[Pearce](#)

Establishes the Missouri Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Initiative within the Department of Higher Education.

Remarks: This initiative would provide matching funds for public colleges and universities that engage in certain activities that promote engagement in STEM fields.

Last Action: 3-24-10 S Voted do pass from committee on Senate-Education

[SB 939](#)

[Barnitz](#)

Modifies the use of the Consumer Price Index to measure tuition rates for public institutions of higher education.

Last Action: 3- 3-10 S Voted do pass from committee on Senate-Education

[SB 963](#)

[Shoemyer](#)

Transfers the administration of the Minority Teaching Scholarship and the Minority and Underrepresented Environmental Literacy Program to the Department of Higher Education.

Last Action: 3-29-10 H Read second time

[SB 987](#)

[Stouffer](#)

Increases the statutory award amount for research projects funded by the University of Missouri Board of Curators.

Last Action: 5-11-10 H Truly Agreed to and Finally Passed

[SB 1057](#)

[Shields](#)

Reorganizes certain entities, divisions and departments within state government.

Last Action: 4-29-10 S Hearing conducted

[SCR 31](#)

[Pearce](#)

Encourages students and faculty to promote international education at Missouri colleges and universities.

Last Action: 5-13-10 H Truly Agreed to and Finally Passed

[SJR 44](#)

[Shields](#)

Proposes a constitutional amendment to eliminate the department of elementary and secondary education and the department of higher education and instead create a new department of education. Changes title of bill.

Last Action:

5-11-10 H Executive Session - No Action Taken

[SJR 45](#)

[Shields](#)

Modifies the State Board of Education and requires the advice and consent of the Senate for the appointment of the Commissioner of Education.

Last Action:

5-11-10 H Executive Session - No Action Taken

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Mission Review Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The purpose of mission review is to ensure that the Missouri system of higher education is responsive to the state's needs; is focused, balanced, and cost-effective; and is characterized by programs of high quality as demonstrated by student performance and program outcomes. This item provides an update on the review of the mission of public institutions by staff at the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE).

Background

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) has statutory responsibility to conduct mission reviews of public institutions every five years. After several years of inaction due to limited staffing, the CBHE reintroduced mission review in December 2008 as a phased collaborative initiative between MDHE staff and all public institutions. In February 2010, MDHE staff completed the first phase of the mission review and submitted a draft summary to each public institution for response and to solicit additional information.

Current Status

To date, the MDHE has received responses to the draft summary from twenty institutions. Many institutions agreed with the findings of the draft summary or requested only minor corrections or revisions. Some institutions provided additional information to clarify or amend preliminary findings contained in the draft summary. MDHE staff is engaged in discussion with institutions to address concerns and, where necessary, to revise the summary of findings to ensure the final report is fair, accurate, and comprehensive.

MDHE staff has completed a draft Mission Review Performance Report for the four-year institutions and Linn State Technical College. Each institution reviewed and commented on its draft report. Many submitted additional materials that improved the comprehensiveness of these reports. MDHE staff used all documents submitted by the institutions, as well as the institutions' responses, to compile a final institutional report.

A draft summary report of recommendations across all four-year institutions and Linn State along with individual mission review summaries are on file at the MDHE offices and are being reviewed internally. The final report will be shared with the institutions before it is submitted to the CBHE.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

Review of Community College Sector

During consultations with the community colleges about the draft mission review report of each institution, MDHE staff discovered that the colleges recently developed a common mission statement for the sector. The new statement (see attachment) is more comprehensive than the one that was on file with the MDHE and addresses issues that were not previously included in the CBHE-approved mission statement for community colleges.

At the request of the Missouri Community College Association (MCCA), the MDHE has agreed to conduct an analysis of community colleges as a sector. This review builds upon the reviews that were completed of individual two-year institutions and uses the proposed community college mission statement as a foundation. MDHE staff is currently conducting this analysis and will prepare a separate Mission Review Performance Report for the community colleges as a sector. As with the four-year sector and Linn State Technical College, this report will be shared with the institutions before being submitted to the CBHE for review.

Next Steps

MDHE staff will prepare a final mission review report based on the institutional summaries and the corporate review of the community college sector. Staff will submit the report along with findings and recommendations to the CBHE at its September 9, 2010, meeting.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.030 (7), RSMo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is an information item only.

ATTACHMENT

Proposed Community College Mission Statement

Proposed Community College Mission Statement

As comprehensive open access institutions of higher learning, Missouri's community colleges serve the diverse learning, workforce, and economic development needs of their communities. This is accomplished through, but not limited to, the following:

- Associate degrees with strong general education curriculums that meet Missouri general education requirements preparing students for transfer and further study
- Career and technical programs and technical/paraprofessional training for credit (via certificates and AAS degrees) that prepare students for entry into or advancement in the workforce and/or further study
- Developmental course work and support services for learners who are underprepared for college-level work
- Workforce training and certificates that upgrade skills or support retraining in both credit and non-credit formats
- Dynamic, customized training programs for business/industry in both credit and non-credit formats
- A vast array of support services for students (e.g., academic advisement, assessment, articulation, career planning and job placement, counseling, library and learning resources, and financial aid) to facilitate the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to achieve their educational, professional, and personal goals
- Globalized curricula, international exchange programs, and study abroad opportunities designed to develop competencies desired in a global economy
- Distance learning opportunities
- Programs, courses, and services for special student groups, such as student with disabilities, student with limited English proficiency, and talented and gifted persons
- Continuing education courses, including professional development, recreation, and personal development courses
- Articulated course work, dual credit, and dual enrollment opportunities for students who are prepared for college-level work
- Ongoing assessment of students, programs and services
- Advisory boards for programs and services and a broad range of opportunities for community engagement
- Assistance to small businesses through business development, incubation, and delivery of training for new and existing employees in small business settings
- Off-campus and on-campus learning experiences that prepare students to achieve career and educational goals and to succeed in a global environment

May 5, 2010

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Imperatives for Change Performance Report
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

Imperatives for Change: Building a Higher Education System for the 21st Century (IFC) serves as the statewide coordinated plan to promote improvement in and establish public reporting about priorities for Missouri's higher education system. The intent of this item is to present a summary of key findings from the first annual performance report of IFC data which will be presented to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) for approval in August 2010 and to identify next steps in publication of the annual performance report. This item will also provide an update of additional performance measures selected by institutions.

Background

The adoption of IFC in July 2008 by the CBHE was the culmination of more than two years of consensus building with institutional presidents and chancellors. IFC addresses three major strategic goals:

- Increase Educational Attainment
- Produce a Globally Competitive Workforce
- Increase Shared Responsibility for Investment, Stewardship, and Accountability

IFC also includes several objectives and indicators (measures) for each strategic issue. Of the 50 IFC indicators, last year's baseline report presented data for 38 indicators for which data was available at the time. Over the past year, MDHE staff has continued to work with institutional representatives to refine and develop new methodologies, implement new data collection, and identify target goals for sector and statewide performance. Further information on IFC and the prior year baseline report may be found on the MDHE website (<http://www.dhe.mo.gov/ifc.shtml>).

Senate Bill 389 (2007) mandated the identification, definition, and reporting of two institutional performance measures by each of the state's public institutions. Attachment A provides a brief summary of updated data detailing these measures.

Attachment B is the coordinated plan, *Imperatives for Change*, which is provided for reference in addition to the Baseline Report and its supporting materials.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

Summary of Findings

- Missouri experiences only moderate degree attainment and has seen little to no improvement in recent years.
- The higher education community has increased completions in high demand fields, collaborated with the business community to train workers for jobs that currently exist, and expanded commitment to research and public service.
- While investment from the state has seen slight increases in prior years, Missouri higher education still remains among the lowest funded states in the country.

Goal 1. Increase Educational Attainment

Over the last decade Missouri consistently ranked below the national average (28th in 2008-09) with only 27 percent of all 18-64 year olds holding a bachelor's degree. Missouri's young adult population (25-34) has only slightly higher attainment, 29 percent, and still lags behind the national average. While Missouri's degree production has increased by 13 percent since 2002, the average US state has increased by 18 percent.

Postsecondary participation, persistence, and graduation rates remain essentially stable:

- **Participation** -- Roughly two-thirds of recent Missouri public high school graduates enroll in postsecondary education the fall semester following graduation.
- **Persistence** -- In 2008 Missouri mirrored the national average with 71 percent of full-time freshmen students from the prior year re-enrolling at the same institution.
- **Graduation** -- Among students enrolling at a public 4-year institution in 2003-04, 53 percent had graduated with a baccalaureate degree by 2008-09. Among public 2-year students in 2006-07, 21 percent had completed by 2008-09, with another 18 percent transferring to another institution.

Increasing degree attainment is a critical factor in creating a more educated citizenry, improving quality of life and providing the state with a globally competitive workforce. Missouri continues to face significant challenges in this area. Missouri must encourage students to enroll and then persist throughout the educational process in order to increase the educational capital of the state. Missouri can also improve degree attainment by ensuring more Missourians are prepared and can afford college *before* setting foot on campus. The number of recent Missouri public high school graduates who required remedial education has increased over the past decade, with 37 percent not ready for college level coursework. Education fees have increased more than 73 percent for Missouri public institutions in the past eight years. While Missouri has made significant investments in state financial aid through the Access Missouri program (\$92,582,926 in FY2009), among the 67,900 freshmen who filed a FAFSA in 2008-09, and were otherwise qualified to receive Access Missouri funds, over 40,000 (59%) still failed to file before the April 1st deadline.

Goal 2. Produce a Globally Competitive Workforce

Missourians are responding to the rapidly changing global economy through their selection of degrees in health practitioner, STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and other critical fields.

- Health practitioner -- Over the past six years Missouri has increased its certificates and degrees awarded in health practitioner fields by 56 percent.
- STEM -- Missouri's public four-year institutions have increased their science, technology, engineering, and mathematics degrees awarded by 14 percent over the past year.
- Critical fields -- Completions in critical high demand employment fields have increased 10 percent in the last year and 23 percent over the past six years.

Higher education provides individuals with the skills and credentials necessary to increase their personal income. Missourians with a bachelor's degree earn 57% (\$16,000 annually) more than those with only high school diplomas.

In an effort to expand their resources beyond those provided by student and state support, Missouri's public institutions of higher education have a commitment to research and public service. Last year they received \$1.4 billion in external grants and contracts, a seven percent increase over the last five years. These external revenue streams account for 17.5 percent of public university budgets. In the same period, institutions have also increased their expenditures on research and development by 20 percent.

To provide students with valuable experience before entering the work-force, Missouri's public two-year schools engage in job training partnerships with Missouri businesses. In 2008 more than 44,000 Missourians enrolled in new job training, customized training and related training programs. In the past three years 38 percent (13,877) more students participated in new job customized and related training programs.

Goal 3. Increase Shared Responsibility for Investment, Stewardship and Accountability

Missouri higher education experienced dramatic withholdings in FY2002 and cutbacks in FY2003. While there have been incremental increases in state appropriations for higher education since then, it is only in FY2010 that appropriations have reached the prior funding levels. At just over one billion dollars in FY2010 this investment represents 11.9 percent of total state revenue, slightly higher than previous years but significantly lower than the high point of over 17 percent in the 1980s. Missouri higher education consistently ranks among the least funded states in the country. In FY 2009, the state ranked 43rd in the country in appropriations for higher education per student FTE, 42nd per \$1,000 of personal income and 47th per capita.

Conclusion

Imperatives for Change is an essential tool for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of higher education in Missouri. Its robust data are available to education leaders and policy makers who wish to make targeted improvements in the state's performance on the three goals of IFC. It is

clear that much work remains to be done to move Missouri above average performance in higher education.

Next Steps

MDHE will present the complete IFC Performance Report in August 2010. This document will consist of a brief summary brochure, a short assessment and presentation of data, and an extensive fact book of associated data. The primary audience will be elected officials and the Missouri public. More detailed information will be available electronically through links for those who want to drill down on specific initiatives. Additionally, MDHE staff has leveraged IFC data indicators to inform an evolving higher education performance dashboard for the governor's office which will be integrated into the final Performance Report documentation. This dashboard relies upon statewide goals for critical measures of higher education performance. These statewide goals are informed by an extensive consultation with institutional representatives.

MDHE staff will work with institutions and with other partners to prioritize work on the few remaining indicators for which no data are currently available and for which new data collections might potentially be required in order to include these indicators in future reporting.

Finally, the *Imperatives for Change* baseline report provided a new framework for the annual report to the Governor and General Assembly which will be continued with additional Performance Report data.

Conclusion

Findings from the first annual *Imperatives for Change* Performance Report highlight Missouri's current challenges and failure to improve in recent years. MDHE staff looks forward to working with postsecondary institutions and other P-20 partners to address the critical needs of the state and opportunities for growth. The postsecondary community must identify action-steps to address these challenges and improve the quality of higher education, student learning, and the educational capital of Missouri.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.1006.1 (1), RSMo. Coordinating board's responsibilities include work with public institutions in the identification and reporting of institutional performance measures.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Institutional Performance Measures Summary
Attachment B: *Imperatives for Change: Building a Higher Education System for the 21st Century*

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change		
Crowder College	1C4	Developmental Enrollee Success Rate	Students who completed the highest developmental classes in English who also successfully passed the first college level English class	2007 52.3%	2008 59.9%	↑		
			Students who completed the highest developmental classes in Math who also successfully passed the first college level Math class	69.2%	59.1%	↓		
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Students who completed degrees or certificates within three years	2005 Cohort 31.2%	2006 Cohort 24.6%	↓		
			Students who transferred to a four-year institution within three years	14.5%	17.3%	↑		
	East Central College	2AA	Job Placement	Career/technical program graduates from who were employed within 180 days of graduation.	2007 79.7%	2008 79%	↓	
3A1		Student Success Rate	Students who completed degrees or certificates within three years	2005 Cohort 23.1%	2006 Cohort 23.4%	↑		
			Students who transferred to a four-year institution within three years	25.1%	16.1%	↓		
Harris-Stowe State University	1AB	Ethnicity of Degrees Conferred	Total Degrees Conferred	2007-08		2008-09	↑	
			African-American	123		106	↑	
			Caucasian	95	77%	85	80%	↓
			Other	25	20%	19	18%	↓
				3	2%	2	2%	↓

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change
Harris-Stowe State University	2E1	High Impact Learning Participation	Undergraduate students who engaged in at least one "high-impact" learning experience.	Data Not Available	31.5%	↓
Jefferson College	1C1	Student Learning	<i>Arts and Sciences students scoring at or above expectations on ACT-CAAP:</i>	<i>2007-08</i>	<i>2008-09</i>	
			Reading	90.0%	49.5%	↓
			Writing	95.0%	78.0%	↓
			Math	90.0%	72.0%	↓
			Science	83.0%	68.0%	↓
			<i>Arts and Sciences students scoring at or above expectations on COMPASS-CAAP:</i>			
			Reading	83.0%	88.0%	↑
			Writing	65.0%	70.0%	↑
			Math	91.0%	61.0%	↓
			<i>CTE students on the WORKKEYS Assessment:</i>	<i>2007-08</i>	<i>2008-09</i>	
			Gold Career Readiness Certificate	36.9%	42.6%	↑
			Silver Career Readiness Certificate	49.3%	44.3%	↓
			Gold or Silver Career Readiness Certificates	86.2%	86.9%	↑
				<i>2005 Cohort</i>	<i>2006 Cohort</i>	
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Students who completed degrees or certificates within three years	30.3%	32.3%	↑
			Students who transferred to a four-year institution within three years	18.2%	15.3%	↓

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline		Follow-up		Change
Lincoln University	1AB	Ethnicity of Degrees Conferred	Total Degrees Conferred	2007-08		2008-09		
			African-American	454		393		↑
			Asian	115	25%	104	26%	↓
			Caucasian	5	1%	4	1%	↑
			Hispanic	261	57%	250	64%	↓
			Native American	4	1%	8	2%	↓
			Non-Resident	4	1%	1	0%	↓
			Unknown	53	12%	20	5%	↓
	1D2	Enrollment	Total Enrollment	2007-08		2008-09		
			African-American	3156		3109		↓
			Asian	1,158	37%	1154	37%	↓
			Caucasian	27	1%	26	1%	↓
			Hispanic	1,764	56%	1712	54%	↑
			Native American	37	1%	38	1%	↓
			Non-Resident	13	0%	12	0%	↑
Unknown			109	3%	116	4%	↑	
Linn State Technical College	1A3	Job Placement	Career/technical program graduates from who were employed within 180 days of graduation.	2008-07		2008-09		↓
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Students who completed degrees or certificates within three years	2008-07		2008-09		↑
			Students who transferred to a four-year institution within three years	47.5%		50.5%		↓

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change
Metropolitan Community College	1A3	Job Placement	Career/technical program graduates from who were employed within 180 days of graduation.	2007-08 60%	2008-09 62%	↑
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Students who completed degrees or certificates within three years	2004 Cohort 12.0%	2005 Cohort 20.8%	↑
			Students who transferred to a four-year institution within three years	12.2%	12.3%	↑
Mineral Area College	1CA	Student Satisfaction Rate	Spring graduate satisfaction with the institution on a five-point scale	2009 4.20	2010 4.27	↑
			Spring graduate satisfaction with their program on a five-point scale	4.03	4.04	↑
	1C3	Licensure and Certification Pass Rates	Graduates who pass licensure and certification exams.	2009 85%	2010 89%	↑
Missouri Southern State University	2E1	High Impact Learning Participation	Undergraduate completers who participated in one or more "high-impact" experiential learning components prior to graduation.	2008 68%	2009 68.0%	
	1AC	Persistence Rate	Students who completed at least 24 credit hours with a 2.0 GPA or better during their first two years of study	2006-07	2007-08	
			<i>Full-time</i>	62%	Not Yet Available	
			<i>Part-time</i>	36%		

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change
Missouri State University - West Plains	1AC	Persistence Rate	<i>Full-time</i>	2007-08 57%	2008-09 59%	↑
			<i>Part-time</i>	2007-08 58%	2008-09 54%	↓
	1C1	Student Learning	Average composite score students achieved on Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP)	2007-08 61.0%	2008-09 60.8%	↓
Missouri Western State University	2E1	High Impact Learning Participation	Undergraduate students who engaged in at least one "high-impact" learning experience prior to graduation	Fall 2008 28%	Fall 2009 41.9%	↑
			Undergraduate students who engaged in at least one applied learning experience prior to graduation	89%	87%	
	2A1	Collaborative Partnerships	Collaborative partnerships to enhance student experience and improve regional economic development.	2008 333	2009 Not Yet Available	
Moberly Area Community College	1AC	Persistence Rate	<i>Full-time</i>	2007-08 36%	2008-09 35%	↓
			<i>Part-time</i>	2007-08 53%	2008-09 86%	↑
	1C3	Licensure and Certification Pass Rates	Graduates who pass licensure and certification exams.	2007-08 96.0%	2008-09 95.6%	↓

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change
North Central Missouri College	1C4	Developmental Enrollee Success Rate	Students who completed the highest developmental classes in English who also successfully passed the first college level English class	2005 Cohort 58.1%	2006 Cohort 70.7%	↑
			Students who completed the highest developmental classes in Math who also successfully passed the first college level Math class	70.6%	78.8%	↑
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Students who completed associate degrees or certificates within six years	2005 Cohort 39.0%	2006 Cohort 45.2%	↑
			Transfer	16.2%	21.7%	↑
Northwest Missouri State University	1C1	Student Learning	Students who scored at or above the 50th percentile on the MAPP	2007-08 69.0%	2008-09 64.1%	↓
			Students who completed bachelor's degrees within six years	2001 Cohort 52.1%	2002 Cohort 51.4%	↓
			Transfer	33.1%	31.6%	↓

