

## AGENDA

Council on Postsecondary Education  
July 21, 1997

9:00 a.m. (ET), Council Conference Room, 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 320, Frankfort

- A. Roll Call
- B. Approval of Minutes
  - 1. *March CHE Minutes* ..... B-1
  - 2. *March Executive Committee Minutes* ..... B-7
  - 3. *March Programs Committee Minutes* ..... B-9
  - 4. *March Finance Committee Minutes* ..... B-13

### Remarks by Governor Patton

- C. New Program Proposals – Overview ..... C-1
  - 1. *Postponement of New Program Proposals* ..... C-5
  - 2. *AAS in Industrial Plastics Technology, Jefferson CC* ..... C-9
  - 3. *Master of Accountancy, Northern Kentucky University* ..... C-13
  - 4. *MS in Physical Therapy, University of Louisville* ..... C-17
  - 5. *Doctor of Audiology, University of Louisville* ..... C-21
- D. *Baccalaureate Transfer Frameworks* ..... D-1
- E. *Modification to 1997 Accountability Reporting* ..... E-1
- F. *The Kentucky Plan-KSU Enhancement 1997-2002* ..... F-1
- G. *Allocation of 1997/98 Paducah Funds* ..... G-1
- H. *1997/98 Postsecondary Education Equine Trust Program* ..... H-1
- I. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program:  
Performance Indicators ..... I-1
- J. 1997/98 Agency Operating Budget ..... J-1
- K. Biennial Budget Process ..... K-1
- L. Paducah Regional Center Advisory Committee ..... L-1
- M. Governor's Conference on Higher Education Trusteeship ..... M-1
- N. Licensure Review: Sue Bennett College
- O. Pikeville College School of Osteopathic Medicine
- P. Other Business
- Q. Adjournment

All agenda materials are available on the CPE home page at <http://www.cpe.state.ky.us>.

---

*Action items are indicated by italics.*

**Sunday, July 20**

6:00 p.m. (ET) Reception & Dinner for Council Members at Holiday Inn Capital Plaza

**Monday, July 21**

9:00 a.m. (ET) Council meeting in Council Conference Room

\*\*\*\*\*

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Leonard V. Hardin, Chair  
Charles Whitehead, Vice Chair  
Larry Hayes  
Glenn Leveridge  
James M. Miller  
Hilma Prather  
Denny Wedge

**FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Larry Hayes, Chair  
Denny Wedge, Vice Chair  
Ronald Greenberg  
Leonard V. Hardin  
Wendy Hyland  
Shirley Menendez  
James M. Miller  
Nathan Smith  
Charles Whitehead

**PROGRAMS COMMITTEE**

Hilma Prather, Chair  
Glenn Leveridge, Vice Chair  
Joe B. Campbell  
Allen Franks  
Leonard V. Hardin  
Marlene Helm  
JoAnne James  
Benjamin K. Richmond  
Susan Snowden North  
Wilmer "Bill" Cody (ex officio)

*The Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services and provides, upon request, reasonable accommodation including auxiliary aids and services necessary to afford individuals with disabilities an equal opportunity to participate in all programs and activities.*



## **NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS: OVERVIEW**

---

### **Information:**

Council staff received eleven new program proposals for consideration at its July meeting; seven of these proposals were received on or before the May 1 deadline -- one doctoral, one master's, one bachelor's, and four associate degree programs; in addition, four proposals for new associate degree programs were received on July 1.

In response to Chairman Hardin's April 24 letter to university Board chairs (Attachment A) deferring consideration of new program proposals (due to the special legislative session and anticipated changes in the role of the Council) unless an "extremely compelling justification" for consideration existed, Council staff returned the seven proposals received by May 1. Subsequently, four university Presidents submitted letters outlining compelling needs for considering their programs. After reviewing the cases made in those letters, Council staff reviewed four of the original program proposals, each of which met the compelling need requirement. (In considering the case made for a program, staff paid particular attention to compelling circumstances related to certification requirements, legislative mandates, and critical workforce needs.) However, action related to four associate in applied science degree program proposals for which exemptions were requested could not be taken because Council had not received those program proposals prior to receiving the letter requesting the exemptions. This information was communicated to the university president submitting the proposals, who subsequently did submit them to the Council for review on July 1, 1997, too late for evaluation prior to the Council's July 21 meeting.

Table 1 summarizes the new program approval process and status for all eleven proposals, listing the submitting institution, the date each program was first included in the institution's program advisory statement, whether the compelling need requirement was met, and Council staff's recommendation regarding action.

For those four programs being recommended for approval, agenda items are included (C-2, C-3, C-4, and C-5), each of which contains an analysis and rationale section addressing the five sections in the proposal that were identified by Council staff, in cooperation with the Council of Chief Academic Officers, as requiring heightened scrutiny during the evaluation process: 1) consistency with institutional mission and statewide strategic plan; 2) desired student outcomes and assessment mechanisms; 3) opportunities for cooperation, transfer, and articulation agreements; 4) relationship to state/regional/local workforce requirements; and 5) proposed revenue sources to support the program. For those six programs being recommended for postponement, an agenda item is also included (C-1), which provides an analysis and rationale for the postponement. It should be noted, however, that a recommendation to postpone consideration of any program does not suggest that the program is unacceptable, only that compelling need was not documented.

It should also be noted that the recommendation to postpone action on the Technical Studies degree is not based upon the lack of a compelling need for such a degree; in fact, the Technical

Studies degree is, in staff's viewpoint, worthy of consideration. However, this program's implementation involves, to a great extent, close program coordination between the two branches under the auspices of the newly formed Kentucky Community Technical College System (KCTCS); moreover, while the program is innovative, it deviates significantly from current practice relative to the Council's program approval policies and procedures as well as the role of the institutional governing board relative to program authority. Thus, advice from the KCTCS regarding this degree program should be solicited by the Council as part of any interim program approval process in effect during this transitional phase. Postponing action on the Technical Studies degree program until the Council can obtain feedback from KCTCS regarding the programmatic and policy issues surrounding this proposal will provide an opportunity to address them appropriately.

**Table 1. New Program Proposals**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Program/ Advisory Statement Notification</b>	<b>Compelling Need</b>	<b>Status</b>
Northern Kentucky University	Accountancy (MAcc) (2/3/97)	Statutory Mandate; Professional Licensure Requirement	Recommend Approval (see agenda item C-3)
University of Louisville	Audiology (AuD) (1/30/97)	Professional Certification Standards; Grant Opportunity	Recommend Approval (see agenda item C-5)
University of Louisville	Physical Therapy (MS) (1/30/97)	Professional Certification Requirements	Recommend Approval (see agenda item C-4)
Jefferson Community College	Industrial Plastics Technology (AAS) (1/29/97)	Critical Workforce Demand	Recommend Approval (see agenda item C-2)
Prestonsburg Community College	Occupational Therapy Assistant (AAS) (1/29/97)	N/A	Withdrawn by UK (6/10/97)
Morehead State University	Radiological Sciences (BS) (2/1/97)	Not Met	Recommend Postponement (see agenda item C-1)
University of Kentucky Community College System	Technical Studies (AAS) (1/29/97)	Not Met	Recommend Postponement (see agenda item C-1)
Hazard & Southeast Community College	Physical Therapist Assistant (AAS) (1/29/97)	*	Recommend Postponement (see agenda item C-1)
Madisonville Community College	Occupational Therapy Assistant (AAS) (1/29/97)	*	Recommend Postponement (see agenda item C-1)
Prestonsburg Community College	Law Enforcement Technology (AAS) (1/29/97)	*	Recommend Postponement (see agenda item C-1)
Owensboro Community College	Early Childhood Education (AAS) (1/29/97)	*	Recommend Postponement (see agenda item C-1)

\*Compelling need has not been determined since program proposal was not received until July 1, 1997, which allowed insufficient time to determine whether such a need exists.