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change			
Ozarks Technical Community College	2AA	Job Placement	Career/technical program graduates from who were employed within 180 days of graduation.	2007-08	2008-09				
				71.7%	68%	↓			
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Students who completed degrees or certificates within three years	2007-08	2008-09				
18.6%				16.1%	↓				
			Students who transferred to a four-year institution within three years	2007-08	2008-09	↓			
				2008	2009				
Southeast Missouri State University	2E1	High Impact Learning Participation	Undergraduate student graduates who had completed an experiential learning course this academic year.	1365	93.8%	1432	95.9%		
				Academic and Career Planning	Students who completed course work designed to provide career planning assistance:	2007-08	2008-09		
						Freshmen	75.7%	73.2%	
						Sophomores	77.2%	73.5%	
						Juniors	50.2%	43.4%	
Seniors	100.0%	100.0%							
State Fair Community College	1AC	Persistence Rate	<i>Full-time</i>	2007-08	2008-09	↑			
				61%	58%	↓			
	1C4	Developmental Enrollee Success Rate	Students who completed the highest developmental classes in English who also successfully passed the first college level English class	<i>Part-time</i>					
				36%	31%	↓			
				2006	2007				
				<i>Cohort</i>	<i>Cohort</i>				
				67.5%	57.3%	↓			

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change
State Fair Community College	1C4	Developmental Enrollee Success Rate	Students who completed the highest developmental classes in Math who also successfully passed the first college level Math class	2006 Cohort 60.6%	2007 Cohort 50.9%	↓
	Three Rivers College					
	1EA	Career and Technical Student Success Rate	Career/technical program graduates from who were employed within 180 days of graduation.	2007-08 74%	2008-09 73%	↓
	1C3	Licensure and Certification Pass Rates	Graduates who pass licensure and certification exams.	2007-08 84%	2008-09 79%	↓
Truman State University						
		Graduate & Professional School Placement Rate	Graduates who enroll in graduate or professional school within two-years.	2007-08 45%	2008-09 42.2%	↓
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Students who completed bachelor's degrees within six years	2001 Cohort 69.9%	2002 Cohort 68.9%	↓

Institution	IFC	Title	Measure	Baseline	Follow-up	Change
University of Central Missouri	2E1	High Impact Learning Participation	Graduates who engaged in at least one "high-impact" learning experience.	2007-08 68%	2008-09 68.1%	↑
	<i>As authorized by MDHE staff, UCM will select a new performance measure to replace student debt load after its new president begins in August 2010. UCM has identified two potential replacements:</i>					
	1C3	Licensure and Certification Pass Rates	Licensure and/or certification exam passage rate			
	1AC	Persistence Rate	Full-time & Part-time persistence rates			
University of Missouri - System	2D2	Research Funding	Millions of dollars the four campuses of the UM System obtained in external research funding	2007-08 \$181.57	2008-09 \$208.08	↑
	3A1	Student Success Rate	Six Year Graduation Rates:	2001 Cohort	2003 Cohort	
			Columbia	67%	68%	↑
			Kansas City	43%	44%	↑
			Missouri Science & Technology	61%	63%	↑
		St. Louis	43%	41%	↓	

Imperatives for Change: Building a Higher Education System for the 21st Century

A Coordinated Plan for the Missouri Higher Education System

*Adopted by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education
July 30, 2008*

The following motion was approved unanimously by the CBHE:

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board adopt the revisions to the Coordinated Plan as documented in Attachment C, including two additional editorial changes - “community colleges” and “contiguous states” to “two-year colleges” and “surrounding states” - and to remove the provisional status of the Coordinated Plan. It is further recommended that institutional representatives continue to work with MDHE staff on the development of clear operational measures, baselines, benchmarks, and targets.

Finally, it is recommended that the Coordinating Board direct the Commissioner of Higher Education and MDHE staff to continue the important work of collecting contextual information, establishing baseline data, clarifying data definitions, and setting target goals for the Coordinated Plan and that this phase of the Plan will be presented to the CBHE for review and action at its September 2008 meeting.

***Imperatives for Change:
Building a Higher Education System for the 21st Century***

Introduction

The rapidly changing social and economic environment presents profound challenges to all states and nations. More than ever, in the knowledge-based economy of the 21st century, higher education is the gateway to an improved standard of living for Missouri's residents. The imperative for change is clear: those educational systems that adapt to the new environment will be positioned to lead their states to succeed in a globally competitive world.

The collective challenge to the higher education system is to understand the key components of the environment and to devise effective strategies that will capitalize on strengths while addressing weaknesses in challenging financial times. Providing the vision, the stable and sufficient resources, and the collective action to support a higher education system that ensures the future prosperity of Missouri residents, the state of Missouri, and the nation is necessary to address the most important challenges of the day.

Imperatives for Change provides a vision that has been developed collaboratively by Missouri's higher education institutions and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. This plan will serve for the next three to five years as a foundation for prioritizing goals, justifying an increased resource base, allocating resources, and implementing dynamic strategies to provide Missouri residents with the educational opportunities they need to be competitive on a global scale.

Mission Statement

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education, the Missouri Department of Higher Education, and the state's institutions of higher education will work collaboratively to support a diverse system of affordable, accessible, high-quality educational institutions that demonstrate student learning and development, encourage and support innovation, foster civic engagement, enhance the cultural life of Missourians, and contribute to economic growth.

Vision Statement

Missouri's higher education will be an innovative and coordinated system of diverse postsecondary institutions that benefits Missouri and the nation by equipping all Missouri residents for personal and professional success in the 21st century and that is moving towards becoming one of the best in the nation.

Basic Values

Missouri's higher education community is united in its commitment to the following core values.

- ❖ Higher education in Missouri serves many purposes and constituencies, but first and foremost the system is focused on students, learning, and each individual's realization of his or her full educational potential.
- ❖ Qualified students should be able to attend the higher education institution that best fits their educational goals and needs regardless of cost.
- ❖ Access without success is an empty promise. Missouri's higher education institutions are dedicated to providing nationally and internationally competitive educational programs, research, and extension services to ensure their students have the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the 21st century, including the ability to think critically, to communicate effectively, and to be life-long learners.
- ❖ Diversity of institutional missions is a strength of the system that must be preserved.
- ❖ Higher education is a public good as well as a private benefit, contributing both to economic development and civic engagement.
- ❖ Basic and applied research, the creation of knowledge, and the application of information to solve problems are basic functions of the higher education system that must be recognized and supported.
- ❖ The higher education community is dedicated to making decisions based on reliable and transparent data.
- ❖ The higher education community values the appropriate use of technology to enhance programs, services, research, and administration.
- ❖ Public accountability for learning outcomes and stewardship of public funds are priorities for Missouri's higher education institutions.
- ❖ Ensuring the continued affordability and effectiveness of Missouri's higher education system requires a partnership among the institutions, the state, and other stakeholders.

Strategic Issues, Goals, and Action Steps

Strategic Issue: *Increase Educational Attainment*

GOAL 1: Missouri's higher education system will improve educational attainment, including certificate and degree production at all levels, to enhance the quality of Missouri's workforce and the quality of life of its residents.

Objective 1A: *Increase the percent of Missouri residents who possesses a postsecondary credential.*

Indicators

- 1) Percentage of the population aged 25 to 64 who hold a degree or certificate, for the state as a whole and disaggregated by demographic groups and regions
- 2) Number of transfer students who graduate from any institution with a baccalaureate degree
- 3) Increases in personal income from degree attainment

Contributing Factors

- a) Number of postsecondary credit hours delivered
- b) Number of degrees and certificates awarded, disaggregated by demographic groups
- c) Cohort analysis of persistence from fall semester to fall semester

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Raise the aspirations of those who do not see postsecondary education within their reach;
 - ✓ Increase postsecondary access for, and success of, historically under-represented groups;
 - ✓ Develop incentives that reward institutions that increase degree production and retention rates while demonstrably sustaining quality within programs;
 - ✓ Expand opportunities for non-traditional learners through course redesign, alternative methods of program delivery, and better coordination of distance education; and
 - ✓ Create incentives and standards for seamless student transitions between educational institutions.
-

Objective 1B: *Missouri's system of higher education will become more affordable to more Missourians.*

Indicators

- 1) Percentage of family income required to pay for college after grant and scholarship aid by income quintiles
- 2) Total student financial aid awarded to Missouri students from all sources including both restricted and unrestricted institutional funds

Contributing Factors

- a) Missouri resident on-time FAFSAs files by income and EFC level
- b) Percent change in state appropriations for higher education

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Implement the Higher Education Student Funding Act;
- ✓ Support the growth of the Access Missouri Student Financial Assistance Program;
- ✓ Carry out a sustained statewide public information campaign on the value of higher education and the steps prospective students must take to prepare academically and financially; and
- ✓ Increase state funding and external funding sufficient to enable institutions to minimize tuition increases and maintain quality undergraduate and graduate programs and services.

Objective 1C: *Missouri's higher education system will demonstrate continual improvement or sustained excellence in student learning outcomes.*

Indicators

- 1) Results of assessments of student learning in general education (Institutions will be provided the option of using national normed tests and/or participation in an MDHE administered project involving samples of student work evaluated by a statewide committee of faculty). Data generated should serve dual purposes of accountability, i.e., demonstration of learning gains, and improvement, i.e., use by faculty to make changes in curriculum content and delivery.
- 2) Results of assessments of student learning of major fields
- 3) Pass rates on licensure and certification examinations
- 4) Developmental student success rate in collegiate-level courses

Contributing Factor

- a) Results of student engagement and/or satisfaction surveys

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Continue to experiment with VSA and/or similar template for reporting of assessment of student learning gains;
- ✓ Evaluate need for and potential structure of policy in student assessment and placement, especially as a natural outgrowth of Curriculum Alignment Initiative
- ✓ Evaluate potential revisions to statewide data collection to better illustrate the scope and magnitude of postsecondary assessment
- ✓ Inventory instruments currently used to assess general education, major field, and professional certification / licensure

NOTE: Prior to implementation of this section, there should be exploration with DESE, the State Board of Education, and P-12 organizations to obtain joint agreement.

Objective 1D: *Increase college attendance rate of high school students.*

Indicators

- 1) Same year fall college attendance rates of spring Missouri high school graduates
- 2) Percentage of the population and number of students aged 18 to 24 enrolled in postsecondary education, disaggregated by demographic group

Contributing Factors

- a) Percent of Missouri 9th graders who take the ACT within four years
- b) Percent of Missouri high school graduates enrolled in postsecondary education that were placed in remedial coursework
- c) College attendance rates of the 9th grade cohort of Missouri students, disaggregated by demographic group

Objective 1E: *Increase college attendance rate of non-traditional students.*

Indicator

- 1) Percentage of the population, and number of students over the age of 24 enrolled in postsecondary education, disaggregated by demographic group

Contributing Factor

- a) Enrollment in New Jobs Training, Customized Training, and related training programs

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Implement appropriate early intervention strategies at the school district level;
 - ✓ Implement the Curriculum Alignment Project;
 - ✓ Support the activities of the P-20 Coalition;
 - ✓ Provide incentives for attracting adult students, particularly in underserved regions;
 - ✓ Provide incentives for the delivery of degrees (especially graduate degrees) in underserved geographic areas
 - ✓ Provide institutional support for the additional costs associated with non-traditional course delivery methods;
 - ✓ Review and, if necessary, strengthen CBHE oversight to assure the effectiveness of non-traditional programming and;
 - ✓ Work with DESE to explore requiring collegiate level placement testing such as the ACT, Work Keys, Accuplacer, Compass, etc. in the 11th grade.
-

Strategic Issues, Goals, and Action Steps

Strategic Issue: *Develop a 21st Century Society and Global Economy*

GOAL 2: Missouri's higher education system will contribute to a dynamic, information-based, globally competitive society and economy by collaborating with government and business.

Objective 2A: *Missouri's higher education system will demonstrate improvement in meeting the workforce needs of Missouri.*

Indicators

- 1) Number of direct educational partnerships with Missouri employers, including MBEs
- 2) Number of degrees and certificates awarded in key non-METS fields (fields to be determined)
- 3) Number of students passing certification and licensure examinations in high demand fields (fields to be determined)

Contributing Factor

- a) Employer follow-up surveys of appropriate categories of degree and/or certificate completers

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Develop corporate links to access training and learning opportunities;
- ✓ Expand customized education and training opportunities where the business community and higher education institutions work together;
- ✓ Offer more access for place-bound or time-bound learners;
- ✓ Establish employer-based feedback mechanisms to evaluate the quality and preparedness of the graduates of postsecondary programs; and
- ✓ Support programs to recruit well-prepared, new and experienced teachers in high need areas.

Objective 2B: *Missouri's higher education system will increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded in METS-related and health practitioner fields. (Specific fields to be determined)*

Indicators

- 1) a. Number of degrees and certificates awarded in METS-related fields, including METS-related teacher education
b. Number of METS-related degree and certificate recipients who transferred from a two-year college
- 2) a. Number of degrees and certificates awarded in health practitioner fields
b. Number of health practitioner degree and certificate recipients who transferred from a two-year college

Contributing Factor

- a) Number of credit hours delivered in METS-related fields

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Work with elementary and secondary schools to increase student interest in mathematics and science while improving overall educational preparation in mathematics and science;
- ✓ Invest in increased institutional capacity in health practitioner programs;
- ✓ Increase the number of postsecondary students completing courses in METS-related fields; and
- ✓ Offer funding incentives to institutions for increasing graduates in METS and health practitioner fields while demonstrating sustained quality programs.

Objective 2C: *Missouri's higher education system will increase the number of graduate degrees awarded in critical fields. (Specific fields to be determined.)*

Indicator

- 1) Number of graduate and professional degrees awarded in critical fields, disaggregated by demographic group and geographic location

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Foster increased access to graduate and professional programs for historically underserved populations;
- ✓ Increase the number of graduate and professional programs newly offered in underserved locations
- ✓ Provide incentives to expand access to graduate and professional programs in underserved areas using cooperative arrangements, resource sharing, and technology whenever possible; and

- ✓ Expand access to high-quality continuing professional development opportunities in underserved areas using cooperative arrangements, resource sharing, and technology whenever possible.

Objective 2D: *Missouri's higher education system will increase the amount and scope of basic and applied research and development activity to the extent consistent with institutional missions.*

Indicators

- 1) Total expenditures on research and development at Missouri higher education institutions as a percentage of gross state product
- 2) Total number and value of external grants awarded to researchers connected to Missouri higher education
- 3) Number of invention disclosures and patents awarded in connection with a Missouri higher education institution
- 4) Number of new business start-ups linked to research or development incubators associated with Missouri higher education institutions

Contributing Factor

- a) Missouri's New Economy Index

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Develop public relations efforts to inform the public about the benefits of research activities;
- ✓ Establish competitive grant programs to expand research capacity in higher education institutions;
- ✓ Establish competitive grant programs for collaborative research projects;
- ✓ Improve cooperation between the Department of Economic Development and higher education institutions;
- ✓ Establish and utilize a state-supported data inventory for identifying expertise and opportunities that result from research and development activities on campuses;
- ✓ Provide extension programs and innovation centers with technical guidance to encourage the development of new companies, economy clusters, and partnerships;
- ✓ Provide incentives to institutions that transfer new technologies to the marketplace.

Objective 2E: *Missouri institutions will increase learning experiences beyond the classroom and service activities beyond the campus in support of*

promoting civic engagement, understanding international and cultural issues, and improving critical thinking.

Indicator

- 1) Percentage of students participating in “high-impact” learning activities such as internships, study abroad, student-faculty research, and service learning
- 2) Number of direct education outreach programs and program participants (e.g., ESL, TRIO, ABE)

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Encourage and reward institutions to emphasize and assess student gains in critical thinking, creative problem solving, and effective communication in all academic programs;
- ✓ Provide incentives to institutions to provide their students increased access to “high-impact” learning opportunities;
- ✓ Use technology and alternative delivery mechanisms to increase opportunities for lifelong learning by all Missouri citizens;
- ✓ Foster increased cultural literacy, international understanding, and appreciation for diversity in all students through appropriate learning opportunities; and
- ✓ Establish learning communities within institutions that encourage the development of engaged citizens among students, faculty, staff, and the surrounding community.

Strategic Issues, Goals, and Action Steps

Strategic Issue: *Enhance Resources through Increased Investment, Stewardship, and Shared Responsibility*

GOAL 3: Missouri's higher education system will increase external financial support for higher education by demonstrating its value to key stakeholders and public policy-makers while understanding that shared responsibility is necessary for providing a globally competitive workforce, creating valuable new knowledge and products, and enriching the quality of life of all Missourians.

Objective 3A: *Missouri's higher education system will increase the efficiency with which students move to graduation.*

Indicator

- 1) Three-year and six-year graduation rates of college-ready students

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Use appropriate technology to improve the delivery of instruction, the sharing of knowledge, and the accomplishment of managerial tasks;
 - ✓ Incorporate considerations of institutional efficiency in the implementation of the Higher Education Student Funding Act;
 - ✓ Establish current agreed-upon missions (between each institution and the CBHE) and reinstitute five-year mission reviews;
 - ✓ Provide incentives to and recognize institutions for maintaining distinctive missions;
 - ✓ Provide consistent, comparable, and transparent information on the student experience to key higher education stakeholders, including prospective students and their families, public policy makers, and campus faculty and staff;
 - ✓ Provide consistent, illustrative, and transparent information on research activities and accomplishments to key higher education stakeholders, public policy makers, and the general public;
 - ✓ Pursue continuous improvement and demonstrate accountability for student learning and development; and
 - ✓ Facilitate inter-institutional partnerships that increase revenues and decrease expenses.
-

Objective 3B: *Missouri's higher education system will annually attract additional resources.*

Indicators

- 1) Total state appropriations received for higher education operations
 - i. State appropriations for strategic investments in higher education
 - ii. State appropriations for performance funding in higher education
 - iii. State higher education operating appropriations received per FTE compared to surrounding states and the national average
- 2) Total state appropriations received for capital improvements
 - i. State higher education capital appropriations received per FTE compared to surrounding states and the national average
- 3) Total federal non-student aid dollars received by Missouri higher education institutions
- 4) Total state appropriations received for higher education as a percentage of total state general revenue appropriations
- 5) State public higher education appropriations per \$1,000 of personal income compared to surrounding states and the national average
- 6) Per capita state appropriations for public higher education compared to surrounding states and the national average

These action steps may be taken as appropriate:

- ✓ Develop new coherent, complementary and coordinated policy-driven funding strategies for increased public support that will help ensure national competitiveness;
- ✓ Measure progress in achieving strategic initiatives;
- ✓ Maximize non-state resource development through increased external grants, additional contracts for services, expanded development activities, and additional entrepreneurial activities; and
- ✓ Reward institutions for innovations in efficiency and demonstrated improvement in delivering quality educational programs and services.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Recertification of Institutional Eligibility to Participate in State Student Financial Assistance Programs
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

Background

In accordance with the statutory definitions established for the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program, and the process established by the board's administrative rule on institutional participation, approved institutions must be recertified by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) every three (3) years. The institutional eligibility criteria to participate in the Access Missouri Program are the same for all state student financial assistance programs administered by the CBHE. All institutions currently participating in those programs were last recertified in February 2006 or have been initially approved for participation since 2006.

The process of recertification requires that participating institutions complete and return the following documents: application for recertification; and program participation agreements (See Attachment A to view a sample form) for each program in which the institution wishes to participate.