Gary S. Cox  
Executive Director

*Leonard V. Hardin*  
Chair  
Louisville

*Charles Whitehead*  
Vice Chair  
Ashland

*Joe B. Campbell*  
Lexington

*Allen C. Franks*  
Guthrie

*Ronald Greenberg*  
Louisville

*Larry M. Hayes*  
Louisville

*Marlene Helm*  
Lexington

*JoAnne James*  
London

*Glenn D. Leveridge*  
Lexington

*Shirley Menendez*  
Paducah

*James M. Miller*  
Owensboro

*Susan Snowden North*  
Lexington

*Hilma S. Prather*  
Somerset

*Benjamin K. Richmond*  
Louisville

*Nathaniel Smith*  
Ft. Mitchell

*Denny Wedge*  
Bowling Green

*Wendy C. Hyland*  
Student Member  
Lexington

*Wilmer Cody*  
(*ex officio*)

## MEMORANDUM

TO: University Board Chairs  
James T. Gilbert, ECU  
Anthony Remson, KSU  
L. M. "Sonny" Jones, MoSU  
Sid Easley, MuSU  
James Poston, NKU  
Edward T. Breathitt, UK  
Minx Auerbach, UofL  
Peggy Loafman, WKU

FROM: Leonard V. Hardin  
Chair

DATE: April 24, 1997

SUBJECT: New Program Proposals

The current environment of postsecondary education in Kentucky and the inevitable changes that will be facing us once the special session is over suggest the need for the Council on Higher Education to temporarily modify its existing practices in selected policy areas. One such area that certainly should be treated as something other than "business as usual" is new program approval. My purpose in writing is to suggest that new program proposals not be forwarded by your institutions to the CHE until the reform agenda has been set and we are on a clear implementation course.

Regardless of how all of the components of the Governor's plan unfold, there is clear evidence of the need for strengthened efforts to eliminate program duplication, address low performance programs, coordinate and focus institutional missions, and otherwise enforce policies that result in a true system of postsecondary education. Approving new programs under current policies and missions now or even during the transitional months ahead does not seem to be a prudent course of action.

University Board Chairs

Page 2

April 24, 1997

To this end, I am asking Gary Cox to return the listings of new programs currently under development at your institutions (i.e., program advisory statements submitted to the CHE in February) with a request that new programs be proposed in only the most pressing circumstances. I considered suggesting a moratorium on all programs, but I recognize that certain conditions argue against that, e.g., professional licensure or certification requirements; unique, unmet program needs in the state; legislative mandate; and, critical regional workforce demand. We will leave the door open for considering programs when an extremely compelling justification exists. If you have such a program, have your president correspond with Gary pointing out the extreme circumstances that argue for its consideration.

Thank you for your cooperation as Kentucky's postsecondary education reform efforts unfold.

cc: CHE Members  
University Presidents  
Gary S. Cox



**POSTPONEMENT OF  
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS**

**ACTION ITEM  
CPE (C-1)  
July 21, 1997**

**Recommendation:**

That action on the proposal for a Bachelor of Science Degree in Radiological Sciences submitted by Morehead State University in May 1997 be postponed.

That action on the proposal for a statewide Associate in Applied Science Degree in Technical Studies submitted by the University of Kentucky Community College System (UKCCS) in April 1997 be postponed.

That action on the proposals for an Associate in Applied Science Degree in Law Enforcement Technology (Prestonsburg Community College), an Associate in Applied Science Degree in Occupational Therapist Assistant (Madisonville Community College) and in Physical Therapist Assistant (jointly offered by Hazard Community College and Southeast Community College), and an Associate in Applied Science Degree in Early Childhood Education (Owensboro Community College) submitted by the University of Kentucky Community College System in July 1997 be postponed.

That the EEO eligibility status for 1997 be sustained for each program listed above until it is considered by the Council. In those cases where waivers are needed, the waiver process should be initiated by the proposing institution when the program is reviewed.

**Rationale:**

- Council staff recommends postponing consideration of the proposal for a Bachelor of Science Degree in Radiological Sciences at Morehead State University because a compelling need to warrant immediate review by Council staff was not documented.
- Council staff recommends postponing action on the Associate in Applied Science Degree in Technical Studies proposed by the UKCCS in order to comply with the contents and spirit of House Bill 1, in particular those pieces of the legislation related to the creation of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) and its responsibilities in the academic program area. Postponement will allow time for the KCTCS Board to review the proposal and provide feedback to the Council.
- Council staff recommends postponing action on the four additional associate degree program proposals submitted by the University of Kentucky Community College System because they were received on July 1, 1997, too late to evaluate whether compelling circumstances exist that would warrant their immediate consideration.

## **Background:**

As a result of the unique circumstances created when the General Assembly met in May to consider House Bill 1, Chairman Hardin issued a statement deferring consideration of new program proposals unless "pressing circumstances" existed to warrant immediate review by Council staff. Chairman Hardin further indicated that "professional licensure or certification requirements; unique, unmet program needs in the state; legislative mandate; and critical regional workforce demand" might fulfill the compelling need requirement for immediate review.

Subsequently, the Council received letters from four submitting institutions requesting program proposals be considered due to compelling needs (please refer to the "New Program Proposals: Overview" item in this agenda package, [C], for a summary of this process). After considering the case made for each program proposal, Council staff reviewed four program proposals, communicated with institutions concerning proposal contents, and received responses that addressed issues related to the proposals. In addition, institutions not meeting the compelling need criteria were notified. Thus, the deferral of new program proposals created a unique situation requiring that proposals that might ordinarily have been appropriate for review could not be considered because they did not meet the compelling need requirement. Even though these programs do not meet the compelling needs test, that does not suggest that the programs are inadequate or that they are not needed.

The contents and spirit of House Bill 1 also create a need to postpone action on certain program proposals. First, House Bill 1 creates the KCTCS and authorizes it to coordinate academic programs offered by Kentucky's community colleges and technical schools. Thus, consideration by the Council of any program proposal involving close program coordination between the two branches under KCTCS auspices should be postponed until the KCTCS Board has had the opportunity to review and comment on the proposal.

House Bill 1 also authorizes the Council to review existing policies and to develop new policies related both directly and indirectly to the academic program review and approval process, among them duplication of programs, standardized programs, and programs of distinction. Moreover, the Council's work in the academic program area must be tied to the new statewide strategic agenda for higher education, to be developed in cooperation with the Strategic Committee on Postsecondary Education (SCOPE). Thus, any program proposal deviating significantly from current practice relative to the Council's program approval policies and procedures as well as the role of the institutional governing board relative to program authority should be postponed until the Council has reviewed all academic program policies in relation to the statewide strategic agenda for postsecondary education.

With the passage of House Bill 1, Kentucky entered a new era in postsecondary education. During the current transition stage, interim policies for academic program review and approval will be required that will allow the Council to respond in a timely manner to current institutional and local/regional/statewide needs as they relate to academic program offerings and, at the same time, respond in a manner consistent with the requirements of House Bill 1. These interim policies will be proposed by Council staff to guide new program decisions until such time as the



statewide strategic agenda is in place and able to direct Council policy making in this area. They also could accommodate consideration of some or all of the postponed program proposals in a timely manner.