In addition to examining the submitted documents, Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) staff also review each institution's compliance with the data collection requirements of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. Once recertification has been granted by the Coordinating Board, institutions are notified by the commissioner regarding that action. As a note, the inclusion of program participation agreements was added as part of this recertification cycle as an opportunity to ensure consistent documentation regarding program requirements and to reaffirm institutions' program participation in light of the recent addition to the MDHE's administrative responsibilities of the Kids' Chance Scholarship, the Minority Teaching Scholarship and the Minority and Underrepresented Environmental Literacy Scholarship.

Current Status

All currently participating institutions, with the exception of Warrensburg Area Career Center and Clinton Technical School, are scheduled for recertification. Warrensburg Area Career Center and Clinton Technical School were approved by the Coordinating Board in December 2009. Because of the timing of that action, their approval to participate was extended until recertification of institutional eligibility occurs in September 2013.

Recertified institutions will be eligible to participate in the following programs in accordance with their signed participation agreements returned during the recertification process:

- Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program
- Competitiveness Scholarship Program (Marguerite Ross Barnett Scholarship)
- Higher Education Academic Scholarship (Bright Flight) Program
- Kids' Chance Scholarship Program
- Minority Teaching Scholarship Program
- Minority and Underrepresented Environmental Literacy Program
- Public Safety Officer or Employee's Child Survivor Grant Program
- Vietnam Veteran's Survivor Grant Program

While the MDHE will also administer the A+ program beginning August 28, 2010, it is important to note why that program is not included in the above list. Since eligibility as an approved institution for A+ is established by the authorizing statute, approval by the board is not required.

MDHE staff distributed the application materials required for recertification to all currently approved institutions in November 2009. Based on the department's review of the applications submitted, the list in Attachment B includes all of the institutions that are being recommended for recertification.

One of the criteria for participation in state student assistance programs is approval by the United States Department of Education to participate in federal student aid programs authorized as part of Title IV of the Higher Education Act. Fourteen of the institutions included in the attached list are marked with an asterisk indicating schools that have provisional certification to participate in the federal programs. While provisional certification permits full participation in federal programs, such institutions are subject to loss of participation more quickly than if they were fully certified. As such, the approval of these institutions to participate in state programs will be monitored more closely and is considered contingent upon their continued approval to participate in federal programs.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.1102 – Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program
6 CSR 10-2.140 – Institutional Eligibility for Student Participation

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education approve the institutions listed in the attachment for recertification to participate in the state student financial assistance programs administered by the Missouri Department of Higher Education until September 2013.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Sample Participation Agreement
Attachment B: List of Institutions Recommended for Recertification

**Agreement for Educational Institution Participation in the
Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program**

1. This agreement contains requirements that an educational institution must fulfill before students attending or accepted for attendance at the institution may receive an award under the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program. This agreement must be signed before any financial assistance can be awarded for an eligible student attending or accepted for enrollment at the institution. Failure by an educational institution to comply with any of the terms of this agreement may result in termination of this agreement. In the absence of a signed agreement or if an agreement is terminated, student applicants attending or accepted for enrollment at the institution will be denied financial assistance awards under the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program.
2. Pursuant to the regulations of the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program:

EXACT NAME OF INSTITUTION

STREET ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

PHONE NUMBER

(hereinafter “the institution”) hereby agrees to comply with the statutory provisions of the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program, sections 173.1101 through 173.1107, RSMo, the rules adopted and promulgated thereunder, all additional applicable statutes and regulations, and any further guidance or requirements issued by the MDHE. The provisions of this agreement shall not in any way limit or negate the obligation and duty of the institution to follow the provisions of those and all other applicable statutes and rules.

3. The institution certifies that the institution’s chief executive officer or another officer or employee of the institution who has the responsibility and requisite authority for ensuring that the institution complies with the law and rules referred to in paragraph two of this Agreement has read and understands such laws and rules.

4. This agreement may be terminated by either party upon not less than sixty days written notice to the other party.
5. A student applicant's financial assistance funds processed by the Missouri Department of Higher Education and received by the institution may not be delivered until the attendance period has commenced and the institution has verified the student applicant's eligibility in accordance with sections 173.1110 and 173.1104, RSMo, and 6 CSR 10-2.150. If the student applicant is not enrolled full-time or does not plan to enroll full-time, is not making satisfactory academic progress, or is otherwise ineligible, the institution shall return the funds to the Missouri Department of Higher Education within thirty days after determining that the student does not meet the eligibility requirements.
6. This agreement shall not be varied by oral agreement, but only by an instrument in writing duly executed by the parties hereto. Any waiver or modification, express or implied, by the Missouri Department of Higher Education of any term or condition contained in this agreement shall operate as such only in the specific instance and shall not be construed as a waiver or modification of any condition generally or in any other instance.

EXACT NAME OF INSTITUTION, TYPED OR PRINTED

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICER

DATE

NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICER, TYPED OR PRINTED

Return two signed originals to:

Missouri Department of Higher Education
Attn: State Student Assistance Programs
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65109

APPROVED BY:

Signature of Approved Missouri Department of Higher Education Staff

Date

INSTITUTION NAME	PROGRAMS							
	Access Missouri	Bright Flight	Kids Chance	Marguerite Ross Barnett	Minority Teaching	Minority & Underrepresented Environmental Literacy	Public Safety Officer or Employee's Child Survivor	Vietnam Veteran's Survivor
Avila University*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Barnes-Jewish College of Nursing	X	X	X	X			X	X
Boonslick Technical Education Center	X		X				X	X
Cape Girardeau Area Career & Technical Center	X	X	X	X			X	X
Cass Career Center*	X	X						
Central Methodist University	X	X			X			
College of the Ozarks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Columbia Area Career Center	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Columbia College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cottey College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cox College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Crowder College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Culver-Stockton College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Drury University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
East Central College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Eldon Career Center*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fontbonne University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Four Rivers Career Center	X	X	X	X			X	X
Franklin Technology Center*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Grand River Technical School	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hannibal Career and Technical Center	X	X		X				
Hannibal-LaGrange College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Institutions Recommended for Recertification for Participation
June 10, 2010

Attachment B

Harris-Stowe State University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hillyard Technical Center*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jefferson College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kansas City Art Institute	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kirkville Area Technical Center*	X	X	X	X			X	X
Lebanon Technology and Career Center	X		X				X	X
Lex La-Ray Technical College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lincoln University*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lindenwood University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Linn State Technical College	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Logan College of Chiropractic	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Maryville University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Metropolitan Community College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mineral Area College	X	X	X	X			X	X
Missouri Baptist University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Missouri Southern State University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Missouri State University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Missouri State University-West Plains	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Missouri University of Science and Technology	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Missouri Valley College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Missouri Western State University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Moberly Area Community College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nichols Career Center	X	X	X	X			X	X
North Central Missouri College	X	X		X				
Northland Career Center	X							
Northwest Missouri State University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Northwest Technical School*	X	X	X				X	X
Ozarks Technical Community College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Park University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Institutions Recommended for Recertification for Participation
June 10, 2010

Attachment B

Pemiscot County Vocational School of Practical Nursing*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pike & Lincoln Counties Technical Center	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Poplar Bluff Technical Career Center*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ranken Technical College	X	X	X	X			X	X
Research College of Nursing	X	X	X			X	X	X
Rockhurst University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rolla Technical Institute	X		X				X	X
Saint Louis University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Saint Luke's College	X		X	X			X	X
Saline County Career Center	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Sikeston Career and Technology Center*	X	X	X				X	X
South Central Career Center*	X							
Southeast Missouri Hospital School of Nursing/Health Sciences	X	X	X	X			X	X
Southeast Missouri State University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Southwest Baptist University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
St. Charles Community College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
St. Louis College of Pharmacy	X	X	X	X			X	X
St. Louis Community College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
State Fair Community College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Stephens College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Texas County Technical Institute	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Three Rivers Community College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Truman State University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
University of Central Missouri	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
University of Missouri-Columbia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
University of Missouri-Kansas City	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
University of Missouri-St. Louis	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Washington University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Waynesville Area Technical Academy*	X	X	X	X		X	X	X

Webster University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wentworth Military Academy	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Westminster College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
William Jewell College	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
William Woods University	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

LAMP Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The Learning Assessment in Missouri Postsecondary Education (LAMP) Advisory Council was created to consider statewide issues surrounding learning assessment in Missouri and to make policy recommendations to the Commissioner of Higher Education. The intent of this agenda item is to present a status report on LAMP's work to date and to provide recommendations to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) for review and action.

Background

Established in fall 2008, the LAMP Advisory Council serves as a forum for dialogue, research, and policy recommendations about comprehensive student learning assessment in higher education at key transition points, from high school to college, completion of general education courses, and in the academic major. LAMP's focus is driven by student learning indicators in the state's public agenda for higher education, *Imperatives for Change: Building a Higher Education System for the 21st Century* (IFC), and the course competency work developed through the CBHE's Curriculum Alignment Initiative (CAI).

Structure

The LAMP Advisory Council is led by three institutional co-chairs and aided by Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) staff. LAMP was charged to:

- Review relevant assessment research
- Summarize current Missouri assessment practices
- Design and implement proof of concept pilot projects
- Recommend policy changes
- Develop and implement a communication plan

Progress

The LAMP initiative has focused on assessment for the transition from high school to college. The announcement in July 2009 of the federal "Race to the Top" grant program significantly impacted the LAMP initiative. Attention has been on the relationship between the work of LAMP and the academic standards and assessment initiatives that are part of the national effort to reform K-12 education.

Members of the LAMP Advisory Council have been assessing how they might support Missouri's involvement with the Common Core State Standards and its application for funding under the "Race to the Top" program. The LAMP Council reaffirmed its commitment to continue collaboration with the K-12 education sector and with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) to assess competence-based learning outcomes across the

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

transition from secondary to postsecondary education. The Council will continue to work on aligning the assessment of CAI entry-level competencies with DESE end-of-course learning outcomes, and the further alignment of those assessments with the emerging Common Core State Standards.

Missouri is one of 32 states that are part of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium, which is applying for federal funds to develop formative and summative assessments in both mathematics and English language arts that are aligned with the national core standards. Missouri's participation in this consortium presents opportunity for the LAMP Advisory Council to shape the emerging state and national regimes for measuring college and career readiness.

Conclusion

The institutional co-chairs of LAMP and MDHE staff continue to support the state's engagement in the assessment consortia and its application for "Race to the Top" funding. The LAMP and CAI workgroups have built a foundation for alignment policy and practice in Missouri through data from interviews, stakeholder surveys, reviews of the literature and identification of best practices, and collecting supporting documents.

The work of LAMP has evolved to a point where a new mechanism is needed to implement the findings and strategies that would be most effective in aligning curricula and assessment tools. A permanent entity may be needed to continue the necessary collaboration between all sectors of the education pipeline, to advise on policy, and to develop tools to assess the quality of student learning in Missouri.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.005, RSMo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education direct the Commissioner of Higher Education to implement a merger of the LAMP and CAI initiatives into a single postsecondary advisory group to address both alignment of competencies and alignment of assessments across educational sectors and to continue emphasizing the importance of assessment at all Missouri higher education institutions.

It is further recommended that the Board encourage higher education faculty and administrators to support MDHE and DESE as the departments work together on curriculum alignment issues as outlined in Senate Bill 389. In particular, higher education members are encouraged to participate in DESE workgroups such as the State Model Curriculum Workgroup.

ATTACHMENT(S)

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Distribution of Community College Funds
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The process for making state aid payments to community colleges in FY 2010 will be monthly. All FY 2010 state aid appropriations are subject to a three percent governor's reserve.

The total FY 2010 state aid appropriation for community colleges is \$148,377,417. The amount available to be distributed (appropriation less the three percent governor's reserve) is \$143,926,097.

The payment schedule of state aid distributions for April and May, 2010 is summarized below.

State Aid (excluding M&R) – GR portion	\$19,536,626
State Aid – Lottery portion	1,204,822
State Aid – Federal Budget Stabilization portion	2,431,364
Maintenance and Repair	<u>711,690</u>
TOTAL	\$23,884,502

In addition to the state aid payments listed above, there is an additional appropriation of \$8,000,000 from the Federal Budget Stabilization Fund included in House Bill (HB) 22 for maintenance, repairs, replacements and improvements at community colleges. The amount available, after the Governor's reserve, is \$6,234,372 of which \$5,193,609 has been drawn down to date.

The total distribution of state higher education funds to community colleges (not including HB 22 funds) during the period July 2009 through May 2010 is \$129,980,019.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 163.191, RSMo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assigned to Consent Calendar

ATTACHMENT(S)

None

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Legislation Implementation Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The MDHE continues to track its progress implementing the provisions of recently passed higher education-related legislation. A description of each new law and progress in implementation is provided as an attachment. This item contains a brief summary of some areas in which the MDHE has made significant progress since the February 2010 board meeting.

Updates Provided Elsewhere on the Agenda

Detailed information regarding implementation of several new laws is provided elsewhere in the agenda. The ongoing progress of the Curriculum Alignment Initiative (CAI) and the LAMP committee initiated by [SB 389](#) (2007) are detailed in Tab K and L in the Consent Calendar. [SB 389](#) also required the establishment of performance measures; these will be discussed in connection with the board item on *Imperatives for Change* (Tab E).

Higher Education Student Funding Act

[SB 389](#) (2007) established the Higher Education Student Funding Act (HESFA). The CBHE's policy on the implementation of the HESFA requires MDHE staff to notify each institution, including community colleges, in writing that its notice of tuition change has been received, the date of such receipt, and whether its tuition increase triggers the provisions of § 173.1003, RSMo, within one business day after receiving the institution's notice of tuition change. These notifications have been sent to the six institutions that have, at this point, provided its notice of tuition change. None of these institutions have reported a tuition increase that triggers the relevant provisions of § 173.1003, RSMo.

STATUTORY REFERENCES

Chapter 173, RSMo, Department of Higher Education
Section 173.005.2(7), RSMo, Curriculum alignment
Section 160.800, RSMo, P-20 Council
Section 173.1006, RSMo, Establishment of performance measures
Section 173.1004, RSMo, Consumer information
Sections 173.1000-1004, RSMo, Higher Education Student Funding Act

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assigned to Consent Calendar

ATTACHMENT

Legislation Implementation Matrix

NEW CBHE DUTIES IMPOSED BY HIGHER EDUCATION-RELATED LEGISLATION

ITEMS REQUIRING ONGOING ATTENTION

Bill	Subject	Description	Implementation Timeline			Current Status
			Date	New Duties	Area Responsible	
Bills Passed in 2009						
SB 291	P-20 Council	This omnibus education bill includes language that will strengthen the P-20 Council by allowing it to form as a non-profit corporation and expanding its membership.	Beginning August 28, 2009	Work with P-20 Council to identify candidates for commission membership and explore possibilities relating to non-profit corporation formation	Academic Affairs	The Missouri P-20 Council has provided grant funding to strengthen and/or establish regional councils throughout the state. The Council also supported a statewide meeting focusing on education and certification of early childhood educators. MDHE staff is still waiting for the Governor's office to appoint an executive director for the Council and to authorize the establishment of the Council as a non-profit corporation. The P-20 Council and the P-20 approach were mentioned in the proposed right-sizing of government, in several Missouri applications for federal funding, and in the draft workforce development plan for the state.
HB 62	Data breach	This bill requires agencies that maintain sensitive personal data to take certain steps in the event that that information is improperly disclosed.	Beginning August 28, 2009	Ensure that MDHE procedures are consistent with new state law	Missouri Student Loan Program staff and General Counsel	MDHE staff are currently reviewing this new law and determining the extent to which it will impact security measures and data breach protocol already in place.
HB 427	War Veterans' Survivor Grant	This bill changes the laws regarding members of the military, veterans, and their families. Revises the war veteran's survivor grant created by last year's HB 1678 . The changes are primarily definitional and would not change the number or dollar amount of awards.	Beginning August 28, 2009	Ensure that MDHE implements program in a manner consistent with revised law	Grants & Scholarships	The changes contained in the bill are limited to issues concerning eligibility determinations to be made by the Missouri Veterans Commission. As a consequence, no revisions are proposed for the current rules and procedures. Additionally, no funding was appropriated for the implementation or operation of this program. HB 2003 includes \$281,250 for awards under this program. MDHE staff is meeting with veterans commission staff to finalize the application and processing procedures to make awards in Fall 2010.
HB 481	Foster youth tuition waiver	This bill includes language that would create a tuition waiver program for certain students who have been in foster care.	Beginning August 28, 2009	Develop provisions (including, if appropriate, regulations) for the implementation of the program	Grants & Scholarships	MDHE staff are reviewing the provisions of the statute and determining how to proceed. Based on budget instructions for FY 11, no funds were requested for the upcoming fiscal year for this program.
			Fall 2009	Develop a FY 11 budget	Fiscal & Legislative	Based on budget instructions for FY 11, no funds were

Bill	Subject	Description	Implementation Timeline			Current Status
			Date	New Duties	Area Responsible	
				request that includes estimate of funds required to reimburse institutions to tuition waived		requested for the upcoming fiscal year for this program.
			Fall 2010	First semester waiver may be offered	Grants & Scholarships	Will take place only if funds are appropriated to reimburse institutions for any tuition waived pursuant to this program.
Bills Passed in 2008						
HB 1678 / SB 830	War Veterans' Survivors Grant	The CBHE is responsible for administering up to 25 war veterans' survivor grants per year, promulgating rules to implement the program, and providing forms necessary to apply for the grant.	August 2008	Develop budget request that includes funds to provide grants	Grants & Scholarships, Fiscal Affairs	This item was included in the CBHE budget request for FY 10. No funds were appropriated for the program. Based on budget instructions for FY 11, no funds were requested for the upcoming fiscal year for this program.
			August 2008	Promulgate rules, provide forms	Grants & Scholarships	Regulations were approved by the CBHE at its September 2008 meeting and the final rule became effective on June 30, 2009. Work with the Missouri Veterans Commission concerning the administration of this program has been restarted based on the appropriation of funds in HB 2003.
	Missouri Returning Heroes' Education Act	The CBHE is also responsible for ensuring that public institutions of higher education charge certain veterans no more than \$50 per credit hour.	August 2008	Provide guidance about implementation	Grants & Scholarships, General Counsel	The MDHE has made available a Q/A document regarding this act. It is available on the MDHE website at http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/moretheroesact.pdf .
			August 2010	Develop budget request that includes funds to reimburse institutions for monies lost through waiver	Grants & Scholarships, Fiscal Affairs	Institutions were asked to include information about the amount of tuition waived as part of their FY 11 budget requests. Based on budget instructions for FY 11, no funds were requested for the upcoming fiscal year for this program.
HB 2191	A+ Scholarship, Kids' Chance Scholarship	This bill permits the MDHE to distribute interest accrued in the Kids' Chance Scholarship Fund. The bill also changes certain provisions related to the A+ program, which is administered by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.	August 2008	Develop budget request that allows distribution of accrued interest	Grants & Scholarships	MDHE staff are members of the Kids Chance of Missouri, Inc., board of directors, which facilitates communication between the two organizations. Regulations were approved by the CBHE at the December 2008 meeting and those regulations became effective on June 30, 2009. The MDHE has awarded 10 \$2,500 scholarships under this program for the 2009-10 academic year.