Finally, postponing consideration of these programs has created a situation related to institutional eligibility due to EEO status. Given that all six proposals recommended for postponement were submitted during calendar year 1997 and would be postponed due to mitigating circumstances, they will remain eligible for review and approval under their 1997 EEO eligibility status throughout the remainder of calendar year 1997 and into calendar year 1998.





**NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

---

**Recommendation:**

That the proposed Associate in Applied Science in Industrial Plastics Technology (IPT) at Jefferson Community College (JCC) be approved and registered in CIP 15.0607.

**Staff Analysis:**

JCC has met its equal opportunity goals and is eligible to submit proposals for new degree programs in calendar year 1997 for Council consideration. July consideration by the Council is the last step in the review and approval process that began with submitting the proposal on April 24, 1997.

Staff was notified of the development of this proposal through the Program Advisory Statement submitted in spring 1997. Submission of the proposal before May 1, 1997, was consistent with the projected submission date identified in the Program Advisory Statement.

In response to Chairman Hardin's April 24 request that consideration of proposals for new degree programs be deferred unless a compelling need could be documented, the IPT program proposal was returned. Subsequently, a compelling case for considering the IPT proposal due to critical local workforce needs was made, and Council staff reviewed the proposal. After completing this review, a request for additional information concerning program objectives and program resources was issued. The information provided in response to this request satisfied all staff concerns and led to the decision to recommend Council approval of the IPT program.

**Rationale:**

- This program proposal is sound and well developed. JCC has addressed each of the program proposal areas identified as warranting increased emphasis during the academic program review process.
- The proposed Industrial Plastics Technology program is consistent with JCC's mission to offer career-oriented programs designed to prepare students for immediate technical employment and to meet the workforce needs of the community it serves. The heavy concentration of plastics industries in Jefferson and surrounding counties, the involvement of the Plastics Industry Network, and statistical evidence contained in the Kentucky Occupational Outlook and Job Openings report and supplied by The Society of the Plastics Industries, Inc. document the critical need and strong community support for this degree program. Kentucky experienced a 24% growth in plastics industry jobs between 1991 and 1994, a trend projected to continue until 2005. In addition, a JCC survey found that 100% of

the respondents indicated they expected to hire additional technicians in the next five years. In addition, Pleasure Ridge Park Magnet Career Academy, one of JCC's Tech-Prep partners, has implemented an Industrial Chemical and Plastics magnet program for IPT students and been an active partner with JCC in developing its IPT program.

- The Industrial Plastics Technology curriculum is a 71-74 credit-hour program that will prepare graduates for entry level positions as molding machine operators, line supervisors, quality assurance technicians, or product design technicians in industries that use the injection molding process for plastic parts. Coursework consists of a full core of general education courses, required courses in Industrial Plastics Technology, and several technical courses in such areas as applied fluid power, blueprint reading, computer-aided design, and properties of plastics. Program outcomes and student competencies have been fully outlined; in addition, program review and student assessment processes have been supplied.
- No other like program exists in JCC's service area, nor does this program duplicate Kentucky Tech programming in the College's service area; thus, student demand for the program is expected to be high. However, since many prospective students are currently employed full-time, it is expected that the program will attract primarily part-time students and, therefore, produce graduates at a slower rate than programs attracting primarily full-time students. JCC anticipates an enrollment of 3 full-time and 7 part-time students in its first year (1997/98) and 20 full-time and 30 part-time students in its fifth year (2001/02) of operation.
- Implementing the program will not require additional facilities or equipment. An industrial-sized injection molding machine valued at over \$150,000 has been donated for student instruction, and the Kentucky Alliance for Plastics Industries has pledged its continued support for students pursuing the associate degree. Current and anticipated faculty vacancies will be reallocated to hire one full-time faculty member to coordinate and teach technical courses; in addition, faculty teaching in the Engineering Technology, Industrial Electrical Technology, Quality Technology, and Industrial Chemical Technology programs will also teach courses in the IPT program. Total personnel and operating costs of \$45,300 and \$97,512 (includes hiring one additional full-time faculty member) are projected.

An executive summary prepared by Jefferson Community College staff follows.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1. Mission, Influence, Organization

The proposed Industrial Plastics Technology Program is consistent with the College's mission to offer career-oriented programs designed to prepare students for immediate technical employment. It is also consistent with the College's long range plan to establish a Manufacturing Technology Center on the Southwest Campus. There is a heavy concentration of plastics industries in Jefferson and surrounding counties. Like similar companies throughout the nation, they are becoming increasingly automated and in need of more highly-skilled workers than ever before. In 1995, with the assistance of the Louisville/Jefferson County Office of Economic Development, they formed a Plastics Industry Network to address common concerns; primary among these was workforce development and the creation of an educational infrastructure to retrain existing workers and prepare new ones. The Network, now statewide and incorporated as the Kentucky Alliance for Plastics Industries (KAPI), contacted Jefferson Community College about developing an associate degree program in Industrial Plastics Technology to meet this critical need. An initial training regimen was developed jointly by Jefferson Community College faculty and other KAPI members and taught at Pleasure Ridge Park High School--one of Jefferson's Tech-Prep partners--on a non-credit basis. The development of the associate degree has been KAPI's ultimate goal and Jefferson faculty have consulted with the Alliance in every phase of program planning and implementation.

### 2. Program Description

The Industrial Plastics Technology Program equips students with a basic knowledge of mold forming, injection molding, college chemistry, mathematics, and statistical process control. Graduates will be qualified for entry-level positions such as injection plastic molding machine operator, setter, and tender. The curriculum includes a full core of general education courses, required courses in Industrial Plastics Technology, and a variety of technical courses in such areas as applied fluid power, blueprint reading, statics and strengths of materials, computer-aided design, and properties of plastics. Students may choose to satisfy 3 credit hours of their technical electives through cooperative education experiences in a number of local companies. Program competencies include such items as "demonstrate a knowledge of safety issues related to plastics processing," "demonstrate a knowledge of team skills," and "demonstrate an understanding of the basic machine components and system controls of an injection molding machine."

The program will be evaluated through the on-going program review processes of the University of Kentucky Community College System. These reviews, conducted on a periodic basis and when enrollments or graduates drop below specified goals, evaluate all elements of a program, including its curriculum, its objectives, student success and satisfaction rates, employer satisfaction surveys, and placement and salary information on graduates.

Industry leaders were heavily involved in the development of the Industrial Plastics Technology curriculum and an Advisory Committee is being assembled from among them in anticipation of program approval. Internally, this program will share related core courses with the Engineering Technology, the Industrial and Engineering Technology, and the Quality Technology programs--thus allowing flexibility for students in the program and efficient use of institutional resources.



While the program is designed to prepare students for immediate employment, it does contain general education components which will be fully transferrable to baccalaureate institutions.