Bill	Subject	Description	Implementation Timeline			Current Status
			Date	New Duties	Area Responsible	
SB 768	Missouri Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders	The Commissioner of Higher Education or his/her designee will be a member of this commission. The commission will enlist higher education institutions to ensure support and collaboration in developing certification or degree programs for students specializing in autism spectrum disorder intervention.	TBD	Participate in committee, promote role of higher education in this area	Commissioner	The Education Subcommittee of the Missouri Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders distributed a survey for postsecondary institutions to identify the programs, certificates, and specializations that are currently offered. The subcommittee is currently compiling and analyzing the results. Consideration is being given to a future survey of postsecondary institutions as to the ASD-related services provided to students, faculty, and staff.
Bills Passed in 2007						
SB 389	Curriculum Alignment Initiative	Public institutions must work with the MDHE to establish agreed-upon competencies for all entry-level collegiate courses in key disciplines. The CBHE must establish policies to ensure transferability of core course credits.	2008-09 academic year	Competencies and guidelines must be implemented	Academic Affairs	<p>At its December 2009 board meeting, the CBHE approved exit-level competencies in Physics for non-majors, second semester Foreign Language, and Trigonometry.</p> <p>The Curriculum Alignment Initiative Steering Committee is assisting MDHE staff in conducting crosswalks between the approved math and English competencies and the proposed Common Core Standards for national K-12 education. The results of the crosswalks will assist in the ongoing discussions between MDHE and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education about better aligning the Missouri K-12 and higher education sectors. The Committee is also cooperating with the Learning Assessment in Missouri Postsecondary Education (LAMP) Advisory Council to identify potential pilot projects for assessing the approved CAI competencies.</p> <p>LINKS: <i>Curriculum Alignment Initiative website:</i> http://www.dhe.mo.gov/casinitiative.shtml</p> <p><i>Learning Assessment in Missouri Postsecondary Education website:</i> http://www.dhe.mo.gov/lamp.shtml</p>
SB 389	Higher Education Academic Scholarship Program ("Bright Flight")	The existing Bright Flight scholarship is revised to include students whose ACT/SAT scores are in the top 3% to 5% of all Missouri test-takers. Scholarships awards are increased to \$3,000 for those in the top 3 % and established at \$1,000 for the 3% to 5% range.	June/July 2009	Appropriation request for FY 2011 must be developed to include updated scholarship amounts	Fiscal Affairs	Public materials (website and publications, etc.) were revised to provide early notification of this change to the Bright Flight program to students. Financial assistance staff developed a model to estimate the fiscal impact of this change in preparation for an appropriation request for FY 11. However, based on current budget instructions, increased funding to address the expansion of eligibility and increased award amounts was not
			July 2010	Rule changes must be complete	Grants and Scholarships	

Bill	Subject	Description	Implementation Timeline			Current Status
			Date	New Duties	Area Responsible	
			August 2010	New scholarship award amounts become effective		<p>requested. The budget as passed by the General Assembly provides enough money to continue to provide \$2,000 awards for students scoring in the top 3%. In addition SB 733 (2010) clarifies that only once the top 3% receive \$3,000 may awards first be made to those scoring in the 4th and 5th percentiles.</p> <p>Implementation of the changes necessary in the automated payment system (FAMOUS) is complete. Regulatory amendments that included this change were approved by the CBHE at its December 2008 meeting and the amendments became effective June 30, 2009.</p> <p>LINK: Information about Bright Flight program: http://www.dhe.mo.gov/brightflight.shtml</p>
SB 389	Lewis & Clark Discovery Initiative ("LCDI")	Creates a fund into which MOHELA distributions will be deposited. LCDI may only be used for capital projects at public institutions or to support the Missouri Technology Corporation. Institutions that knowingly employ professors or instructors found guilty of certain crimes are ineligible to receive money through the LCDI.	August 28, 2007	Track expenditure of funds	Deputy Commissioner, Fiscal	<p>MOHELA has made transfers totaling \$234 million out of a total of \$280 million that was scheduled to have been transferred to this point. The fund has earned approximately \$10.7 million in interest, to bring total proceeds to about \$244.6 million.</p> <p>The remaining projects on the LCDI list were identified by the CBHE as the Board's top capital priorities in the ranked list provided to the Joint Committee on Capital Improvements and Leasing in July 2009. These projects were also identified as the Board's top capital priorities for the FY 2011 budget process.</p>
				Review the funding of projects identified by Governor Nixon, in cooperation with the Office of Administration	Deputy Commissioner	
SB 389	Higher Education Student Funding Act (also known as tuition stabilization)	Establishes limits on tuition increases based on each public institution's tuition in relation to the statewide average and CPI. Institutions exceeding the limits can be fined up to 5% of their state appropriation unless a waiver is sought and approved by the Commissioner of Higher Education. Community colleges are not subject to these limits unless their average tuition for out-of-district students exceeds the	2008-09 academic year and each academic year in the future	CBHE must review data submitted by institutions about tuition changes and make determinations about any waivers sought	Commissioner, Academic Affairs	<p>The board approved a policy to implement this portion of the law during its December 2007 meeting, and approved a revised version of the policy during a January 2009 meeting conducted by conference call.</p> <p>The average tuition, as defined by the CBHE policy, for 2009-10 is \$6,144. The MDHE has sent each institution notice indicating which institutions are above average, which are below average, and which institutions are exempt from the Act for 2010-2011.</p>

Bill	Subject	Description	Implementation Timeline			Current Status
			Date	New Duties	Area Responsible	
		state average.				<p>The CPI change for calendar year 2009 was 2.7%. The MDHE has notified institutions of this figure.</p> <p>The impact of this law has been preempted for the 2009-10 academic year by the agreement between the governor and institutions that limits appropriation cuts to 5.2% in exchange for a freeze on tuition and fee increases.</p> <p>LINK: Policy: http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/studentfundingact.doc</p>
SB 389	Performance measures	Institutions and the MDHE must develop institutional and statewide performance measures. The MDHE must report on progress developing statewide measures to the Joint Committee on Education at least twice a year. The MDHE must develop a procedure for reporting the effects of performance measures to the Joint Committee on Education in an appropriate timeframe for consideration in the appropriation process.	July 1, 2008	Performance measures must be established	Commissioner & Deputy Commissioner	<p>The CBHE's coordinated plan, <i>Imperatives for Change</i>, includes numerous measures on key state goals. This plan was adopted at a special meeting of the CBHE on July 30, 2008. Items in the plan serve to fulfill the statutory obligation to identify three state-level performance measures. Each public institution has submitted at least two institution-specific performance measures for inclusion in the report on performance measures that will be sent to the joint committee on education.</p> <p>A baseline <i>IFC</i> report was adopted by the Board at its June 2009 meeting. MDHE staff have met with all sectors on the collection of data, the establishment of target goals, and strategic actions. The latest progress report on these components of the plan will be made to the Board in June of 2010.</p>
SB 389	Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program	Establishes Access Missouri as the state's single need-based financial assistance program, to be administered by CBHE. Award ranges vary by institutional sector and expected family contribution ("EFC"). No student who is found or pleads guilty to certain criminal offenses while receiving financial aid is eligible for renewed assistance. In the event of budget shortfalls, the maximum award will be reduced across sectors; for surplus, the maximum EFC allowed will be raised. Assistance provided to all applicants from any other student aid program, public or	September 2007	Program must be administered and students will receive Access Missouri financial assistance	Grants & Scholarships	<p>During FY 08, award levels for the program were established at 85% of the statutory maximum, a level sufficient to expend all appropriated funds (\$72 million) and assist more than 39,000 students. For FY 09, award levels were set at the statutory maximum and the EFC cutoff was raised to \$14,000. No mid-year adjustments were made and all appropriated funds (\$95 million before withholdings) were expended.</p>
			August 2009 and every 3 years thereafter.	Award amounts may be adjusted to reflect inflation indicated by the CPI	Grants & Scholarships	<p>An item was included in the CBHE budget request for FY 10 to adjust the award amounts to reflect inflation as provided in the authorizing statute. This increase was not included in HB 3 or any other budget bill.</p>

Bill	Subject	Description	Implementation Timeline			Current Status
			Date	New Duties	Area Responsible	
		private, must be reported to the CBHE by the institution and the recipient.	Program will sunset at the end of FY 2013, unless reauthorized.			Based on a substantial increase in the number of eligible students (22%) and no increase in funding, award levels are set at 78% of the statutory maximum. In response to the withholding of additional distribution funds, no mid-year award adjustment was made for FY 2010.

ITEMS NOT REQUIRING ADDITIONAL ONGOING ACTION

Bills Passed in 2009						
HB 62	Diploma mills	This bill criminalizes the use of false or misleading diplomas.	August 28, 2009	No action required	N/A	This bill does not require action by the MDHE.
HB 103	Campus security	This bill would allow college and university police to respond to emergencies and provide services outside institution property lines if requested by local law enforcement.	August 28, 2009	No action required	N/A	This bill does not require action by the MDHE.
HB 247	Nursing Student Loan Program	Changes the eligibility requirements for participation in this program.	August 28, 2009	No action required	N/A	This program is not administered by the MDHE. As such, no action is required.
HB 390	Immigration	This bill clarifies the steps schools must take to ensure that only students who meet certain requirements with regard to citizenship receive postsecondary education public benefits, as that term is defined by the bill.	ASAP	Ensure that current procedures meet standards of new law	General Counsel	MDHE staff sent an e-mail to presidents and chancellors on July 27, 2009, explaining the impact of this law and its relationship to the old law. MDHE staff also posted information explaining the changes on the department's website at http://www.dhe.mo.gov/citizenshipstatus.shtml .
HB 490	A+	Clarifies that all public vo-tech schools may receive funds for A+ students.	August 28, 2009	No action required	N/A	This program is not administered by the MDHE. As such, no action is required.
Ballot Measures Passed in 2008						
Proposition A:	Repeal of casino loss limits	This initiative amends Missouri law to eliminate daily loss limits for gamblers at casinos. Proponents of the initiative claimed that it would provide benefits to the state including \$5-7 million annually to higher education, early childhood development, veterans, and other program.	Immediate	None	Fiscal Affairs	MDHE staff do not currently foresee any action required by this measure. Furthermore, the new law will not result in increased funding for higher education. The only money higher education receives from gaming is \$5 million annually for Access Missouri. This amount is capped by state law, as is funding for veterans. Only early childhood education is likely to receive additional funding as a result of this initiative.

						Several bills that would redirect the additional revenues resulting from lifting loss limits have been introduced during the 2009 legislative session, including SB 23 , SB 56 , SB 139 . None of these bills has made significant legislative progress as of April 1, 2009.
Constitutional Amendment 1 : English language only	This Constitutional amendment requires all governmental meetings at which any public business is discussed or decided, or at which public policy is formulated, to be conducted in English. This is an amendment to Article I of the Constitution, which sets forth the state's Bill of Rights.	Immediate	MDHE staff will ensure that CBHE meetings are conducted in compliance with this law	General Counsel		This measure will not affect CBHE meetings, which are currently conducted in English. The measure does not affect the MDHE's plans to begin issuing some of its publications in Spanish.
Bills Passed in 2008						
HB 1549	Immigration	This omnibus immigration bill requires applicants for state grants and scholarships to provide proof of citizenship before the applicants receive grants or scholarships.	August 28, 2009	No action required	N/A	The language created by this bill was changed by HB 390 (2009).
		This bill also requires employers to comply with certain requirements to verify prospective employees' legal citizenship status.	January 1, 2009	Verify that current employment procedures meet requirements of the new law	Administrative Operations, General Counsel	The MDHE already takes steps to confirm that its employees are legally eligible to work in the U.S. The department's procedures meet the requirements of the new law.
SB 967	MOHELA	MOHELA may now originate Stafford loans.	May 2, 2008	Work with MOHELA to ensure that the MDHE can guarantee loans originated by MOHELA	Student Loan Program, General Counsel	Although the law does not specifically require action by the MDHE, the MDHE executed an agreement with MOHELA whereby it agreed to guarantee student loans originated by MOHELA.
SB 1181	Studies in Energy Conservation	This bill creates the Studies in Energy Conservation Fund, which is to be administered by the MDHE in coordination with the Department of Natural Resources. The MDHE is permitted to use any money appropriated to the fund to establish a full professorship of energy and conservation.	August 2008	Develop a FY 10 appropriations request that includes money for the Studies in Energy Conservation Fund.	Fiscal Affairs	Although the CBHE requested funds for this program in its FY 10 budget request, no funds were appropriated. Based on budget instructions for FY 11, no funds were requested for the upcoming fiscal year for this program.
Bills Passed in 2007						
SB 389	Joint Committee on Education ("JCE")	The JCE's scope is expanded to include several components associated with higher education.	Immediate	MDHE will begin reporting to JCE on higher education issues	Legislative Liaison	There are no current requests for information from the JCE.

			August 28, 2010	MDHE report on the impact of tuition stabilization to the JCE	Legislative Liaison	
SB 389	Fines for non-compliance with CBHE rules and policies	Public institutions that willfully disregard CBHE policy can be fined up to 1% of their state appropriation.	August 28, 2007	Develop policy to implement this provision	General Counsel	<p>The policy on fining institutions that willfully disregard CBHE policy was approved at the February 2008 board meeting. That policy is now in effect.</p> <p>LINKS <i>Policy on fines:</i> http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/finesforwillfuldisregard.doc <i>All CBHE public policies:</i> http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/cbhepublicpolicies_0208.doc</p>
SB 389	Out-of-state public institution standards	Out-of-state public institutions must be held to the same standards as Missouri institutions for program approval, data collection, cooperation, and resolution of disputes.	July 1, 2008	Rules must be promulgated	Academic Affairs	<p>Out-of-state public institutions became exempt from proprietary school certification on July 1, 2008. All out-of-state public institutions were notified of their change in status and the requirement to submit all degree programs through the program approval process used for Missouri public institutions. In addition, a rule on this subject is now in effect.</p> <p>LINKS <i>CBHE-approved rule:</i> http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/outofstate_publicinst.doc <i>Final regulation in the Code of State Regulations:</i> http://www.sos.mo.gov/adrules/csr/current/6csr/6c10-10.pdf</p>
SB 389	"No better than free"	No student shall receive need-based assistance that exceeds the student's cost of attendance. This does not include loans or merit-based aid.	August 28, 2007	The statute does not specify what is required of MDHE		<p>Staff has provided ongoing guidance and technical assistance to institutional staff concerning the impact of this provision on Access Missouri awards. This has been accomplished through responses to individual inquiries, periodic electronic and regular mail contact, fall workshops, and presentations at financial assistance meetings.</p>
SB 389	Binding dispute resolution	In order to receive state funds, public institutions must agree to submit to binding dispute resolution to address grievances about jurisdictional boundaries or the use or expenditure of state resources. The Commissioner of Higher Education will preside over the dispute resolution.	August 28, 2007	Statute becomes effective		<p>The board adopted a policy on this subject at its December 2007 meeting. That policy is now in effect.</p> <p>LINK: Policy: http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/disputeresolution.doc</p>
SB 389	Missouri Teaching Fellows Program	Creates the Missouri Teaching Fellows Program, which will offer loan forgiveness and stipends to individuals who teach in unaccredited school districts. The program will be administered by the MDHE.	N/A	N/A		<p>The legislature has not appropriated funds for the administration of this program. Based on budget instructions for FY 11, no funds were requested for the upcoming fiscal year for this program.</p>

						<p>LINK: Information about program: http://www.dhe.mo.gov/moteachingfellows.shtml</p>
SB 389	Consumer information	The CBHE must promulgate rules and regulations to ensure that public institutions post on their websites academic credentials of all faculty (adjunct, part-time, and full-time); course schedules; faculty assignments; and, where feasible, instructor ratings by students; as well as which instructors are teaching assistants.	August 28, 2007	Statute becomes effective	General Counsel	<p>The board approved the filing of an administrative rule to implement these provisions of the new law at an October 2007 meeting. The rule has been filed and is now in effect.</p> <p>The rule required institutions to post general course information by August 1, 2008, and to post faculty evaluations to inform students registering for fall 2009 classes. MDHE staff surveyed institutions and reviewed institutions' websites, and determined that all institutions appear to have met these deadlines.</p> <p>LINKS: <i>CBHE-approved rule:</i> http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/consumerinformation.doc <i>Final regulation in the Code of State Regulations:</i> http://www.sos.mo.gov/adrules/csr/current/6csr/6c10-9.pdf <i>August 27, 2008, update:</i> http://www.dhe.mo.gov/mdhe/boardbook2content.jsp?id=566; scroll down to Attachment B</p>

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Proprietary School Certification Actions and Reviews
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

All program actions that have occurred since the April 22, 2010, Coordinating Board meeting are reported in this consent item. In addition, the report includes information concerning anticipated actions on applications to establish new postsecondary education institutions, exemptions from the department's certification requirements, and school closures.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Sections 173.600 through 173.618, RSMo, Regulation of Proprietary Schools

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assigned to Consent Calendar

ATTACHMENT

Proprietary School Certification Program Actions and Reviews

Coordinating Board for Higher Education

Proprietary School Certification Program Actions and Reviews

Certificates of Approval Issued (Authorization for Instructional Delivery)

Kaplan University
St. Louis, Missouri

This for-profit institution, based in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, is a subsidiary of the Iowa College Acquisition Corporation, whose parent organization is the Washington Post Company, a publicly traded company. Kaplan University will offer four general education courses at the St. Louis location. The university “is committed to general education, a student-centered service and support approach, and applied scholarship in a practical environment.” This school is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

Certificates of Approval Issued (Authorization Only to Recruit Students in Missouri)

Kaplan University
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

The ownership structure of this for-profit institution is described above. This approval authorizes the Florida campus to recruit student into a wide variety of associate’s, bachelor’s, and master’s degree programs including criminal justice, business administration, and computer information. This school is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

Applications Pending Approval (Authorization for Instructional Delivery)

Advanced Associates of Dental Assisting Academy
Independence, Missouri

This for-profit, individually owned institution proposes to offer two non-degree programs to prepare students for dental assisting careers. The objective of the school is to offer “intensive hands on and classroom instruction...to produce qualified dental assistants.” This school is not accredited.

Benedictine College
Kansas City, Missouri

This not-for-profit institution based in Atchison, Kansas, proposes to operate in Missouri to offer an Executive Master of Business Administration program. The mission of this institution is to provide “the education of men and women within a community of faith and scholarship.” This school holds regional accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

Everest College

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

Kansas City, Missouri

This for-profit, corporately owned institution proposes to operate in Missouri to offer allied health nondegree programs and an associate's degree program in criminal justice. The college is owned by Corinthian Colleges, Inc., which was founded in 1995 and now operates schools across the country. As of September 2009, schools owned by Corinthian Colleges, Inc., had an enrollment of more than 100,000 students. Everest College "is dedicated to preparing students from diverse backgrounds with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to successfully compete for jobs and to cope with ever-changing work force requirements." This school is accredited by the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS).

Applications Pending Approval (Authorization Only to Recruit Students)

None

Applications Withdrawn

Flex-A-Dent School of PDR
Bolivar, Missouri

This application proposed operations by a single proprietor school to offer a two-week nondegree program in automotive paintless dent repair. The application was withdrawn by the applicant without explanation.

Exemptions Granted

None

Schools Closed

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Academic Program Actions
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

This agenda item reports all program actions brought to the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) for review since the April 22, 2010 meeting of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE).

Background

In FY 2009, the CBHE approved the following program actions for public institutions:

- 117 program changes
- 42 new programs
- 19 off-site programs

In FY 2009, the CBHE reviewed the following program actions for independent institutions:

- 73 program changes
- 9 new programs
- 12 off-site programs

Current Status

The following tables summarize program actions for public and independent institutions for FY 2010 as of the printing of this board item. This information represents the program actions since the April 22, 2010 meeting of the CBHE.

Public Institutions:

- 36 program changes
- 9 new programs
- 8 off-site programs

Independent Institutions:

- 0 program changes
- 1 new programs
- 0 off-site program

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

	Certificate	Associate	Baccalaureate	Graduate	Total
Deleted	66	46	4	1	118
Inactivated	7	4	2	1	14
Other Program Changes*	117	87	28	36	268
New	4	13	8	12	37
Off-site	4	12	3	1	20
Programs Withdrawn	0	0	1	1	2

* Includes options inactivated/deleted, options added, titles changed, certificates added, programs combined.

INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS

	Certificate	Associate	Baccalaureate	Graduate	Total
Deleted	1	0	0	3	4
Inactivated	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Changes*	0	0	6	6	12
New	0	3	12	13	28
Off-site	1	0	5	3	9
Programs Withdrawn	0	0	0	0	0

* Includes options inactivated/deleted, options added, titles changed, certificates added, programs combined.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Sections 173.005.2(1), 173.005.2(8), 173.030(1), and 173.030(2), RSMo, Statutory requirements regarding CBHE approval of new degree programs.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assigned to Consent Calendar

ATTACHMENT

Academic Program Actions

ACADEMIC PROGRAM ACTIONS

Under RSMo 173.005.11 and 6 CSR 10-10.010, out-of-state public institutions offering programs in Missouri are subject to an approval process similar to that for Missouri's public institutions of higher education. The CBHE must approve all courses before they are offered in Missouri.

I. Programs Discontinued

Moberly Area Community College

1. Current Program:

AAS, Occupational Education

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program As Changed:

AAS, Occupational Education (deleted)

2. Current Program:

C1, Business Office

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program As Changed:

C1, Business Office (deleted)

Southeast Missouri State University

1. Current Program:

BSBA, Management Information Systems

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

BSBA, Management Information Systems (deleted)

St. Louis Community College – Florissant Valley

1. Current Program:

C1, Telecommunication Engineering-Basic Electronics

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Telecommunication Engineering-Basic Electronics (deleted)

2. Current Program:

C1, Deaf Communication Studies/American Sign Language

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Deaf Communication Studies/American Sign Language (deleted)

3. Current Program:

AAS, Electronic Engineering Technology

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

AAS, Electronic Engineering Technology (deleted)

4. Current Program:

AAS, Plastics Technology

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

AAS, Plastics Technology (deleted)

5. Current Program:

AAS, Plumbing Design Engineering Technology

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

AAS, Plumbing Design Engineering Technology (deleted)

6. Current Program:

C1, Plumbing Design Engineering Technology

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Plumbing Design Engineering Technology (deleted)

7. Current Program:

C0, Plumbing Design Engineering Technology

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C0, Plumbing Design Engineering Technology (deleted)

8. Current Program:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Millwright

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Millwright (deleted)

9. Current Program:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Plumbing & Pipefitting

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Plumbing & Pipefitting (deleted)

10. Current Program:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Tool & Die

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Tool & Die (deleted)

11. Current Program:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Welder Repair

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Skilled Trades Industrial Apprenticeship-Welder Repair (deleted)

St. Louis Community College – Florissant Valley, Forest Park, & Meramec

1. Current Program:

C1, Addictions Study

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Addictions Study (deleted)

2. Current Program:

C0, AS400 Programmer

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C0, AS400 Programmer (deleted)

St. Louis Community College – Florissant Valley & Meramec

1. Current Program:

C0, Real Estate

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C0, Real Estate (deleted)

St. Louis Community College – Forest Park

1. Current Program:

C1, Multimedia

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Multimedia (deleted)

St. Louis Community College –Meramec

1. Current Program:

AAS, Real Estate

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

AAS, Real Estate (deleted)

2. Current Program:

C1, Real Estate Appraisal

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

C1, Real Estate Appraisal (deleted)

University of Central Missouri

1. Current Program:

BS, Industrial Technology
Industrial Technology (2+2)
Industrial Technology (major)

Approved Change:

Delete program

Program as Changed:

BS, Industrial Technology (deleted)
Industrial Technology (2+2)
Industrial Technology (major)

II. Programs and Options Placed on Inactive Status

Metropolitan Community College - Blue River, Business & Technology, Longview, Maple Woods, Penn Valley

1. Current Program:

C1, Database Programming (ORACLE)

Approved Change:

Inactivate certificate

Program as Changed:

C1, Database Programming (ORACLE) (inactive)

Metropolitan Community College - Blue River, Longview, Maple Woods, Penn Valley

1. Current Program:

C1, Game Programming

Approved Change:

Inactivate certificate

Program as Changed:

C1, Game Programming (inactive)

2. Current Program:

C0, Entrepreneurship

Approved Change:

Inactivate certificate

Program as Changed:

C0, Entrepreneurship (inactive)

III. Approved Changes in Academic Programs

Crowder College

1. Current Program:

C0, Pharmacy Technician (*delivered at the main campus*)

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0) to the Moss Center - Nevada, Watley Center - Cassville, and Webb City Center sites

Program as Changed:

C0, Pharmacy Technician (*delivered at the main campus and at the Moss Center - Nevada, Watley Center - Cassville, and Webb City Center sites*)

2. Current Program:

C0, Certified Nurse's Assistant (*delivered at the main campus*)

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0) to the Moss Center - Nevada, Watley Center - Cassville, and Webb City Center sites

Program as Changed:

C0, Certified Nurse's Assistant (*delivered at the main campus and at the Moss Center - Nevada, Watley Center - Cassville, and Webb City Center sites*)

3. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0) Emergency Medical Technician to the main campus and to the Watley Center – Cassville site.

Program as Changed:

C0, Emergency Medical Technician (*delivered at the main campus and at the Watley Center – Cassville site*)

Linn State Technical College

1. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0) program in Basic Welding

Program as Changed:

C0, Basic Welding

2. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0) program in Advanced Welder

Program as Changed:

C0, Advanced Welder

Metropolitan Community College - Blue River, Longview, Maple Woods, Penn Valley

1. Current Program:

AAS, Computer Science & Information Systems
Database Management
Game Programming
Interactive Digital Media
Networking
Programming
Technical Support

Approved Change:

Inactivate Game Programming option

Program as Changed:

AAS, Computer Science & Information Systems

Database Management

Game Programming (inactive)

Interactive Digital Media

Networking

Programming

Technical Support

Metropolitan Community College - Business and Technology

1. Current Program:

AAS, Manufacturing Technology

CNC Machining

Manual

Approved Change:

Change title of program to Precision Machining

Program as Changed:

AAS, Precision Machining

CNC Machining

Manual

2. Current Program:

C1, Manufacturing Technology

Approved Change:

Change title of program to Precision Machining

Program as Changed:

C1, Precision Machining

3. Current Program:

C1, Manufacturing Technology Computer Numerical Control Operator

Approved Change:

Change title of program to Precision Machining Computer Numerical Control Operator

Program as Changed:

C1, Precision Machining Computer Numerical Control Operator

Missouri Western State University

1. Current Program:
1st Professional Cert. Post Degree, Teaching of Writing

Approved Change:
Change to Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate

Program as Changed:
Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate, Teaching of Writing

2. Current Program:
1st Professional Cert. Post Degree, TESOL

Approved Change:
Change to Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate

Program as Changed:
Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate, TESOL

3. Current Program:
1st Professional Cert. Post Degree, Forensic Investigations

Approved Change:
Change to Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate

Program as Changed:
Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate, Forensic Investigations

4. Current Program:
1st Professional Cert. Post Degree, Autism Spectrum Disorders

Approved Change:
Change to Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate

Program as Changed:
Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate, Autism Spectrum Disorders

5. Current Program:
BS, Early Childhood Education

Approved Change:
Change to Bachelor of Science in Education (BSE)

Program as Changed:
BSE, Early Childhood Education

Moberly Area Community College

1. Current Program:
C1, Business Accounting

Approved Change:
Change title to Business Accounting Technology

Program As Changed:
C1, Business Accounting Technology

Southeast Missouri State University

1. Current Program:
BSBA, Marketing
Integrated Marketing Communication
Marketing Management

Approved Change:
Add option in Sales Management

Program as Changed:
BSBA, Marketing
Integrated Marketing Communication
Marketing Management
Sales Management

2. Current Program:
MSN, Nursing

Approved Change:
Add Post-Master's Graduate Certificate – Family Nurse Practitioner

Programs as Changed:
MSN, Nursing
Post-Master's Graduate Certificate – Family Nurse Practitioner

St. Charles Community College

1. Current Program:
N/A

Approved Change:
Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), English as a Second Language Certificate
of Specialization

Program as Changed:

C0, English as a Second Language Certificate of Specialization

St. Louis Community College – Florissant Valley

1. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), Telecommunication Engineering-Basic Electronics

Program as Changed:

C0, Telecommunication Engineering-Basic Electronics

2. Current Program:

AAS, Information Systems
Computer Network Specialist
Microcomputer Applications
Office Information Coordinator
Software Developer

Approved Change:

Change title of Microcomputer Applications option to Microcomputer Support Specialist

Program as Changed:

AAS, Information Systems
Computer Network Specialist
Microcomputer Support Specialist
Office Information Coordinator
Software Developer

3. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), Deaf Communication Studies/American Sign Language

Program as Changed:

C0, Deaf Communication Studies/American Sign Language

St. Louis Community College – Florissant Valley, Forest Park, & Meramec

1. Current Programs:

AAS, Graphic Communications
AFA, Associate of Fine Arts

Approved Change:

Add One-Year Certificate (C1), Fine Arts Studio developed from existing parent degrees

Programs as Changed:

AAS, Graphic Communications

AFA, Associate of Fine Arts

C1, Fine Arts Studio

2. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), Addictions Study

Program as Changed:

C0, Addictions Study

St. Louis Community College – Forest Park

1. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), Multimedia

Program as Changed:

C0, Multimedia

2. Current Program:

AAS, Mass Communications

Broadcast

Print

Approved Change:

Delete options

Program as Changed:

AAS, Mass Communications

Broadcast (deleted)

Print (deleted)

St. Louis Community College – Forest Park, & Meramec

1. Current Program:
AAS, Manufacturing Technology
 Computer
 Design
 Production

Approved Change:
Delete options

Program as Changed:
AAS, Manufacturing Technology
 Computer (deleted)
 Design (deleted)
 Production (deleted)

St. Louis Community College –Meramec

1. Current Program:
N/A

Approved Change:
Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), in Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Video Art

Program as Changed:
C0, Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Video Art

2. Current Program:
N/A

Approved Change:
Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), in Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Digital Photography

Program as Changed:
C0, Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Digital Photography

3. Current Program:
N/A

Approved Change:
Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), in Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Interactive Design

Program as Changed:

C0, Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Interactive Design

4. Current Program:

N/A

Approved Change:

Add Single-Semester Certificate (C0), in Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Page Layout/Graphic Design

Program as Changed:

C0, Digital Media Certificate of Specialization: Page Layout/Graphic Design

State Fair Community College

1. Current Program:

AAS, Early Childhood Education (*delivered off-site in Clinton, Missouri*)

Approved Change:

Change title to Early Childhood Development

Program as Changed:

AAS, Early Childhood Development (*delivered off-site in Clinton, Missouri*)

University of Central Missouri

1. Current Program:

BSE, Secondary Education
Agricultural Education
Biology
Business Teacher Education
Chemistry
Earth Science
English
Family & Consumer Sciences
Mathematics
Physics
Social Studies
Speech Communication & Theater
Technology Education

Approved Change:

Change title of Technology Education option to Engineering and Technology Teacher Education

Program as Changed:

BSE, Secondary Education
Agricultural Education
Biology
Business Teacher Education
Chemistry
Earth Science
Engineering and Technology Teacher Education
English
Family & Consumer Sciences
Mathematics
Physics
Social Studies
Speech Communication & Theater

2. Current Program:

BS, Technology

Approved Change:

Add One-Year Certificate (C1) in Technology developed from approved existing parent degree

Programs as Changed:

BS, Technology
C1, Technology

IV. Received and Reviewed Changes in Programs (Independent Colleges and Universities; includes Discontinued Programs and Programs Placed on Inactive Status)

No actions of this type have been taken since the last board meeting.

V. Program Changes Requested and Not Approved

No actions of this type have been taken since the last board meeting.

VI. New Programs Approved

Mineral Area College

1. AAS, Occupational Therapy Assistant (*designed for delivery at the main campus in Park Hills, and off-site at the Cape Girardeau Career and Technology Center in Cape Girardeau*)
2. AAS, Physical Therapy Assistant (*designed for delivery at the main campus in Park Hills, and off-site at the Cape Girardeau Career and Technology Center in Cape Girardeau*)
3. AAS, Renewable Energy Technology
4. C0, Renewable Energy Technology

Moberly Area Community College

1. AA, Associate of Arts (*designed for off-site delivery at the Macon Area Career and Technical Education Center in Macon, Missouri. The program will be delivered via a combination of on-site instruction, ITV, and web synchronous systems.*)
2. AAS, Business & Office Technology (*designed for off-site delivery at the Columbia Higher Education Center in Columbia, Missouri. The program will be delivered via a combination of on-site instruction, ITV, and web synchronous systems.*)
3. AAS, Business Accounting Technology (*designed for off-site delivery at the Columbia Higher Education Center in Columbia, Missouri. The program will be delivered via a combination of on-site instruction, ITV, and web synchronous systems.*)
4. C1, Business & Office Technology - Executive/Legal (*designed for off-site delivery at the Columbia Higher Education Center in Columbia, Missouri. The program will be delivered via a combination of on-site instruction, ITV, and web synchronous systems.*)
5. C1, Business & Office Technology - Medical Office (*designed for off-site delivery at the Columbia Higher Education Center in Columbia, Missouri. The program will be delivered via a combination of on-site instruction, ITV, and web synchronous systems.*)
6. C1, Business Accounting Technology (*designed for off-site delivery at the Columbia Higher Education Center in Columbia, Missouri. The program will be delivered via a combination of on-site instruction, ITV, and web synchronous systems.*)
Executive
Legal
Medical

Southeast Missouri State University

1. GRCT, Facilities Management
2. GRCT, Heritage Education
3. GRCT, Historic Preservation
4. MA, Teacher Leadership (*designed for delivery at the Southeast Missouri State University main campus in Cape Girardeau, Missouri and sites in Kennett, Malden, and Sikeston, Missouri; the Perryville County Higher Education Center in Perryville, Missouri, and Jefferson College in Hillsboro, Missouri. The program will be delivered via a combination of face-to-face, web-enhanced, ITV, and web-based classes.*)

VII. New Programs Received and Reviewed (Independent Colleges and Universities)

Lindenwood University

1. MA, Communications

VIII. Programs Withdrawn

Northwest Missouri State University

MSED, Teacher Leadership (*for off-site delivery in Albany, Missouri*)

Southeast Missouri State University

Associate of Arts (*for off-site delivery in Kennett, Malden, and Sikeston*)

Three Rivers Community College

Associate of Arts (*for off-site delivery in Kennett, Malden, and Sikeston*)

IX. New Programs Not Approved (Independent Colleges and Universities)

No actions of this type have been taken since the last board meeting.

X. New Courses Approved (Out-of-State Institutions)

No actions of this type have been taken since the last board meeting.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Curriculum Alignment Initiative Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The Curriculum Alignment Initiative (CAI) was established to identify entry- and exit- level competencies that will serve to outline standards for success in collegiate-level coursework and that will help facilitate the transfer of single general education courses. The intent of this agenda item is to provide an update on CAI accomplishments.

Background

The CAI Steering Committee has developed entry- and exit-level competencies to fulfill the curriculum alignment mandates of Senate Bill 389. Entry-level competencies establish a proposed threshold for student access to collegiate-level coursework across disciplines as a means for smoothing the transition from secondary to postsecondary education. Exit-level competencies were established to further facilitate transfer of general education courses. Optimal competencies were also developed to outline additional requirements for students in the pipeline who aspire to prepare for selected careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

The CBHE has approved entry-level competencies in six areas, 16 exit-level competencies for specific college-level general education courses, and optimal entry-level competencies for two engineering courses. The initial CAI report, historical background information regarding CAI, and documents detailing previously-approved competencies are available on the MDHE website: <http://www.dhe.mo.gov/casinitiative.shtml>.

Alignment of CAI Competencies and Common Core State Standards Initiative

In June 2008, the CBHE approved entry-level competencies in several areas, including mathematics and English language arts. In September 2009, Missouri and 47 other states committed to adopt the standards for mathematics and English language arts contained in the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI), coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Key stakeholders in the higher education community raised concerns about the adoption of the CCSSI.

Foremost among them was a concern that the arduous work done by faculty and staff to create the CAI entry-level competencies was for naught, that college-level standards were being imposed on colleges and universities, and that the CCSSI standards may be lower than those adopted in Missouri. In response to these concerns, MDHE staff consulted with national education experts and the Council of Chief State School Officers about the CCSSI. The CAI

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

Steering Committee, other content experts, and institutional academic administrators in Missouri agreed to perform crosswalks to assess the alignment of the core standards with the CAI competencies in math and language arts to ensure that a critical mass of content experts will be involved in the process.

The MDHE asked the Council on Public Higher Education (COPHE), the Missouri Community College Association (MCCA), and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Missouri (ICUM) to identify volunteer content experts in mathematics and in English and Communication. MDHE staff asked the content experts—twelve in each discipline—to analyze and compare the content of the national Common Core State Standards Initiative with the CBHE-approved CAI entry-level competencies and to assess the degree to which they are aligned. The precise methodology was left to the reviewers, but their primary goal was to determine if the CAI entry-level competencies equaled or exceeded the expectations of performance contained in the Common Core State Standards. We asked the reviewers to identify specific areas, if any, in which Missouri’s standards did not rise to the level of the national standards.

Four responses were received in English and Communication, and three in mathematics (one of these was done at the request of MDHE in January 2010). The consensus among the content experts from each discipline is that there is no appreciable difference between the CAI entry-level competencies and the CCSSI standards. Attachment A contains the summary report.

Additional CAI Work and Relationship to LAMP

In April, the Curriculum Alignment Initiative Steering Committee (CAS) met in Jefferson City. The CAS discussed strategies for the dissemination of the entry-level and exit-level competencies. The dissemination of the competencies has been delayed, first by the concerns over the CCSSI and more recently by the uncertain status of both the MDHE and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). The legislation that mandated CAI, however, is still state law. As this work is ongoing at all levels, the CAI will continue to move forward and support this work.

Additionally, Missouri has joined the thirty-two state SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium in applying for federal funds, as part of “Race to the Top,” for developing assessments for college and career readiness. DESE is eager for the participation of the higher education sector in developing the assessments, which will not be rolled out until 2014.

The CAS noted that the purpose of the both CAI and the SMARTER Balanced Consortium is to ensure that when students graduate from high school, they are ready for college. The work of the CAI has been instrumental in narrowing the gap of knowledge regarding what is expected upon graduation from high school and what is necessary to be successful upon entry into a college or university.

MDHE staff and the Learning Assessment in Missouri Postsecondary Education (LAMP) Advisory Council co-chairs have held discussions about moving the initiative forward. In light of the issues noted above, the work of LAMP has intentionally slowed. The LAMP Advisory Council was originally charged with recommending a system for assessing student learning using indicators in the state’s public agenda for higher education—*Imperatives for Change: Building a*

Higher Education System for the 21st Century (IFC)—and the competencies developed through the work of the CAI. Initial work of LAMP has provided important context for moving forward on a statewide assessment agenda. Further work by LAMP will recommence after DESE and MDHE make strategic decisions about alignment between competencies adopted by DESE and CBHE, and in the context of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. Additional information about LAMP is available on the MDHE website: <http://dhe.mo.gov/lamp.shtml>.

Cross-cultural and global education have been identified as two additional areas for cross-disciplinary competency work. A voluntary workgroup of institutional faculty and administrators from all sectors (Attachment B) are charged with identifying and developing those competencies that will allow students to work constructively among those with disparate backgrounds, to contribute effectively in a global economy, and to live as citizens in a global context. The cross-cultural/global workgroup continues its work on the development of cross-cultural competencies. The workgroup has nearly completed a draft of the cross-cultural/global competencies, which it will submit for review at the next CAS meeting.