### **3. Supportive Data**

The Kentucky Occupational Outlook and Job Openings report shows that a combined total of new industry growth and separation/replacement of retiring workers will create an annual average total of 373 new jobs under the categories of plastic mold machine setters, operators, and tenders. The Society of the Plastics Industries, Inc. reports 18,500 industry jobs in Kentucky (a 24% increase from 1991 to 1994) and 233 plastics facilities (a 41% increase from 1991 to 1994). 1994 sales/shipment value was \$5 billion, with annual wages of \$710 million and capital expenditures of \$186 million. Jefferson Community College's own survey found that 100% of the respondents indicated that their companies would be likely to hire new technicians during the next five years. All but one responding noted that they would give preference to students with the competencies outlined in the Industrial Plastics Technology curriculum (this exception explained by a shift away from injection molding in company production). Respondents quoted salaries for entry-level employees with such skills as between \$14,000 and \$50,000 annually, with most companies reporting an average salary of between \$16,000 and \$30,000. The companies reponding indicated that collectively they expect to hire about 142 technicians over the next five years. (Letters of support from several local industries and KAPI accompany the degree proposal.)

While none of Jefferson Community College's benchmark institutions offer an associate degree in Industrial Plastics Technology, the College did review curricula of similar programs at other colleges in other states during the program development phase. Jefferson's proposed program is similar to but less general than others, emphasizing injection molding and industrial safety, and including as well as a strong general education core. The Advanced Technology Institute at Bowling Green, Kentucky (affiliated with Kentucky Tech)--which prepares plastics technicians--neither offers an associate degree nor overlaps with Jefferson's service area.

Due to the fact that no other such program exists in our service area, and to the high degree of interest expressed by local industries, it is anticipated that program demand will be high. We do anticipate, however, that because many prospective enrollees are employed full-time, the program will attract primarily part-time students and produce graduates at a slower rate than programs in which students are traditionally full-time.

Growth in Kentucky's plastics industries is expected due both to the increased consumption of plastics products nationally and to the high concentration of automobile/truck product end-users in the region. In fact, Kentucky experienced a 24% growth in industry jobs from 1991 to 1994--a trend projected to continue until at least 2005.

### **4. Resources**

Implementation of the proposed program will not require additional facilities or equipment. An industrial-sized injection molding machine (valued at over \$150,000) has been donated and will be installed in the Vogt Manufacturing Center which already houses industrial and industrial/teaching sized CNC mills and lathes and other equipment. The Computer Aided Design lab, which will support this program, has also been upgraded with the addition of pentium-based processors and state of the art Bridgeport CAM software. Current and anticipated faculty vacancies can be reallocated to hire a full-time faculty member to coordinate and teach technical courses in the program. In addition, local industries have pledged support of resources and cooperative education opportunities.

**NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

---

**Recommendation:**

That the proposed Master of Accountancy program submitted by Northern Kentucky University (NKU) be approved and registered in CIP 52.0301, contingent upon notification that the NKU Board of Regents has taken action to exercise its option for a quantitative waiver for 1997.

**Staff Analysis:**

Northern Kentucky University is eligible to submit new program proposals in 1997 by declaring its intent to exercise its right to a quantitative waiver of the Council's equal opportunity requirements as provided for in 13 KAR 2:060. Council staff received a letter from Board Chairman Poston indicating the University's intent to exercise its waiver option for 1997. However, since official Board action will not occur prior to the July Council meeting, staff is recommending approval of the program contingent upon notification that the NKU Board has affirmed Chairman Poston's statement.

On April 24, 1997, Chairman Hardin asked that consideration of proposals for new degree programs be deferred unless a compelling need could be documented. President Moreland responded that the Master of Accountancy program was submitted in response to the legislation requiring the completion of 150 semester hours to sit for the Certified Public Accountant (CPA) exam which becomes effective in January 2000. Since this rationale responds to the criteria outlined in Chairman Hardin's memo, the proposed program was reviewed and is presented for Council consideration.

The proposed program was first included in a letter (submitted in lieu of a Program Advisory Statement) dated January 1990 as one of several programs which could be considered for development by the university.

As part of the consideration of new program proposals in January 1997, five areas were identified for increased attention during the proposal review process. While not all of these areas received sufficient attention in the original proposal, the most serious omission was any indication of revenue sources to support the program. Subsequent information provided by the University addressed the staff's concerns.

**Rationale:**

- Legislation requires that in order to sit for the Certified Public Accountants exam, a person must complete 150 semester credit hours, including a bachelor's degree. While a master's degree is not required to fulfill this prerequisite, a student survey indicated a clear preference



for a master's degree in accounting over other approaches such as increasing the number of hours in the bachelor's degree from 128 to 150.

- The Master of Accountancy is a 30-hour program consisting of 18 hours of required accounting and business communication courses and 12 hours of business electives. This curriculum was developed in accordance with the recommendations of professional accounting organizations and with the advice of local CPAs.
- While the overall enrollment increase in the first five years of the program is expected to be modest (21 students in fall 1998 increasing to 33 in fall 2001 and beyond), a substantial shift from a predominance of part-time enrollment in the first two years to full-time enrollment in subsequent years is projected. The projected increase in graduates from 7 in 1999 to 28 in 2003 mirrors the expected shift to full-time enrollment.
- Based on the placement level of bachelor's degree accounting graduates, employment prospects for graduates of the master's program are good. While public accounting firms do not expect entry-level employees to possess the CPA, advancement beyond the first managerial level would be unlikely without the CPA.
- Projected expenditures for the program range from \$56,000 in the first year to \$87,000 in the fourth year. Faculty salaries will constitute the greatest expenditure with nominal amounts for library support, student stipends, faculty continuing education, and accounting computer software. One additional doctoral faculty member is needed in 1998 and a second faculty member may be needed by 2001 to offer both graduate and undergraduate courses.
- Student tuition will be the primary revenue source for the first three years of the program. In the first year, some internal reallocation is needed to cover all anticipated expenditures. By the fourth year, a mix of state appropriations and tuition will be available to support the program.

An executive summary of the proposal prepared by Northern Kentucky University staff follows.

# PROPOSAL FOR A MASTER OF ACCOUNTANCY

## Executive Summary

Department of Accountancy  
Northern Kentucky University  
Highland Heights, Kentucky 41099

The proposed Master of Accountancy was developed in response to the legislation in Kentucky and its contiguous states which requires (beginning in the year 2000) candidates for the Certified Public Accountant examination to have 150 semester hours including a bachelor's degree. This proposed degree program supports the mission of Northern Kentucky University to educate "students to be productive citizens, to prepare them for success in careers and occupations. . ."

The proposed program is comprised of 30 hours of graduate coursework; 15 hours in accounting and 15 hours in business-related support courses. The program was developed in consultation with advisors from the accounting community who hire accounting graduates from Northern Kentucky University. The proposed curriculum is in compliance with the accreditation standards of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business and with guidelines issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

Resources needed to bring the program to the students include an additional faculty line, a minimal operating budget increase and some additional support to the library from the "Support of Learning" surcharge already in place.

The needs for qualified entry-level accountants can be met best with this proposed degree. No other option available on the campus at Northern Kentucky University allows the flexibility to meet the specific needs of this profession. It is requested that the program begin operation with the fall 1998 semester in preparation for students desiring to take the CPA examination in May 2000.





**NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

---

**Recommendation:**

That the proposed Master's Degree in Physical Therapy at the University of Louisville (UofL) be approved and registered in CIP 51.2308.

**Staff Analysis:**

UofL has met its equal opportunity goals and is eligible to submit proposals for new degree programs in calendar year 1997 for Council consideration. July consideration by the Council is the last step in the review and approval process that began with resubmitting the proposal on May 1, 1997 (the program proposal was originally submitted in November 1996 and withdrawn from consideration in order to make curriculum changes recommended by Council staff).