Conclusion

The MDHE will continue to facilitate both the work of the CAI cross-cultural/global competencies workgroup and the dissemination of entry- and exit-level competencies through the CAS. The MDHE also is committed to working collaboratively with DESE in aligning the CBHE-approved competencies with the Common Core State Standards for secondary education and in the development of appropriate assessment instruments to measure college readiness. The MDHE will continue to communicate with all educational sectors, parents, students, and legislators about the standards for access to collegiate-level coursework and for the transfer of general education courses.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.005.2(7)(10), RSMo, Curriculum Alignment, Fines

Section 173.020 (4), RSMo. Identify higher education need, design coordinating plan for higher education

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assigned to Consent Calendar

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Summary Report – Alignment of CAI Entry-Level Competencies and Common Core State Standards

Attachment B: Cross-Cultural and Global Education Workgroup Members



Summary Report
Alignment of CAI Entry-level Competencies and Common Core State Standards

Background

As part of SB 389, signed into law August 28, 2007, presidents and chancellors of public institutions or their designees were charged to work with the commissioner of Higher Education in the development of competencies for first general education courses in key disciplines. The Curriculum Alignment Initiative (CAI) was established to identify entry- and exit- level competencies that will serve to outline standards for success in collegiate-level coursework and that will help facilitate the transfer of single general education courses.

In June 2008, the CBHE approved entry-level competencies in several areas, including mathematics and English language arts. In September 2009, Missouri and 47 other states committed to adopt the standards for mathematics and English language arts contained in the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI), coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

Adoption of the Common Core Standards was required as part of the state's application for "Race to the Top," even though the standards had not been finalized. In the fall 2009, the Missouri Department of Higher Education staff compared the CAI entry-level competencies in mathematics and English language arts to the draft standards of the CCSSI to assess the extent of alignment between the two sets of standards. The MDHE also asked content experts in both mathematics and English language arts to do a similar analysis. Both the MDHE and the content experts concluded that there were no significant gaps in alignment between the CAI competencies and common core standards.

Many in the higher education community raised concerns about the adoption of the CCSSI. Foremost among them was a concern that the arduous work done by faculty and staff to create the CAI entry-level competencies was for naught, that college-level standards were being imposed on colleges and universities, and that the CCSSI standards may be lower than those adopted in Missouri. In response to these concerns, MDHE staff consulted with national education experts and the Council of Chief State School Officers about the CCSSI. The CAI Steering Committee, other content experts, and institutional academic administrators in Missouri agreed to perform crosswalks to assess the alignment of the core standards with the CAI competencies in math and language arts to ensure that a critical mass of content experts will be involved in the process.

Results

MDHE staff sent requests to twelve content experts in mathematics and twelve in English and Communication. We asked the content experts to analyze and compare the content of the national Common Core State Standards Initiative with the CBHE-approved CAI entry-level competencies and to assess the degree to which they are aligned. We left the precise methodology to the reviewers. The primary goal of the review was to determine if the CAI entry-level competencies equal or exceed the expectations of performance contained in the Common Core State Standards. We asked the reviewers to identify specific areas in which Missouri's standards do not rise to the level of the national standards.

Four responses were received in English and Communication, and three in mathematics (one of these was done at the request of MDHE in January 2010).

The consensus among the content experts from each discipline is that there is no appreciable difference between the CAI entry-level competencies and the CCSSI standards. The

tables below summarize the findings for each discipline. The reviewers' complete reports can be found after the tables.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

NAME	COMMENTS
Katricia Pierson William Woods University	"All the English competencies are covered by the CCSSO standards. "
Christine Warren Southeast Missouri State University	"Overall, the National Standards align with the Missouri Standards."
Dale Haskell Southeast Missouri State University	"The English sections of the Missouri Core Competencies [and] the federal Common Core Standards [are] fundamentally compatible with each other in terms of philosophy."
Lisa Shoemaker State Fair Community College	" the minor differences I detect do not warrant concern that either group's standards are lesser than or greater than the other's."

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
MATHEMATICS**

NAME	COMMENTS
Ann Boehmer East Central College	"Overall, I found many similarities between the competencies. . . . The CAI, however, contained topics that are often reserved for a College Algebra class, and would not necessarily be expected of a student who completed high school without college algebra. For these reasons, I found the CAI to have a rigor level higher than the CCSSO."
Nicholas Baeth University of Central Missouri	"For the most part, the CAI entry-level competencies equal or exceed the expectations of performance contained in the Common Core State Standards. The exceptions lie with a lack of specificity pertaining to topics, methods, and strategies within the CAI documents and the omission of the areas of Probability and Statistics that are found in the CCSS documents."
Mary Shepard Northwest Missouri State University	"It seems clear to me that basic categories of standards from one set match to basic categories in the other. From discussions with others who have read the CCSSO standards, and I personally agree, if students came to us meeting the CCSSO standards we, as college faculty, would be very happy. The students would be in good stead to succeed in college level courses below the calculus level."

**Full Reports
English Language Arts and Communications**

Katricia G. Pierson
William Woods University

All the English competencies are covered by the CCSSO standards. For the cross-disciplines, there are five competencies that do not have a corresponding CCSSO standard:

- CD-Reading – 1 – Use effective pre-reading strategies.
- CD-Reading – 3a – Summarize the major points in a text and use graphic organizers to organize ideas and concepts in a visual manner.
- CD-Reading – 4 – Connect reading to historical and current events and personal interests.
- CD-Writing – 5h – Conclude research by sharing information in a cogent style reflective of the learning from the research.
- CD-Oral – 1a – Recognize the importance of effective speaking and listening habits.

It is my estimation that the CCSSO standards require more complex skills than the standards developed by CAI groups because the student is expected to analyze, apply, synthesize, and evaluate information more frequently whereas the CAI standards tend to ask students to simply identify and use information. It isn't always clear what "use" means in the CAI standards. It could be apply or synthesize.

Of the five competencies listed above, they all seem to be embedded in the CCSSO standards or are a lower-level skill that must be accomplished before demonstrating a CCSSO standard.

Christine Warren
Southeast Missouri State University

Comparison of MDHE Core Competencies and National Readiness Standards in **English**

MDHE Core Competencies	National Readiness Standards
1a, text discussion	None found
1b, incorporate ideas from reading for writing	W2, gather information to build or address R2, support with text evidence
1c, identify main idea and supporting evidence	R4, determine main ideas and the details that support
1d, distinguish fact from opinion	None found
1e, distinguish general and specific information	R10, analyze how specific details and larger portions of text contribute to meaning (?)
1f, summarize and paraphrase information	R3, summarize information (does not include paraphrase, an important skill)
1g, communicate in groups	SL 5, 6, 8, listen, evaluate, and respond constructively to a discussion
2a, generating ideas, revising, editing, proofreading writing (does not include with technology)	W11, 12 assess and revise writing and use technology to edit writing
2b, Revise work	W11, assess and revise
3a, use varied sentence structures	W7, use varied sentence structures
3b, produce error free sentences	W9, demonstrate command of standard English conventions
3c, communicate with few mechanical errors	W9, , demonstrate command of standard English conventions
4a, write focused topic sentences	W1, establish a topic sentence * that addresses the specific task
4b, use details to develop main idea	W4, support with relevant details
4c, Use organizational and developmental patterns	W7, use cohesion structures W5, use a logical progression of ideas
4d, use transitional devices	W3, sustain focus W7, use cohesion structures
5a, use basic essay structure (clearly specific)	W5, create a logical progression of ideas? (much less specific)
5b, construct thesis	W1, establish a thesis
5c, organize logically	W5, create a logical progression
5d, develop main idea with detail	W4, support with relevant details
5e, use transitions	W7, use structures to achieve cohesion
5f, maintain appropriate tone and vocab	W6, choose words to express precisely W8, develop appropriate tone

6a, acknowledge sources	W10, cite accurately
6b, locate information with technology	R12, extract information from print and online text
6c, evaluate reliability of information and sources	W13, synthesize information from relevant sources?
6d, record relevant information	R12, extract key information
6e, document sources correctly	W10, represent and cite accurately
No competency found	R1, inference (an important skill)
None found	R5, determine chronology and relationship of text events
None found	R6, nonfiction individuals and fiction characters analysis
None found	R7, vocab strategies
None found	R8, analyze tone in a text
None found	R9, analyze organizational structure of a text
None found for this part of the standard	W13, provide graphics to information
None found	SL1,2,3,4, 7

*Should “sentence” be added after “topic” in standard W1? If W1 is about choosing an appropriate on-task topic, the topic sentence and thesis should be addressed in a separate standard.

Overall, the National Standards align with the Missouri Standards. The three exceptions are indicated in the above chart. Not all the national reading or speaking and listening standards are addressed by Missouri, but the emphasis of the Missouri Standards is on writing, not reading nor speaking and listening.

Dale Haskell
Southeast Missouri State University

After comparing the English sections of the Missouri Core Competencies with the federal Common Core Standards, I find them to be, fundamentally, compatible with each other in terms of philosophy.

In terms of focus, however, the Missouri Core Competencies are directed at writing (specifically with academic writing) and, as such, would be more readily addressed and assessed within the context of good teaching and learning in our schools. The federal Core Standards, with their inclusion of speaking and listening skills, would in my opinion be far more difficult to address and assess, and would be a problematic “match” for traditional good practice in English Language Arts classrooms.

If we were obliged to accomplish the federal standards, I believe that we would have to reorient much of our instructional practice toward oral communication skills, and that such a reorientation would de-emphasize student reading and writing skills. This would be troubling to me, in terms of preparing students for success in higher educational settings.

I think we’re better off focusing just on writing, if we are given the option of doing so.

Lisa Shoemaker

State Fair Community College

After mulling over the standards established for both groups, Rusty, I have to say that the minor differences I detect do not warrant concern that either group's standards are lesser than or greater than the other's.

As I was serving on Missouri's alignment committee for the state competency standards, I was uneasy during most of our sessions when we established these core standards. Yes, they are standards, but the reality is that so very few of my entry-level composition students come close to meeting a majority of the state standards. When I read over the Missouri competencies, I see that these are skills that I teach in Composition I, but rarely—and I mean rarely—do many of my students enter Composition I with these competencies achieved even at a low level. Having said that, as I read the national standards, I see more specificity in the competencies, but they do not lead me to believe that they are higher or lower than the standards that Missouri has established for students entering a first-year college writing course.

Since reading is so tied to good writing, the Missouri standards for writing do contain competencies that require good reading before a student writes (i.e., 1f: Summarize and paraphrase information), so I'm not concerned that Missouri does not delineate reading and writing as separate competencies. Perhaps this was part of the concern of my colleagues.

Certainly, the national standards itemize competencies associated with certain genres and rhetorical modes (i.e., writing arguments), but the standards that Missouri has in place would apply to arguments as well as explanatory essays.

I guess, Rusty, I mean to say, "I'm good" with the slight differences. Good grief, we writing instructors have quite the tasks before us, eh?

Todd S. Phillips
Truman State University

Here are my thoughts on these standards that relate to communication: I have added a few thoughts. I think the trick is going to see at what level the standards are mastered. How can we ensure success in college if the skills needed for success may not be taught, developed, or mastered at the level expected for college success? I think this is a good list of standards. The key here will be acquiring these skills at the appropriate level.

Writing-Inform/Explain	3	Demonstrate understanding of content by reporting facts accurately and anticipating reader misconceptions.
Writing- Arguments	1	Establish a substantive claim, distinguishing it from alternate or opposing claims.
Writing- Arguments	2	Link claims and evidence with clear reasons, and ensure that the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims.
Writing- Arguments	3	Acknowledge competing arguments or information, defending or qualifying the initial claim as appropriate.
Speaking & Listening	1	Select and use a format, organization, and style appropriate to the topic, purpose, and audience.
Speaking & Listening	2	Present information, findings, and supporting evidence clearly and concisely. (Distinguish between fact and opinion)
Speaking & Listening	3	Make strategic use of multimedia elements and visual displays of data to gain audience attention and enhance understanding.
Speaking & Listening	4	Demonstrate command of formal Standard English when appropriate to task and audience.
Speaking & Listening	5	Listen to complex information, and discern the main ideas, the significant details, and the relationships among them. (Summarize and paraphrase information)
Speaking & Listening	6	Demonstrate active listening skills and follow the progression of the speaker's message, and evaluate the speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric.
Speaking & Listening	7	Ask relevant questions to clarify points and challenge ideas.
Speaking & Listening	8	Respond constructively to advance a discussion and build on the input of others.

I would add:

Speaking & Listening 9: Communicate effectively in groups by listening, reflecting, and responding appropriately.

Speaking & Listening 10: Demonstrate critical and analytical thinking through speaking by entertaining opposing ideas and their ramifications.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

MATHEMATICS

Ann Boehmer
East Central College

Overall, I found many similarities between the competencies. There were some areas of improvement. The most apparent improvement of the CCSSO is the vagueness of many topics, which would allow different schools different mastery levels, with all claiming to have met the competency requirement. However, the CAI very clearly list subsequent competencies to be mastered, providing a competency less open to interpretation. The CAI, however, contained topics that are often reserved for a College Algebra class, and would not necessarily be expected of a student who completed high school without college algebra. For these reasons, I found the CAI to have a rigor level higher than the CCSSO, however, the CCSSO (with clarification and restricted use of technology) does contain the necessary skills a student should possess to be successful in a first semester college level mathematics' course (i.e. College Algebra). The following are suggested areas of improvement:

CCSSO

Number Concepts

A *The real numbers include the rational numbers and are in one-to-one correspondence with the points on the number line.* Concern: the irrational numbers. To master the real numbers a student should have competency with the rational numbers, as well as the irrationals. The emphasis on the rationals, could allow the irrationals to be omitted.

Quantity Skills

1 *Know when and how to convert units in computations.* The type of units has been omitted. Does the skill include both standard and metric? Without clarification, the metric system could easily be overlooked.

Modeling Skills

3 *Model situations with equations and inequalities.* Again the concern is vagueness. The CAIs specifically list linear, absolute value, quadratic, rational, and radical equations, linear and absolute value inequalities, and systems of linear equations and inequalities with two variables, whereas the CCSSO do not list the specifics of the equations to be solved.

Shape Skills

1 *Use multiple geometric properties to solve problems involving geometric figures.* The corresponding CAI includes specifics such as recognize and apply properties and theorems related to circles, determine the area and perimeter of plane figures and use the concept of conservation of area, and apply the basic formulas for volume and surface area of solids.

Coordinate Skills

3 *Use coordinates to solve geometric problems.* Needs a better descriptive of what is included. The corresponding CAI refers to using geometry to make connections between algebra and geometry, describing lines in the coordinate plane using slope-intercept and point-

slope forms, and using slope to describe the steepness and directions of lines and determine if the lines are parallel, perpendicular, or neither.

CAI

The following are topics that are often reserved for a college algebra class. By including these topics in the K-12 competencies, an unnecessary discrepancy could potentially be created between college bound students, non-college bound students, and career technical students. The object of these competencies should be limited to the skills that will help a student be prepared to take a college level class, whether that class is algebra based, statistical based or geometrical based, not the skills a student will master after the completion of a first semester college level mathematics course.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|---|
| Numerical Computation | 1 | Calculate the sum, difference, product, and quotient of complex numbers and express the result in standard form |
| Algebra | 2d | Solve quadratic equations by factoring, completing the square, and using the quadratic formula (completing the square being the questionable topic) |
| Algebra | 2f | Solve radical equations |
| Algebra | 3a | Correctly apply the algebraic language and notation for functions including domain and range |
| Algebra | 3b | Compose and decompose functions and find inverses of basic functions |
| Algebra | 3c | Identify and compose a variety of functions (e.g. constant, linear, quadratic, cubic, absolute value, exponential and logarithmic functions) and apply the properties of each. |
| Algebra | 4b | Recognize the basic shape of the graph of a quadratic function; <u>find the vertex; calculate and recognize the relationships among the solutions of the related quadratic equations, zeroes of the function and intercepts of the graph.</u> |
| Algebra | 4c | Recognize and sketch the basic shapes of the graphs of the following functions: constant, linear, quadratic, cubic, square root, cube root, absolute value, exponential and logarithmic (without technology) |
| Algebra | 4d | Describe the effects of parameter changes on functions |
| Algebra | 4e | Describe and sketch the effects of transformations on the graphs of functions |

Comparison of CAI Competencies & Common Core State Standards Mathematics

N. Baeth, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Central Missouri

At the request of statewide chief academic officers and the Missouri Department of Higher Education, this document has been compiled to assess the alignment of CAI entry-level competencies and the National/Common Core State Standards in the area of mathematics. For the most part, the CAI entry-level competencies equal or exceed the expectations of performance contained in the Common Core State Standards. The exceptions lie with a lack of specificity pertaining to topics, methods, and strategies within the CAI documents and the omission of the areas of Probability and Statistics that are found in the CCSS documents. The CCSS area Modeling, which does not occur as an area in the CAI document, is addressed as an overarching theme. The brief report that follows attempts to find a correspondence between the areas outlined in each of the CAI and CCSS documents.

CCSS Area	CAI Areas	Comparison	CAI Meets/Exceeds?
Mathematical Practice	Introduction Section	The CCSS document is more specific in terms of methodology and strategies that students should consider when working procedural mathematical problems. The CAI document is more complete in its holistic description of how students should think of mathematics.	Yes
Number	Numerical Computation	Both documents outline the importance of the following topics: <i>properties of arithmetic, real numbers, irrational numbers, rational numbers, fractions, ratios, percentages, magnitudes, estimation & approximation, units, and coordinates & number lines.</i>	Yes
Quantity			
Expressions	Algebra	Both documents outline the importance of the following topics: <i>rules of arithmetic applied to expressions, understanding of what an algebraic expression is, building complex expressions out of simple expressions, defining variables to represent quantities, understanding of an equation as one expression equal to another, understanding that solving an equation is looking for a set of values which make the expression a true</i>	Yes
Equations			
Functions			
Coordinates			

		<p><i>statement, comparing solutions in different number systems, solving systems of equations, linear inequalities, understanding a function as a set of pairs, as a table, as a graph, and as a rule given by a formula, linear functions, and exponential functions, recognizing shapes of graphs within certain families of functions.</i></p> <p>The CAI document, in addition, addresses: <i>polynomial & quadratic functions, logarithmic functions, radical equations, rational equations, solving equations by means of factoring, and nonlinear inequalities and their graphs.</i></p>	
Modeling	Introduction Algebra	<p>The CCSS document includes a separate section for modeling which outlines the following topics: <i>precision, purpose of the model, appropriate use of technology, and a basic outline for setting up and using a mathematical model.</i></p> <p>The CAI document does not have a section devoted to mathematical modeling, but does address most of these topics within the Algebra and section as well as in the introduction. However, CAI is less specific in terms of how students should set up a model.</p>	Yes
Shape		<p>Both documents address fundamental topics of Euclidean Geometry including: <i>similarity, congruence, areas, perimeters, volumes, simple geometric proofs, and symmetries.</i></p> <p>In addition, the CAI document includes some trigonometric topics. However, these topics are tagged as not necessary for all students.</p>	Yes
Probability	n/a	Probability is not listed as a CAI entry-level Competency	No
Statistics	n/a	Statistics is not listed as a CAI entry-level competency.	No

At times, the CCSS document is more specific in terms of concepts and skills students must be familiar with before entering college while at other times the CAI document is more specific. For the most part, these documents contain roughly equivalent coverage of primary and secondary school mathematics.

The issues that need to be addressed by the Missouri Department of Higher Education are whether or not to expect students to have a usable understanding of probability and statistics, as outlined in the Common Core State Standards, when entering their first college mathematics course and whether or not students should be expected to have exposure to the above list of topics not addressed by the Common Core State Standards.

APPENDIX: INDIVIDUAL CROSSWALK ANALYSIS

Report to MDHE on a Crosswalk between the CAI math standards and the CCSSO math standards.

Mary Shepherd, Northwest Missouri State University

Date: January 21, 2010

It is difficult to do a standard by standard matching process. Some standards are quite similar, such as CAI Numerical Computation standard 4, “Compare and order real numbers, including finding their approximate locations on the number line,” matches pretty closely to the combination of CCSSO Number Skills 1, “Compare numbers and make sense of their magnitude”, and CCSSO Number Concepts A, “The real numbers include the rational numbers and are in one-to-one correspondence with the points on the number line.” But in general, the matching process is not easy.

Instead of a standard by standard matching, though, it seems clear to me that basic categories of standards from one set match to basic categories in the other. I will proceed to give that general matching, and state where there are differences or omissions in either set.

- CAI Mastery Characteristics and Mathematical Participation generally match to the CCSSO Mathematical Practice section. The CCSSO includes a little more on the use of patterns and repeated reasoning.
- CAI Numerical Computation generally matches to the CCSSO Number and Quantity sections (both Skills and Concepts). CAI includes specific topics of complex numbers, absolute value and sets that are not mentioned in the CCSSO standards. The CCSSO standards give more weight to the units that any quantity must have in some context.
- CAI Algebra parts 1 and 2 generally match to the CCSSO Expressions and Equations sections. CAI standards are more detailed on the types of expressions and equations to be used and manipulated. Some conceptual ideas that CAI assumes are more spelled out in the CCSSO standards.
- CAI Algebra parts 3 and 4 and some of 5 correspond to the CCSSO Functions section. CAI has more functions listed, CCSSO mentions only linear and exponential functions, but includes more related to rates of change. The CCSSO standards, though, make no mention of understanding anything about inverse functions.
- CAI Algebra part 5 corresponds somewhat to CCSSO Modeling section. The CAI standards include the modeling ideas throughout the standards, the CCSSO standards put them into their own section, which might lead to an increased emphasis over the CAI version.
- CAI Algebra part 6 corresponds most closely to the CCSSO Mathematical Practice-Practices 6 standard since both relate to the appropriate use of technology. The CCSSO MP P 6 includes more technology tools and includes paper, pencil, ruler, protractor, spreadsheets, CAS, stats packages, and dynamic geometry software which is much more than the “calculator” ideas that were the main technology tools in the CAI standards.
- CAI Geometry standards basically cover the same ideas as the CCSSO Shape and Coordinates sections.
- CAI has NO probability standards and these are a section in the CCSSO standards.
- CAI CD Statistics standards match somewhat to the CCSSO Statistics standards. The CCSSO standards do include drawing conclusions about populations means and proportions (could be hypothesis testing or confidence intervals) that are not included in the CAI CD standards.

The primary question I was asked to address is something like: “If DESE implements these standards (CCSSO) and assesses them adequately, what aspects of the CAI competencies will be missing?”

This list is short—complex numbers, possibly absolute value (without looking at the examples in CCSSO, though, this is not clear), sets and inverse functions. There are some functions that the CAI standards include that specifically the CCSSO chose not to include—any functions beyond linear and exponential—but the CCSSO document, at least at one time, indicated that the other types of functions would be addressed in the equation solving issues that are related to functions. From the other side of this question, the CCSSO standards do include probability. This is not at all addressed in the CAI standards. Also, the CCSSO standards seem to place a greater emphasis on working with and understanding the units of a quantity, and there seems to be a greater emphasis on modeling than in the CAI standards.

From discussions with others who have read the CCSSO standards, and I personally agree, if students came to us meeting the CCSSO standards we, as college faculty, would be very happy. The students would be in good stead to succeed in college level courses below the calculus level. Finally, although it is mentioned in each set of standards, neither of these sets of standards is enough for a student to progress directly into a STEM field where Calculus 1 is the minimum expected college level starting point for mathematics.

Cross-Cultural and Global Education Workgroup Members

Institution	Representative
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Sharon Hoge
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Steve Williams
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Cindy Bryant
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Bill Gerling
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Shaun Bates
East Central College	Ann Boehmer
Harris-Stowe State University	Johndavid Kerr
Harris-Stowe State University	Ken Bowman
Harris-Stowe State University	Norman McGee
Harris-Stowe State University	Reynaldo Anderson
Harris-Stowe State University	Kimberly Curtis
Harris-Stowe State University	Joe Teng
Harris-Stowe State University	Shawni Jackson
Jefferson College	Mary Beth Ottinger
Jefferson College	Dedric Lee
Jefferson College	Nicole Bach
Lincoln University	Manzoor Chowdhury
Lincoln University	Cheryl Hibbett
Lincoln University	Rhonda Wood
Lincoln University	Ann McSwain
Lincoln University	Glenn Brown
Maryville University	Charles Gulas
Maryville University	Alden Craddock
Metropolitan Community College–Blue River	Ben Wolfe
Metropolitan Community College–Blue River	Cheryl Carpenter
Metropolitan Community College–Longview	Zoe Albright
Metropolitan Community College–Longview	Deanna Poudel
Metropolitan Community College–Penn Valley	Lisa Spaulding
Metropolitan Community College–Penn Valley	Leo Hirner
Metropolitan Community College–Penn Valley	Julianne Jacques
Missouri Southern State University	Chad Stebbins
North Central Missouri College	Susan Stull
Ozarks Technical Community College	Loren Lundstrom
Ozarks Technical Community College	Gavin O'Connor
St. Louis Community College	Celia Bouchard
Truman State University	Doug Davenport
University of Central Missouri	Suhansa (Sue) Rodchua

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Higher Education Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Advisory Council Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The Higher Education Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Advisory Council (HES-HSAC) was established in 2007 to advise the Homeland Security Advisory Council on safety initiatives related to higher education in Missouri. The intent of this board item is to provide an update on the work of the HES-HSAC.

Background

The Homeland Security Advisory Council established the Higher Education Subcommittee in 2007 following the shootings on the campus of Virginia Tech University. The mission of the HES-HSAC is to provide assistance to Missouri colleges and universities in planning, preparing, mitigating, and responding to hazards in order to make Missouri's campuses safe.

Progress on Current Initiatives

The HES-HSAC has made progress on the following priorities:

- **Best Practices.** The HES-HSAC works year-round to identify and disseminate best practices for safety and security issues on campus to assist higher education institutions in creating a culture of preparedness. In April and May, HES-HSAC members assisted the Missouri Campus Safety and Security Consortium (MCSSC) in developing a grant proposal to increase the sharing of best practices among institutions of higher education in the state.

Seventeen two-year and four-year public and private Missouri institutions formed the MCSSC, under the leadership of Northwest Missouri State University, to apply for funds under the Emergency Management for Higher Education grant competition (see attachment for a list of member institutions). The MCSSC proposal outlines a two-year process in which each consortium institution will take part in various activities that support the development or review and improvement, and full integration of, a campus-wide all-hazards emergency plan. Throughout the various stages of this process, the HES-HSAC will serve as both a resource for consortium institutions and a vehicle for informing statewide and local policy on campus safety and security.

During development or review and improvement of all-hazards emergency plans, MCSSC institutions will have the opportunity to:

- Exchange best practices while also participating in national, state, and regional workshops to build knowledge about effective planning procedures.
 - Practice newly acquired skills and execute updated emergency procedures through participation in nationwide and campus-wide exercise activities.
 - Integrate more fully with current emergency planning activities in their region that are represented by the Regional Homeland Security Oversight Committees (RHSOC), municipal government, and the local emergency management coordinating body.
 - Identify and analyze the current limitations of Emergency Response Information Plan (ERIP), the state-sponsored emergency planning tool for K-12 and higher education. Upon completion of the analysis, consortium institutions will oversee revisions to the tool, pilot the updates, and ensure that the revised tool is suitable to the higher education environment. After successful updates, a two-year license agreement will be purchased to provide all Missouri institutions of higher education use of the updated tool.
 - Purchase technology, equipment, and supplies which clearly support emergency plans.
- ***Rapid Response Cycle Model.*** Earlier this year, the HES-HSAC adopted a “rapid response cycle” model for responding to campus security events and the committee is currently dialoging about how the model will be utilized. Discussion of the model at the May meeting focused on defining triggering events, determining appropriate response time frames, and identifying resources and subject matter experts that will contribute to developing the response. Members are also discussing the types of tools that will be produced and how they will be disseminated. Committee members plan to begin using the model later this year.
 - ***Collaboration with the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA).*** HES-HSAC members are in discussions with SEMA regarding increased higher education involvement in national, statewide, and local safety exercises. HES-HSAC continues to work with SEMA on the 2010 Earthquake Recovery Exercise activities that culminate in June. Planning is also underway for higher education participation in the National Level Exercise scheduled for May 16-20, 2011 (NLE 2011) to prepare communities to respond to an earthquake on the New Madrid fault line.
 - ***Missouri Safe Schools and Colleges Conference.*** The HES-HSAC is collaborating with the Missouri School Boards’ Association and the Department of Public Safety Office of Homeland Security to plan the higher education track of the Missouri Safe Schools and Colleges Conference. The conference will be held on July 22 and 23, 2010 at Tan-Tar-A resort in Osage Beach, Missouri. The conference will focus on enhancing prevention and emotional support in dealing with safety and security issues in schools and on campuses including suicide prevention, reducing student aggression, and understanding and planning for campus bomb incidents. Attendees will include faculty and administrators

from all education sectors, along with law enforcement, health care, and emergency personnel.

- ***Committee Membership.*** The HES-HSAC is authorized to have 25 voting members but currently has only 21. In the coming weeks, new members representing various campus functional areas, organization types, institution types, and regions will be appointed to the committee.

HES-HSAC members have been presented with an opportunity to assist in the development of a new campus safety and security resource in the state:

- ***Missouri Center for Education Safety.*** The Missouri School Boards' Association and the Missouri Department of Public Safety have undertaken a joint initiative to create a new Missouri Center on Education Safety. The Center is in the conceptual stage but will likely promote and provide resources across the full spectrum of school and campus safety and security to foster learning for all students and campus personnel in Missouri. The Center will support Pre-K – 12 and higher education institutions, both public and private. HES-HSAC members have been encouraged to provide input and identify opportunities for the Center. During the May meeting, members engaged in extensive discussion about the Center. Recommendations resulting from this discussion will be provided to Missouri School Boards' Association and the Department of Public Safety.

Conclusion

Best practices in campus safety and security support collaborative, multi-disciplinary approaches in planning and preparing for hazards. HES-HSAC serves as a catalyst for this collaboration of multiple stakeholders to foster a culture of preparedness and safety on Missouri campuses.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Governor's Executive Order 06-09

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assigned to Consent Calendar

ATTACHMENT

Missouri Campus Safety and Security Consortium Member Institutions

Missouri Campus Safety and Security Consortium Member Institutions

Consortium Institution		Institution Type
1	East Central College	Public, Two-Year
2	Harris-Stowe State University	Public, Four-Year
3	Jefferson College	Public, Two-Year
4	Linn State Technical College	Public/Technical, Two-Year
5	Maryville University	Independent, Four-Year
6	Mineral Area	Public, Two-Year
7	Missouri State University - West Plains	Public, Two-Year
8	Missouri Western State University	Public, Four-Year
9	North Central Missouri College	Public, Two-Year
10	Northwest Missouri State University	Public, Four-Year
11	Truman State University	Public, Four-Year
12	Park University	Independent, Four-Year
13	Southeast Missouri State University	Public, Four-Year
14	Stephens College	Independent, Four-Year
15	University of Central Missouri	Public, Four-Year
16	University of Missouri - St. Louis	Public, Four-Year
17	Westminster College	Independent, Four-Year

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA) Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

A major statutory responsibility of the CBHE is to ensure efficient and effective transfer of students among Missouri institutions. The CBHE's standing advisory committee, the Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA), works within the board's statutory authority to establish guidelines and to promote and facilitate the transfer of students between institutions of higher education within the state. The intent of this board item is to provide a summary of the work of COTA since the last board meeting.

COTA Update

Pam McIntyre, president of St. Louis Community College-Wildwood, was appointed chair of COTA for 2010-2011. The list of current COTA members is attached.

COTA meet on May 26, 2010, at the MDHE offices. The primary agenda item was a discussion of strategic planning and goals for upcoming year. At previous meetings, members agreed that the development of strategic objectives for COTA could improve the position of higher education within the state, particularly in increasing communication, cooperation, and collaboration among all educational sectors. It also would facilitate the pursuit of the statewide goals contained in *Imperatives for Change*.

The discussion on strategic objectives itself was framed by a concurrent conversation about the context in which we operate, such as the current political and economic trends and general trends in higher education governance, as well as COTA's role in developing statewide policies within this context:

- There are several key transfer or transition moments along the educational spectrum, and it may be appropriate for COTA to assume this broader P-20 perspective to identify strategic objectives.
- There is a growing trend nationwide in higher education toward more centralization of governance and coordination of statewide initiatives.
- Missouri institutions miss opportunities for large grant applications that require identified collaborations between institutions.
- There continues to be a gap between leadership intent and faculty and staff implementation of transfer and articulation agreements.
- Institutions should seek new and effective partnerships that support educational attainment along with student recruitment.

Several specific issues were identified for possible action or exploration, including:

- preparing an annual report on the state and health of transfer and articulation in Missouri;
- exploring institutional collaboration on a grand scale;
- developing a common course numbering system for general education courses;
- exploring ways to engage faculty more fully in the development of fundamental curricular changes, such as a common course numbering system.
- reviewing the appropriateness and value of maintaining selective admissions categories;
- identifying specific strategies for improving the working relationships between the state's two-year and four-year institutions;
- exploring ways to build stronger relationships between the state's public sector and the independent sector;
- exploring ways to build stronger relationships between the state's public sector and the proprietary sector;
- examining issues regarding the transfer of international students;
- reviewing dual credit, early college, and other concurrent enrollment programs;
- developing strategies to assist in college readiness and preparation.

While no action was taken at this meeting, further discussion of these issues will be on COTA's agenda for the coming year.

2011 Transfer Conference

COTA approved holding the 2011 Transfer Conference on February 11, 2011, in Columbia, Missouri. The COTA Advisory Committee (COTA-AC) will have primary responsibility for planning the conference. COTA suggested that COTA-AC use the strategic objectives discussion as a guide for soliciting conference presentations. COTA further encouraged COTA-AC to develop plenary and breakout sessions that would appeal not only to transfer and articulation practitioners but also to faculty and staff. COTA-AC will issue a call for proposals in September, and select presenters by mid-November.

Conclusion

COTA's work over the next several months will focus on identifying and addressing strategic objectives and working with COTA-AC to plan the 2011 Transfer Conference.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.020(3) and 173.005.2(6), RSMo, Responsibilities of the Coordinating Board

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assigned to Consent Calendar

ATTACHMENT

List of Current COTA Members
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

**CBHE Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA)
Membership, 2010-2011**

Chair

Dr. Pam McIntyre, President

St. Louis Community College–Wildwood

Members

Dr. Troy Paino, President

Truman State University

Dr. Steven Graham, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

University of Missouri System

Dr. Evelyn Jorgenson, President

Moberly Area Community College

Dr. R. Alton Lacey, President

Missouri Baptist University

Ms. Julia Leeman, President

Sanford-Brown College

Dr. Tuesday Stanley, Vice Chancellor

Metropolitan Community College

Dr. Bruce Speck, President

Missouri Southern State University

Dr. Robert Stein, Commissioner of Higher Education (ex-officio voting member)

Missouri Department of Higher Education

Support Staff

Dr. Rusty Monhollon, Senior Associate

Missouri Department of Higher Education

Alternates

Public 4-year:

Dr. Cindy Heider, Associate Vice Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Missouri Western State University

Public 2-year:

Dr. Donna Dare, Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

St. Louis Community College

Independent:

Dr. Arlen Dykstra, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Missouri Baptist University

Coordinating Board for Higher Education

June 10, 2010

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Discussion re Cape Girardeau Partnership
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The Cape Girardeau County Partnership is a young collaborative created to meet student and community needs by providing community college-type services in the Cape Girardeau region. The intent of this board item is to provide a context for a discussion of the Cape Girardeau County Partnership with Senator Crowell during the upcoming CBHE meeting.

Background

Cape Girardeau County is home to Southeast Missouri State University and falls within the voluntary service region of Three Rivers Community College. Historically, the region has been subject to vested local interests regarding expanded delivery of postsecondary options. Such options included development of a residence center, establishment of a new community college, and expansion of course and program delivery by current partners.

Education, business, and community leaders have banded together to identify the educational needs of the region. In late 2009, after extensive deliberation over several years, the Board presidents of Southeast, Three Rivers, Mineral Area College, Southeast Missouri Hospital College of Nursing and Health Sciences, and the superintendent of the Cape Girardeau Public School District signed a collaborative agreement that formed the Cape Girardeau County Partnership. Key elements of the partnership agreement include the establishment of an advisory committee, a process to resolve partnership disagreements, agreement that Three Rivers will begin the approval process for an associate degree to be delivered in Cape Girardeau County, and exploration about the needs for expansion of health care programs.

Advisory Committee

By-laws have been drafted for the Cape Girardeau County Partnership that includes the role and membership for the Advisory Committee. It is anticipated that the Advisory Committee will meet minimally twice per year. A list of members is provided in the attachment.

Dispute Resolution

The Advisory Committee will have a standing committee on dispute resolution. If the Committee, through discussions with institutional representatives, is unable to resolve disagreements, the presidents of the institutions involved will seek assistance of the Commissioner of Higher Education in resolving the issue(s).

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

Three Rivers Community College Associate Degree (Cape Girardeau County)

Section 2 of the partnership agreement required Three Rivers to begin the approval process for the first degree program to be delivered by the partnership. In May 2010, Three Rivers submitted a request on behalf of the Cape Girardeau Partnership for Higher Education for delivery of an associate of arts degree in Cape Girardeau County for implementation in fall 2010. The proposal has been posted to the MDHE website for comment; the official comment period for this proposal will close on June 11, 2010.

Health Care

The agreement also stipulates that a needs analysis for future certificate and degree programs in nursing and allied health programs will be conducted by an independent party within 12 months of the date of the agreement and by a firm agreed upon by all partners. Current program deliverers, medical providers, and the Advisory Board will be engaged in the process of developing recommendations for any expanded delivery that meets the citizens' needs.

Conclusion

The members of the Cape Girardeau County Partnership are demonstrating that citizens' needs are best served through collaboration among business and education leaders.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Sections 173.005, 173.005, 173.030, and 173.030 RSMo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is a discussion item only.