Staff was notified that a revised program proposal would be submitted through the Spring 1997 Program Advisory Statement, and subsequent submission of the proposal before May 1, 1997, was consistent with the projected submission date identified in the Program Advisory Statement.

In response to Chairman Hardin's April 24 request that consideration of proposals for new degree programs be deferred unless a compelling need could be documented, the program proposal was returned. However, a compelling case for considering the Physical Therapy program proposal was made based upon changing professional certification requirements and the shortage of qualified physical therapists available to fill existing vacancies, and Council staff began its review of the proposal. After completing this review, a request for additional information and clarification was made regarding course objectives and revenue sources. The response to this request provided the necessary amplification and explanation and thus completed the review process.

**Rationale:**

- This proposal is well written and presents a sound, convincing rationale for upgrading the existing Physical Therapy degree program to the Master's degree level. UofL has also addressed those proposal areas Council staff identified as requiring increased emphasis during the academic program review process.
- The proposed Master's Degree in Physical Therapy would enhance UofL's mission to offer at the master's level "a range of programs responding directly to the advanced educational needs of its metropolitan area" and the School of Allied Health Sciences' mission to "provide highly qualified professionals for allied health services needed in the urban community and throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky."

- The proposed Master's Degree program in Physical Therapy will more appropriately meet the future health care needs of Kentucky's citizens than does the current baccalaureate program because of increased complexity and technological advances in the practice of physical therapy that require additional education; moreover, upgrading this degree program would respond to a national trend; currently, 61 percent of the 138 accredited educational programs for physical therapy offer a master's degree, and accreditation criteria for physical therapy education are expected to change in the near future so that a master's degree will be required as the entry-level degree.
- Employment opportunities for graduates of this program are excellent. At the state and local level, the Kentucky Department of Employment Services projects a 59 percent to 60 percent increase in job opportunities for physical therapists through the year 2000; to meet current and anticipated needs, the proposed program will accept eight additional students per class.
- The Master's in Physical Therapy curriculum consists of 97 credit hours completed over two and a half years. This curriculum represents a revised version of the original program proposal in that students are now able to enter the program after completing their junior year instead of after earning a Bachelor of Science degree. Sequential learning is balanced with adult learning strategies, and content has been added and emphases modified to address changing physical therapy practices. In addition, clinical experiences have been expanded in response to the higher level of practice expected of new graduates in a direct access practice model. The didactic curriculum is problem-based and consists of 80 credit hours in physical therapy, 5 credit hours of clerkship (clinical education experiences scheduled concurrently with or immediately following didactic and laboratory experiences), and 12 credit hours of internship (full-time clinical experiences). Program outcomes and student competencies have been detailed; in addition, student assessment measures have been supplied.
- A similar program exists at UK; however, the proposed program is not considered duplicative, nor is it expected to compete with the UK program since both programs attract five to ten times more applicants than they can accept, and the output of both programs is not expected to keep pace with anticipated workforce needs.
- UofL anticipates an enrollment of 72 full-time students in the program's first year and 120 students during the fifth year; no plans exist to initiate a formal part-time student program or to enroll evening students.

Adequate facilities and library resources exist to support the proposed program; however, three additional full-time faculty will be needed to maintain the program, one the first year and two thereafter. In addition, additional funds for program supplies, equipment, and travel are required. The majority of funding for the program will come from internal reallocation within the physical therapy program and increased tuition revenues, which UofL projects will be adequate to maintain the program.

An executive summary prepared by UofL staff follows.



## Executive Summary of Master's Degree Proposal in Physical Therapy

In keeping with its strong commitment to professional programs, the University of Louisville (UofL) proposes a master's degree program in physical therapy in the School of Allied Health Sciences. More than 60% of the physical therapy programs (including the University of Kentucky (UK) program) offer a master's degree as the entry level degree to begin practice. The program at UofL is at risk of losing its accreditation if it does not make the transition to a master's degree. The Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education of the American Physical Therapy Association has proposed a new evaluative criterion this year that states, "The first professional degree for physical therapists is awarded at the postbaccalaureate level at the completion of the physical therapy program." If this criterion is accepted, the program will be required to make the transition to a master's degree within the next four years. Even if this criterion is not accepted, the program is in danger of being perceived as "second class" as more and more programs make the transition. Such a status will make it more difficult to recruit or retain faculty, attract the most qualified students, and graduate a full class each year.

The proposed master's program in physical therapy will more appropriately meet the future health care needs of citizens of the Commonwealth than does the current baccalaureate program. The responsibilities of a physical therapist have increased over the last 15 years with independent practice legally recognized. Strong critical-thinking and writing skills are a significant component of the educational process and daily practice of a physical therapist. Baccalaureate programs in physical therapy have an increasingly difficult task of adequately preparing students. The Physical Therapy Program at the University of Louisville must keep pace with the changes in the practice of physical therapy by changing the curriculum and graduating a student who is better prepared for the health care environment of the future.

The students entering the proposed master's program must have already earned 90 credit hours with specific required courses in math, science, and psychology. The new program also will accept eight more students per class (40 versus the current 32) to address the significant needs in the Commonwealth and the very large student demand for the program. At the state and local level, the Kentucky Department of Employment projects a 60% increase in job opportunities for physical therapists through the year 2000. In 1995 UofL had 420 applications for 32 positions.

In developing the new curriculum, the faculty generated several thematic constructs around which the entire curriculum would revolve. These themes are 1) development of clinical decision-making skills, 2) application of knowledge and skills to patient care, 3) association of life span and associated changes with special needs, and 4) understanding of diversity issues, including gender, race, life style, culture, and age. These themes are addressed repeatedly and elaborated upon to bring students to a higher level of competence than is possible in the current curriculum. Content has been added and emphasis modified in many areas to address changes in practice. A problem-based approach to learning is reflected in the early and frequent clinical experiences as well as in integration seminars. Clinical education has been



expanded to allow for more diverse and longer experiences. The student will be required to complete a total of 97 credits over two and one half years. The curriculum and the credit hours are in keeping with that offered by other master's programs, including UK (100 credit hours).

pth\execsum.397

**NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

---

**Recommendation:**

That the proposed Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) Program at the University of Louisville (UofL) be approved and registered in CIP 51.0202.

**Staff Analysis:**

UofL has met its equal opportunity goals and is eligible to submit proposals for new degree programs in calendar year 1997 for Council consideration. July 1997 consideration by the Council is the last step in the review and approval process that began with submission of the proposal on May 1, 1997.

On April 24, Chairman Hardin asked that consideration of proposals for new degree programs be deferred unless a compelling need could be documented. The UofL audiology proposal was received on May 1 and included a letter from President Shumaker citing special circumstances and requesting exemption. After reviewing the information submitted, it was agreed that, in fact, a compelling need to review the program had been demonstrated, and staff proceeded with its review. In response to a subsequent request for additional information related to curriculum and articulation/transfer plans, UofL responded with appropriate clarification, and staff now recommends Council approval of this program.

**Rationale:**

- Staff believes this to be a very sound proposal with solid justification and moderate new cost.
- Faculty at the University of Kentucky College of Medicine have endorsed the proposed program, and those faculty will participate in various elements of the program.
- The proposed program is consistent with UofL's mission to offer ". . . a limited number of doctoral programs that are not duplicative of other doctoral programs in the state . . ." and to assist in meeting statewide needs in the health sciences. It currently is the only institution in the state offering a program in audiology at any level.
- The proposed program also is consistent with the *Kentucky Postsecondary Improvement Act of 1997 (HB 1)* which affirms UofL's role as a doctoral degree granting institution and calls for the development of programs of exceptional quality at the university. The new doctoral program will allow for increased applied research by both students and faculty that will, in turn, enhance an already strong national reputation.

- There is a “compelling need” to consider this proposal at this time due to the fact that a unique Veterans Administration (VA) grant opportunity exists for which the program is exceptionally well positioned. The VA is interested in having all of their audiologists (about 500) educated at the doctoral level and thus the VA Request for Proposals.

Factors that favor UofL being funded by the VA grant include (1) the program’s close affiliation with the VA Hospital in Louisville, (2) its affiliation with the Department of Surgery of the UofL School of Medicine; and (3) the capability and experience of the university to deliver academic programming via distance learning technologies to VA audiologists across the nation. The closing date for responses to the VA Request for Proposals is December, 1997, by which time an approved doctoral program must be in place.

- Documentation provided in the proposal indicates movement toward accreditation criteria and standards that will call for a program geared to the doctoral degree as entry into the profession.
- Projected enrollment is based upon the experience of the existing master’s program. By year five, enrollment is projected to be 32 FTE. The program expects to graduate ten students per year.
- The cost of the program by year four will be approximately \$470,000 per year or about \$130,000 more than the current master’s program. The sources of funding have been identified. One new faculty member will be added at the beginning of the second year. Total costs will be met through internal reallocation of the funds from the current master’s program, increased tuition receipts, and increased patient care revenue. Funding of the program *is not* dependent on the VA grant.

An executive summary of the proposal as prepared by faculty of the University of Louisville follows.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PROPOSAL FOR INITIATION OF A NEW DEGREE PROGRAM UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE DOCTOR OF AUDIOLOGY (Au.D.)

The Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) degree program is a professional degree designed to prepare students for careers in contemporary audiology practices. Currently, audiologists must achieve a Master's degree and complete a one-year post Master's fellowship year to be eligible for licensure to practice in most states. Advances in knowledge and expansion of technologies place significant restrictions on abilities to prepare graduates to be both competent and confident as they enter the field under the current two year post Bachelor educational system. Moreover, extreme variability exists within the post graduate fellowship years. The profession of Audiology has made the conscious decision to transform all educational programs to a four-year post-bachelors degree to ensure adequate preparation of students to enter the profession of Audiology. The Doctor of Audiology degree will replace the Master's degree as the entry-level degree for practice. Doctor of Audiology degree programs will incorporate the fellowship year under the auspices of the educational institutions to ensure both adequacy and continuity of instruction. All major Audiology organizations including the American Academy of Audiology, the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (accreditation body), the Educational Audiology Association, the Academy of Dispensing Audiologists, the Academy of Rehabilitative Audiology and the Audiology Foundation of America have endorsed the new degree structure for the profession.

The University of Louisville is the only institution of higher education in the State of Kentucky with an educational program in Audiology. Currently the Master's degree is offered through the Graduate program in Communicative Disorders and awarded by the Graduate School. The Doctor of Audiology degree will replace the currently offered Master's degree, but will be awarded by the School of Medicine.

No other universities in the State of Kentucky have an academic program in Audiology. The University of Kentucky does have Audiology Faculty in the Medical School, but does not offer or conduct a training program in this area. The Audiology faculty of Chandler Medical Center have endorsed the proposed Doctor of Audiology degree program at the University of Louisville.

The University of Louisville, along with Purdue University, Vanderbilt University, and the University of Florida, was identified by the Audiology Foundation of America as a target institution for initiation of this degree program. The faculty's ongoing involvement in the development of innovative educational techniques, coupled with the administrative and physical location of the current program on the Health Sciences Campus, were among the reasons the University of Louisville was so identified.

Audiology has begun the transition to this higher educational standard. It is imperative that the Graduate Program in Communicative Disorders keep pace with the transition as eventually the Master's degree in Audiology will no longer serve as the entry level degree. (Students currently enrolled in the Master's degree program will be allowed to complete their Master's degree or may be considered for entry into the doctoral program.)

The Au.D. degree proposal defines a four-year post-bachelor's professional degree program designed to prepare an individual for audiology practice. The proposal includes both the didactic and experiential components as currently mandated by the professional organizations in Audiology. The program has also been designed to be consistent with a short term professional goal of making the program accessible to persons who have already attained the Master's degree and wish to upgrade their professional education to the doctoral level. Currently there is tremendous interest in making programs accessible for these individuals.

Doctoral level education signifies advanced educational achievement. Professional doctoral education is designed to prepare persons for professional practice. Professional degree programs generally reflect a prescribed program of study with an emphasis on practical and clinical applications of knowledge. Examples of professional degrees include the Doctor of Medicine (M.D.), the Doctor of Dental Medicine (D.M.D.), the Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) the Doctor of Law (J.D.) and the Doctor of Optometry (O.D.). This contrasts to a research doctorate (Ph.D.) which is designed to prepare an individual for a career in research and/or teaching. Programs of study are generally flexible and tailored to an individual's interests. The Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) degree is designed to prepare graduates for audiologic practice, and is consistent with the description of a professional degree program.



**BACCALAUREATE TRANSFER FRAMEWORKS**

**Recommendations:**

That the Baccalaureate Program Transfer Frameworks for the 183 different baccalaureate degree programs offered in the state be approved (presented in a separately bound document).

That the standards and principles used in the design and development of baccalaureate transfer frameworks be adopted.

That staff be instructed to proceed with Phase II (courses from non-offering universities) as a logical extension to the implementation of SB 198 using the same standards and principles as were used in Phase I.

That universities and community colleges be directed to implement the provisions of the Baccalaureate Program Transfer Frameworks.

**Rationale:**

- Senate Bill 198 requires the Council to develop a 60-hour program that can be transferred and applied toward the requirements of a bachelor's degree for each major at each university offering the program. Transfer frameworks for community college to university transfer are to be in place by fall 1997.
- Implementation of the provisions of SB 198 has resulted in frameworks for the 183 baccalaureate degree programs currently offered by public universities. New frameworks will be designed as new baccalaureate degree programs are approved.
- Standards and principles have been developed to guide the development of the frameworks. Approval of the standards and principles will ensure consistent treatment for programs and institutions as current frameworks are expanded and new frameworks are designed for new programs.
- The Phase II portion of the framework development process recognizes that students who transfer from one university to another should have the same transfer benefits as students who transfer from a community college to a university. Completion of Phase II extends the benefits of SB 198 to students who transfer from one university to another.
- The success of this endeavor and the ultimate benefit to students is dependent on institutional staff and faculty implementing the provisions of the frameworks, providing advising information, developing an institutional communications plan, certifying student completion of the frameworks, and reporting data on transfer students to the Council.



## **Background:**

*Purpose of Baccalaureate Transfer Frameworks.* The provisions of SB 198 direct the Council to design a 60-hour program of study for every baccalaureate major. The resulting transfer framework will allow students to transfer the entire 60-hour framework to any university that offers the program. Each transfer framework provides for general education and specialty courses (usually introductory courses in the discipline). A committee of institutional representatives and Council staff began the design and development of frameworks in February 1996. The first group of baccalaureate transfer frameworks covering 55 degree programs was approved by the Council in March 1997. With the approval of these initial frameworks, it was recognized that the remaining 128 programs would need to be completed in two phases: Phase I identifies the coursework needed to transfer from a community college to a university in every bachelor's degree program offered in the state. Approval of the Baccalaureate Program Transfer Frameworks presented in the attached document completes Phase I. Phase II requires that the opportunity for university to university transfer be reflected on each framework by adding the appropriate coursework for each university that does not offer the degree program. It is expected that Phase II will be completed during the 1997-98 academic year. The 1998-99 edition of the frameworks will include Phase II information as well as any curriculum revisions that have been made by universities offering the program.