ATTACHMENT

Cape Girardeau County Partnership Agreement

Cape Girardeau County Partnership Advisory Committee

- Mike Smythe, KFVS12 vice president and general manager
- Gary Rust, Chairman of Rust Communications, which owns the Southeast Missourian
- Wayne Smith, vice president of development and administrative services for Saint Francis Medical Center
- Mary Burton-Hitt, executive director of the Southeast Missouri Hospital Foundation
- Kathy Swan, owner of JCS/Tel-Link and Cape Girardeau City Council member
- Linda Greaser, external relations leader for Procter & Gamble's Cape Girardeau facility
- Barbara Lohr, Jackson mayor
- Dr. Loretta Schneider, Cape Girardeau City Council member
- Dr. Jim Welker, superintendent of the Cape Girardeau School District
- Dr. Ron Anderson, superintendent of the Jackson School District
- Nate Crowden, superintendent of the Delta School District
- Rich Payne, director of the Cape Girardeau Career and Technology Center
- Dr. Tonya Buttry, president of the Southeast Missouri Hospital College of Nursing and Health Sciences
- Marion Tibbs, member of the Three Rivers board of trustees
- Gary Romine, member of the Mineral Area board of trustees
- Al Spradling III, vice president of Southeast's Board of Regents

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Student Loan Program Update
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

The MDHE has served as a guaranty agency¹ in the Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP) since 1979 and is one of 32 guarantors that exist across the nation. Because of the recently enacted Healthcare and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act, the MDHE will no longer have authority to guarantee new federal student loans after June 30, 2010 as those loans will be disbursed through the Federal Direct Loan Program. The purpose of this board item is to describe the challenges this change presents to the MDHE and potential future steps.

Discussion

Context:

- The MDHE is considered to be among the top tier of existing guaranty agencies with:
 - The 9th largest operating fund balance as a percentage of loans in repayment
 - The 11th largest operating fund overall
 - The 14th largest federal fund balance as a percentage of the guarantee portfolio's original principal outstanding
 - The 13th highest defaulted loan recovery rate
 - The 2nd highest loan recovery rate excluding collection by loan consolidation
- Current statutory and regulatory obligations related to the portfolio must continue to be met after June 30, 2010 (see Attachment A).
- The guaranty agency manages both a Federal Reserve Fund and an Agency Operating Fund (see Attachment B).
- With no changes, the MDHE expects to earn at least \$50 million² from its portfolio over the next four years.
- The elimination of new federal student loan guarantees will likely cause a number of financially weaker guaranty agencies to fail due to insolvency.

Unknowns:

- Provisions for guarantor-provided services for loans disbursed through the Federal Direct Loan Program were not included in recent legislation, but federal legislators and administration officials publicly agree the services are necessary.

¹ All references to guaranty agencies in this document refer to the entities designated to guarantee Federal Family Education Loans and any future forms of those entities.

² The use of future revenues and existing funds gained from guaranty agency activities is subject to specific statutory limitations.

- Guarantor-provided services include:
 - Debt management
 - Financial literacy
 - Default prevention
 - College access and outreach
- The U.S. Department of Education is expected to announce in mid-June its plans relating to future provision for the student loan services guaranty agencies currently provide.

Considerations:

- Consistent with federal guidelines, loan program proceeds underwrite the salaries of MDHE personnel who administer not only the loan program, but also those who perform other related departmental functions that serve important state needs.
 - Loan program proceeds provide 100 percent funding for 44 financial aid-related MDHE personnel.
 - Four of the 44 are dedicated exclusively to administering state financial aid programs.
 - The MDHE relies on the guaranty agency within federal guidelines to underwrite salaries for approximately 14 additional full time employee equivalents (FTE).
 - Loan program proceeds have historically funded much of the research and analysis performed for and by the MDHE.
- Loan proceeds fund the majority of development and maintenance costs for the FAMOUS state student financial assistance programs integrated database.
- Grants and other federal funds exist that may assist the MDHE in continuing to provide certain services, to a limited extent. For example:
 - College Access Challenge Grant
 - Awarded to each state by the federal government
 - Limited to activities designed to increase college access, affordability, and completion
 - Requires a match of \$1 for every \$2 of federal grant funds
 - Requires state maintenance of effort involving state support of institutional budgets and financial aid programs that may be difficult to maintain through the state's fiscal crisis.
 - College Goal Sunday Grant
 - Provided through the YMCA
 - Designated for activities to provide free information and assistance to college-bound students and families, particularly regarding FAFSA completion

Challenges:

- Aside from residual earnings from the portfolio, no dedicated continuing funding source currently exists for the agency's ongoing obligations or to support the other functions of the department now supported by loan program proceeds.

- As the MDHE guaranty portfolio decreases, related revenues will decline.
- Should federal contract or grant opportunities arise, the federal government is unlikely to want to work with 32 distinct entities (the number of existing guarantors).

Options to address changing environment:

- MDHE can continue to service its existing portfolio as long as revenues permit.
 - Revenues from its existing portfolio will continue several years though they will become less as the portfolio reduces in size.
 - Remaining a guaranty agency keeps the door open for future funding sources for debt management, financial literacy, default prevention, and college access and outreach.
- MDHE may simultaneously seek a viable consortium or partnership to benefit Missouri
 - With other guaranty agencies to create:
 - Economies of scale
 - A more robust infrastructure
 - Additional capacity to vie for federal servicing opportunities
 - With a secondary market to:
 - Create vertical integration
 - Increase the MDHE's likelihood of benefitting from Direct Loan servicing
- MDHE can seek to sell its portfolio and relinquish associated revenues and responsibilities
 - Requires U.S. Department of Education approval
 - Portfolio must be transferred to a guaranty agency
 - Eliminates eligibility for future opportunities that may become available to guaranty agencies
 - Could potentially result in one-time profit

Evaluation of options should take into consideration:

- Focusing on long-term benefits
- Ensuring those benefits accrue to Missouri
- Maintaining a higher-education access and affordability related purpose
- Maximizing the value and impact of the portfolio

Recommended future steps:

- Remain a guaranty agency while gathering more information about future funding opportunities for guarantors.
- Use existing funds to provide financial literacy, debt management, and default prevention services to current and future borrowers while meeting statutory and regulatory requirements of the existing portfolio
- Explore in depth potential partnerships and alliances with others that would benefit Missouri while keeping state and national higher education goals at the forefront.
- Seek out additional funding opportunities.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.055 RSMo

Section 173.110 RSMo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is a discussion item.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Guarantor Statutory/Regulatory Responsibilities

Attachment B: Guarantor Revenues and Allowable Expenditures

Guarantor Statutory/Regulatory Responsibilities

Federal statutes and regulations require specific activities for FFEL Program participants. The MDHE is required to work with students, borrowers, schools, lenders, servicers, the U.S. Department of Education and others to meet these requirements. Specific requirements resulting from outstanding guarantees include the following:

- Conduct college access activities
- Provide consumer financial literacy education
- Provide borrower assistance (Ombudsman responsibilities)
- Work with borrowers to prevent loan default
- Work with schools to prevent borrower loan defaults
- Maintain loan records
- Establish and enforce standards for lenders and schools
- Provide schools with loan transfer and default information
- Provide training and technical assistance to schools and lenders
- Reinstate defaulted borrower loan eligibility
- Defense of bankruptcy proceedings
- Review and pay lender claims and borrower discharges
- Conduct comprehensive reviews of lenders and servicers
- Conduct comprehensive reviews of high default schools
- Provide assistance to the Secretary of Education as requested
- Identify fraudulent loan applications and work with law enforcement
- Report misconduct of federal loan applications
- Monitor school enrollment
- Monitor borrower repayment status
- Report loan status changes to the central federal student aid database, National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS)
- Report defaulted loans to credit bureaus
- Notify borrowers of loan default
- Collect on defaulted loans
- Assist the USDE with collections through the Treasury Offset program
- Rehabilitate defaulted borrowers who qualify
- Garnish wages of defaulted borrowers

Guarantor Revenues and Allowable Expenditures

Federal Reserve Fund

- Property of Federal Government
- Revenues-
 - Reinsurance on claims of guaranteed loans
 - Secretary's share of Collections
 - Interest
- Expenses-
 - Claims paid to lenders
 - Default Aversion Fees (paid to AOF) to avert default
 - Guarantor share of collections (transferred to AOF)

Agency Operating Fund

- Property of the Guarantor
- Revenues
 - Loan processing fee paid by feds on new loans
 - Account maintenance fee paid by feds on outstanding loans
 - Default Aversion Fees paid by Federal Reserve Fund
 - Guarantor share of collections paid
 - Interest
- Expenses -
 - Use is governed by federal regulations
 - Permissible expenses include guaranty agency & financial aid related activities (payroll, loan servicing, collections expenses, etc.)
 - Other expenses to promote financial literacy & default prevention

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

AGENDA ITEM

Future Issues in Higher Education
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

DESCRIPTION

During the 2010 legislative session, Governor Nixon announced plans to create a single Department of Education that would have authority over pre-kindergarten, K-12 education, and higher education and to merge the authority of the State Board of Education and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education into a single Board of Education. Senate Joint Resolutions 44 and 45 were the initial steps in this process. The intent of this agenda item is to provide an update on this proposal along with suggestions for higher education including recommendations on P-20 issues for the immediate future.

Background

SJR 44 proposed a constitutional amendment to eliminate the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) and would create a new Department of Education. SJR 45 proposed a constitutional amendment to modify the composition of the State Board of Education and to allow the Board to coordinate K-12 and public higher education. While both resolutions passed in the Senate, neither resolution was adopted by the House.

Legislative proposals calling for constitutional amendments resulting in a merger of the MDHE and DESE and creation of a single board of education were unsuccessful during this past session. There remain opportunities, however, to support an efficient and effective P-20 higher educational system, including P-20 initiatives that may be pursued without the need for constitutional amendments.

From the outset, proposals to combine DESE and the Missouri Department of Higher Education raised concerns about differences in the size, magnitude and characteristics of the two systems. While there are many common interests and potential projects that would benefit the full P-20 system, there are also needed initiatives that focus specifically on higher education challenges that deserve attention.

Potential Higher Education Initiatives for FY 2011 and Beyond

With the start of a new fiscal year imminent, along with anticipated turnover in higher education public policymakers and some CBHE members, the following list of twelve potential agenda items for FY 2011 and beyond has been generated for consideration by elected officials and the higher education community. Clearly, it is not feasible to pursue all projects simultaneously.

Coordinating Board for Higher Education
June 10, 2010

There is value, however, in reviewing each item and developing an agreed-upon priority list for FY 2011 that public policy makers, collegiate leadership, and MDHE staff will commit to work on collaboratively.

- ***Discussion on the number of governing boards***
 - Missouri has a history of revisiting governance models every five to ten years with the hope of designing a more effective system to improve higher education outcomes. Traditionally the debate has compared extreme structures, i.e., all institutions under one governing board, or maintaining the status quo of local autonomy with each institution having a separate governing board. It may be timely, especially with limited resources, for Missouri to consider other models. Some examples include creating only two major boards as is done in many states, or having fewer boards with each board having an emphasis on a specific geographic region. While a change in the governance model for the state would not be sufficient to bring about desired results or directly result in meaningful savings, it is an important consideration that could make a difference.

- ***Statewide review of existing programs to identify unnecessary duplication and to ensure quality standards***
 - Historically (during the late 1980s and early 1990s), Missouri regularly used two separate processes to review existing academic degree programs. One process reviewed all programs within the same academic discipline across all public institutions at the same time, e.g., nursing, computer science, engineering. These reviews also retained the services of external consultants to provide additional expertise in completing the process. A second process, campus-based reviews, put all of an institution's programs on a five-year cycle, and each institution performed an internal review which was reported to the CBHE. Both processes were disbanded due to limited resources. It is timely to consider reinstating statewide reviews of academic programs with an agreed-upon process that would help identify unused capacities as well as unnecessary duplication of effort.

- ***Discussion on feasibility of flat tuition in advance of tuition decisions for the 2011-12 academic year***
 - Agreements between institutions and Governor Nixon have resulted in public institutions keeping in-state undergraduate student tuition and fees flat beginning with FY 2010. With increased costs associated with inflation, and cuts to institutional operating budgets for FY 2011, and most likely for FY 2012 as well, the ability of public institutions to continue to keep tuition and fees flat in future years is severely hampered. Rather than wait until tuition and fee decisions for FY 2012 are imminent, there would be value in exploring institutional views on tuition and fees as well as potential strategies for limiting increases.

- ***Revisit institution selectivity categories and definitions***
 - Institutional selectivity categories, i.e., open enrollment, moderately selective, selective, and highly selective, identified admissions standards utilizing class rank and ACT percentile scores. These definitions and categories were adopted by the

CBHE in 1992 for full implementation by 1996. In each case above open enrollment, institutions were given a 10 percent exception for admission of students who fell below their chosen admissions selectivity. In the years that have ensued, it is clear that these categories represent aspirations of institutions and that the data on enrolled students demonstrate that at several public four-year institutions far more than 10 percent of their entering freshmen do not meet their self-designated mission selectivity category. In the recent mission review of public institutions, the need to revisit mission selectivity categories was identified. It is timely to evaluate the viability of selectivity categories that represent aspirations rather than actual admission decisions to ensure accurate representation to consumers about each institution's entering class.

- ***Establish public policy on distance learning***

- Missouri acknowledged the importance of distance learning in April 2000 with the adoption of a statement on the Principles of Good Practice for Distance Learning and Web-based Courses. At the same time, the state fell short of including distance learning programs as part of its new program approval policy or listing such programs in the official state inventory of programs offered by Missouri institutions. The growth of distance education programs is becoming more prominent and profitable across all educational sectors but particularly in higher education. Distance education has created, and will continue to create, opportunities to serve new student clienteles and to serve existing populations better. Online education is innovative and tests conventional assumptions about the very nature and content of an educational experience and the resources required to support it. While chief academic officers have agreed the state should minimally keep an accurate listing of distance learning opportunities provided by Missouri institutions, it is also timely to review any other policy gaps on distance education and determine next best steps to ensure the highest standards for delivery of distance education in Missouri, while protecting students' identity and private information and avoiding unnecessary duplication of effort and program overlap.

- ***Reintroduce performance funding for higher education***

- In the middle 1990s, Missouri became the second state in the nation to adopt a statewide performance funding model. Funding for Results (FFR) provided incentive rewards on several factors, e.g., student learning outcomes in general education and the major, graduation rates, freshmen success rates, and successful transfer. Missouri also encouraged institutions to develop FFR campus models that rewarded departments for engaging in experimentation with teaching and learning improvement projects. Performance funding developed in Missouri for approximately seven years until the early 2000s and was recognized nationally. However, when state funding for higher education was significantly cut in 2002 performance funding was eliminated and hasn't been supported since. The Higher Education Funding (HEF) model that was adopted by the CBHE in June of 2008 included a performance funding component and an approach to performance funding was included in several subsequent budget requests without

success. While the state is not positioned to do performance funding in the immediate future, it is timely to design a system that will be ready for implementation once state funding for higher education regains a positive momentum.

- ***Identify legislative initiatives associated with state student financial aid and proprietary school certification***
 - While some of the CBHE's legislative initiatives were adopted during the 2010 legislative session, others will require continued attention if they are to be enacted. For financial aid, this includes adjusting the cumulative grade point average requirement for lower division students in Access Missouri and establishment of Missouri Promise as a replacement for the existing A+ scholarship with the addition of a "completer" component. For proprietary certification, this would include continued effort to strengthen program oversight and, potentially, revision of the program's fee structure.

- ***Promote greater collaboration among institutions and across sectors***
 - Historically, institutions of higher education in Missouri have collaborated effectively in creating transfer agreements and 2+2 programs, to name only two examples. The current challenges confronting all institutions of higher education demand even greater collaboration among all institutions and across all sectors. Significant benefits accrue to both the collaborating institutions and the state in terms of lower program costs, efficient use of resources, and the reduction of program duplication and overlap. Relationship building and collaborative partnerships should also extend to educational sectors (higher education and K-12) and between higher education, business and industry, and other state agencies. This approach reflects the growing need for more focused work on economic development issues. Expanding existing partnerships and pursuing greater opportunities for greater regional collaboration could also be a part of this discussion.
 - Inherent in this priority is the need to redefine how institutional success is measured and rewarded. The reliance on student headcount as the primary basis for measuring institutional growth often discourages cooperation among institutions and increases the likelihood of conflicts between specific institutions and sectors.

- ***Increase outreach and financial literacy***
 - If Missouri is to develop the dynamic, information-based, globally competitive society and economy essential to future prosperity, more individuals must see postsecondary education as attainable and must be educationally and financially prepared for success there. Through such initiatives as the College Access Challenge Grant, College Goal Sunday, Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Program, and Journey to College, both the MDHE and DESE have established a range of programs designed to improve postsecondary enrollment and completion rates and equip students with a solid foundation for making wise financial choices. However, closer cooperation coupled with a continuing focus on the

importance of these efforts is crucial to capitalizing on opportunities to broaden and strengthen these programs.

- ***Develop plan for the future of the guaranty agency***
 - The MDHE has served as a guaranty agency for the Federal Family Education Loan Program for 30 years. However, due to the recently enacted Healthcare and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act, the MDHE will no longer have authority to guarantee new federal student loans after June 30, 2010. In addition to directly supporting loan program administration, loan proceeds currently support a significant amount of other financial aid related work of the MDHE, in accordance with federal guidelines. The MDHE has a sizable guarantee portfolio that carries with it future responsibilities and revenues. However, because the portfolio will continue to decline over the next several years, it is important to carefully evaluate options and make decisions regarding the future of the MDHE's guaranty agency.

- ***Develop a plan to address student debt load***
 - Missouri students graduating from a four-year public university carry an average student loan debt of \$18,394. Although need-based financial aid programs such as the federal Pell grant and Access Missouri allow lower income students to rely less heavily on borrowing, students from middle-income families often have no choice but to borrow heavily to pay for a post-secondary education. Students graduating with a substantial debt burden are likely to avoid low-paying jobs in the public service sectors and are less likely to make financial commitments, such as purchasing a home. In order to produce graduates ready and able to contribute to Missouri's economy, it is important to look for ways to help students emerge from a post-secondary education without a stifling debt burden.

Potential Agendas for P-20 in Missouri

In addition to the above agendas, it is valuable to consider P-20 initiatives that could be pursued in Missouri without the need for constitutional amendments. Historically, Missouri became engaged in formal P-20 work in 1997. Much of the state's initial work was project focused resulting in state-level studies which highlighted key recommendations for improving the state's overall P-20 system. While some progress has been made, much work to achieve desired results remains.

With the passage of legislation in 2006 and revised in 2009, Missouri now has the opportunity to support P-20 through formal structures that include early childhood, elementary/secondary education, higher education and the department of economic development. Re-activating the state P-20 structure would be an important first step, including the appointment of a P-20 director that would have full-time responsibility to keep P-20 issues before the public and elected officials. Staffing the Coordinating Board for Early Childhood and relocating MDHE in the Jefferson Building in closer proximity to DESE are additional structural actions that could be easily accomplished.

In moving forward, there would be value in development of a single statewide strategic plan (with the governor's imprimatur) that would link the work of preschool, K-12, higher education, and workforce development. The state plan should also establish joint goals among all affected departments and agreed-upon measures to accomplish some of the following outcomes:

- Redesign of the senior year of high school
- Increase Missouri's college-going and completion rates
- Reduce the percentage of new high school graduates requiring remediation
- Continue integration of a K-12/postsecondary/workforce database
- Increase the number of highly qualified teachers recruited and retained
- Increase the success of student transfers across Missouri colleges and universities
- Develop an employer feedback system
- Increase the number of on-time FAFSA filers

Similar to the list of higher education initiatives, it will be important to review each outcome, including any relevant data on file, and to agree on a few priority items to work on collaboratively in the immediate future with our P-20 partners.

Conclusion

A clear public agenda for higher education with a few key priorities is an important foundation for progress. By working collaboratively, public policymakers, elected officials, and higher education leaders can make a genuine difference. Included in Missouri's agenda should be some initiatives that focus specifically on P-20 work. A smooth transition among educational sectors and between education and the workforce is a vital component of a robust economy. Missouri must continue to pursue a seamless system of education and workforce development if the state is to experience solid economic recovery.

STATUTORY REFERENCE

Section 173.005, RSMo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This is a discussion item only.

ATTACHMENT(S)

None