It is important to restate that the frameworks are designed as a planning document for students who have selected a major but may be unsure of the institution where they plan to complete the bachelor's degree. Since the courses used in the transfer frameworks are not necessarily equivalent across all institutions, students must complete all the requirements and conditions for their chosen program of study in order to be guaranteed the benefits of the framework. Students are advised to seek assistance from advisors and to be aware of other sources of information such as college catalogs and departmental brochures.

*Standards and Principles.* A set of standards and principles has been used to guide the development of the transfer frameworks. Many of the principles were derived from the Council's General Education Transfer policy (adopted May 1995); other principles address the unique requirements of the transfer frameworks. Even though a complete set of transfer frameworks is presented for approval, these frameworks represent only the first step in a continuing process. Not only does the addition of Phase II coursework need to be accomplished, but each transfer framework will need to be revised as a program's curriculum is revised by one or more universities. Approval of a set of standards and principles will provide the foundation for the work that remains to be done. The standards and principles are presented in Attachment 1.

*Expectations of Institutions.* Every university and community college must cooperate in the implementation of transfer frameworks in order for them to be of maximum benefit to students. Therefore, institutions are expected to:

- Implement the provisions of the Council's General Education Transfer policy and the Baccalaureate Transfer Frameworks.

- Recognize that the successful implementation of statewide transfer policies may require individual institutions to realign institutional policies to accommodate the provisions of the statewide policies.
- Continue to participate in the development and revision of transfer frameworks, including providing information on revisions to existing programs and suggesting specialty courses for frameworks in proposals for new programs.
- Advise transfer students using information on general education transfer and baccalaureate transfer frameworks.
- Provide certification for each student transferring to another public institution (certification for completion of general education categories per the General Education Transfer Policy or completion of baccalaureate transfer framework).
- Use automated processes to provide appropriate certification for which the student is eligible, either as part of or attached to the transcript. (Direct requests for certification from students must be honored in the same way a request for a transcript is honored.)
- Provide transcripts and certifications to the receiving institution prior to the beginning of the semester in which the student transfers.
- Honor the transfer certification presented by the student.
- Develop an institutional communications plan to inform prospective students about the Baccalaureate Program Transfer Frameworks.
- Report data on transfer students according to the *Comprehensive Data Base Reporting Guidelines*.

*Dissemination of Frameworks.* In order to maximize access to the contents of the transfer frameworks, staff plans to use several methods to disseminate and publicize the transfer frameworks. A complete set of frameworks will be published on the Council's world wide web site. This will provide direct access to high school and college students, high school counselors, college advisors, parents, and the general public. Staff also plans to develop an information packet that describes the transfer frameworks and illustrates how they can benefit the transfer student. A limited number of printed copies of the Baccalaureate Program Transfer Frameworks will be made available to institutions, state-level policymakers, and legislators.

*Institutional Staff Development.* One of the keys to the successful implementation of the Council's transfer policies, the General Education Transfer policy and the transfer framework, is institutional staff understanding of those policies. Multiple types of staff development activities are anticipated: Council staff and committee member presentations at professional conferences, institutionally designed activities, or statewide or regional conferences hosted by one or more institutions. Council staff has agreed to participate in institutional activities upon request.



*Evaluation of Transfer Frameworks.* The Council has collected basic information on transfer students for many years. Beginning with the 1997-98 academic year, data will be submitted that reflect the number of students who transfer with the benefits of the General Education Transfer policy, the Baccalaureate Program Transfer Frameworks, and the statewide articulation agreements. Since these are recent policies, 1997-98 data can serve as the baseline year. After sufficient data have been collected, an analysis of the effectiveness of the policies can be conducted.

*Statewide Transfer Committee.* The development of transfer frameworks is the result of the dedicated effort of the institutional members of the Statewide Transfer Committee. Service on this committee has required two meetings each month, multiple conversations with faculty within each institution, and communication among committee members by computer listserv between meetings. Their exemplary effort is documented by completion of the transfer frameworks within the statutory time limit. Institutional committee members are:

Jack Culross, Dean  
Office of Academic Support and  
Undergraduate Studies  
Eastern Kentucky University

Betty Olinger  
Assistant Vice President for  
Academic Affairs  
Kentucky State University

Gene A. Ranvier  
Registrar  
Morehead State University

Katherine Kerr  
Office of the Registrar  
Murray State University

Robert Appleson, Assistant Provost  
Curriculum and Assessment  
Northern Kentucky University

Louis J. Swift  
Dean of Undergraduate Students  
University of Kentucky

Anthony Newberry  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
Community College System

Deborah G. Wilson  
Assistant University Provost  
University of Louisville

Kyle Wallace  
Director, Academic Advising Center  
Western Kentucky University

Council staff instrumental in the design of this project and assuring its completion according to schedule are: Aphy Brough, Barbara Cook, and Randy Overton.



## Principles for Transfer Frameworks

- A. The basis for developing transfer frameworks is the published curriculum for baccalaureate programs. Most associate degree programs do not contain enough general education to qualify.
- B. The General Education Transfer Policy is an integral part of each transfer framework.
- C. Program-specific general education requirements may be identified and utilized as part of each transfer framework.
- D. The concept of block credit is based on the assumption that similar competencies are developed in similar programs even though particular courses may not be represented across programs.
- E. Each institution recognizes the professional integrity of all other public institutions in the acceptance of credit and the validity of the academic decisions made by the faculties of those institutions.
- F. In some cases, consensus can be easily reached on the courses to be used in the framework. In other cases, there may be a diversity of institutional practices, and compromise may be necessary. The program requirements of institutions offering the program will define courses and categories to be used in each framework.
- G. Transfer frameworks primarily cover lower-division requirements and apply only to transfer students (as distinct from transient [visiting] students).
- H. Transfer frameworks will be created for programs or groups of programs that have sufficient common elements (similar general education and specialty courses) to result in a 60-hour framework. In some cases, groups of programs may represent more than one department or discipline. It is not necessary to develop a separate framework for each major, only that each major be included in a framework.
- I. Transfer frameworks may include relevant criteria such as program admissions requirements, minimum grade point average, minimum course grades, etc.
- J. When fully implemented, the sending institution will certify to the receiving institution that the transfer framework for the student's listed major has been completed and all criteria and conditions have been met. An institution may certify a student's completion of multiple frameworks when appropriate.
- K. Close cooperation and communication among colleges and universities will be established to facilitate the transfer process for students and to enable the participating institutions to maintain timely and comprehensive information.

- L. Particular attention will be paid to academic advising on each campus and to interaction among campuses in order to inform students about the nuances of requirements at the various institutions.
- M. Transfer frameworks will be updated annually. Current information on transfer frameworks will be made available to students.
- N. Each receiving institution will provide a process for students to appeal decisions related to each transfer framework.



## Standards for the Development of a Transfer Framework

*A proposed transfer framework will be developed and maintained by CPE staff for each baccalaureate program (major) according to the following standards and the Principles for Transfer Frameworks. Any institution wishing to propose changes to the framework developed by staff should confer with other institutional members of the Statewide Transfer Committee. Any proposed substitution for the staff's transfer framework must be consistent with these standards and must include agreement of all institutional committee members.*

### Overall Transfer Framework

1. A transfer framework shall consist of 60 credit hours divided between a general education component (48 hours) and a specialty component (12 hours).
2. One transfer framework will be developed for each baccalaureate degree program (major).
3. The transfer framework for a major must be accepted toward the degree requirements for that major by *all* universities offering the program.
4. The transfer framework must reflect the program of study at the offering institution, i.e., courses in the framework must meet the degree requirements at the institution which offers the program.
5. Specialty component courses and program-specific general education courses will be included in each transfer framework for the community colleges.
6. Specialty component courses and program-specific general education courses will be included in each transfer framework for each university that does not offer the degree program if the entire transfer framework can be completed at that university.
7. The standards of program accrediting agencies will be considered in the development of a transfer framework, particularly when the program at all universities is accredited. Decisions to include or exclude courses based on program accreditation must be documented from the relevant accreditation standards.

### General Education Component

1. Generally, the provisions of the General Education Transfer Policy will govern the general education transfer component for the transfer framework.

2. Specific courses may be listed for any of the five categories of the 33-hour transfer component when particular general education courses are specified in the program of study and similar courses are listed for all offering universities.
3. In no instance may courses be specified for the 15-hour block reserved for the unique general education requirements of the sending institution.

### **Specialty Component**

1. The specialty component (12 hours) shall consist of courses applicable to the program at *all* the offering universities.
2. To the extent possible, the specialty component shall be comprised of lower division courses. When it is necessary to list either 300- or 400- level university courses, lower division community college courses must be accepted. Courses at the 400 and 500 level usually will not be appropriate for a transfer framework since a transfer framework is intended to reflect introductory coursework that may be taken by freshmen and sophomores. However, 400-level courses may be included in special instances when the course has no prerequisites and when the institution allows lower-division students to enroll in the course.
3. Discipline-specific courses in the program of study must be used if at all possible. Support or liberal arts courses are to be used only as a second alternative.
4. At least 12 hours of community college courses must be included in the specialty component if the community colleges offer the coursework in the discipline.
5. Courses with prerequisites shall be excluded from the specialty component unless the prerequisite course is included either in the specialty or general education component. If a general education course is specified, comparable courses must be specified for all institutions. Should it become necessary to include a course with prerequisites not meeting the above standard, no more than one prerequisite will be allowed per framework per institution and that condition will be indicated on the framework.



**1997/98 POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION  
EQUINE TRUST PROGRAM**

---

**ACTION ITEM  
CPE (H)  
July 21, 1997**

**Recommendation:**

That the Council approve, in accordance with program guidelines, the 1997/98 base allocation of \$40,000 to each university with an established equine program.

That the Council approve, also in accordance with program guidelines and pending staff review and approval of revised project plans, \$175,000 and \$205,000 to be awarded to Morehead State University and Western Kentucky University respectively to complete construction of equine teaching facilities. Any additional funds will be carried forward to the 1998/99 fiscal year.

**Rationale:**

- The guidelines provide the basis for the expenditure of the funds accumulated in the Postsecondary Education Equine Trust and Revolving Fund. The Fund is established by KRS 138.510(6) as a set-aside of the pari-mutuel tax for the purpose of supporting construction and equipment costs of university equine programs.
- The five institutions with established equine programs (MoSU, MuSU, UK, UofL, and WKU) will each receive a base allocation of \$40,000. MoSU and WKU will receive \$175,000 and \$205,000 respectively to complete projects that received initial funding in 1996/97.
- These allocations have been reviewed and approved by the members of the Postsecondary Education Equine Trust Advisory Committee, which is composed of designated representatives of all participating institutions.

**Background:**

KRS 138.510(6) establishes the Postsecondary Education Equine Trust and Revolving Fund from the proceeds of Kentucky's pari-mutuel tax. The fund is to be used to support capital expenditures by the state universities' equine programs. (MoSU, MuSU, UK, UofL, and WKU operate equine programs.)

The Council is designated as the administrative agent for the funds and has established an advisory committee as required by law to make recommendations as to the expenditure of funds. The committee is composed of designated representatives of the eligible institutions.

On July 15, 1996, the Council adopted revised guidelines for the operation of the program. The above recommendations are consistent with those guidelines and provide that all eligible institutions will receive a base allocation of \$40,000 in each fiscal year, providing that they submit and receive Council approval for a plan for the expenditure of those funds.

MoSU and WKU will receive \$175,000 and \$205,000 respectively to complete construction on their equine teaching facilities. Those facilities will provide additional classroom space and a covered riding arena for use by students in those equine programs.

Any funds remaining in the trust fund will be carried forward until the 1998/99 fiscal year.

**EISENHOWER MATHEMATICS AND  
SCIENCE EDUCATION PROGRAM:  
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

**CPE (I)  
JULY 21, 1997**

---

**Information:**

The Council, serving as the state coordinating agency for postsecondary education, receives federal funds to support projects at public and independent higher education institutions and nonprofit organizations for the improvement of the quality of P-12 instruction in mathematics and science.

Federal regulations require that the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education funds be distributed through a competitive process (RFP). The Government and Performance Act of 1993 (P. L. 103-62) requires the Council to submit its Annual Program Performance Report in 1998 based on a system of performance indicators for the program. Further, the Council is required to collect baseline data for the system in FY 97. In response to this requirement, the Council contracted with WESTAT Inc. for technical assistance. WESTAT Inc. was selected because of the expertise gained in developing a similar set of documents for the federal Eisenhower Office.

Council and WESTAT staff worked with the Kentucky Eisenhower Higher Education Advisory Council to develop a performance indicator system and companion assessment instruments. Once finalized, the performance indicator system (which includes objectives and performance measures) and the assessment instruments became the basis for revising the RFP. As a result, Kentucky has an Eisenhower Higher Education Program with totally articulated components. Since funded projects will be required to administer the companion evaluation instruments, we are assured that we will receive proposals that specifically address the stated objectives and performance indicators, and that we will receive data that are specific to the performance indicators. Future program changes will be based on needs identified through analysis of data collected using the performance indicator and assessment system.

Kentucky is among the first states to have progressed to this point in implementing these requirements, and, in fact, may be the front runner in its efforts to develop and implement a totally integrated performance indicator system.

The Council's Programs Committee, at its meeting on November 11, 1996, directed staff to review the RFP process to assure that Kentucky's mathematics and science teacher professional development needs were being properly addressed. Specifically, staff was directed to assure that proposals responded to mathematics and science gender specific issues and to replication of successful programs in other regions of the state. Section IV of the RFP was revised to include language specific to those issues. In addition, these issues are addressed in objectives 2 and 7 in the Performance Indicator System.





*Council on Postsecondary Education  
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 320  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601*

**DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER**

**IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT**

**Title II - Eisenhower Professional Development Program**

**SECTION 2211 - HIGHER EDUCATION**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**YEAR 13**

---

**CLOSING DATE**

**OCTOBER 31, 1997**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>II.</b>	<b>PHILOSOPHY FOR ADMINISTERING EISENHOWER FUNDS</b>	1
<b>III.</b>	<b>GRANT AWARDS</b>	2
<b>IV.</b>	<b>PROGRAM GUIDELINES</b>	2
	<b>A. Eligible Institutions</b>	2
	<b>B. Activity Recommendations</b>	3
	<b>C. Activity Requirements</b>	3
	<b>D. Other Activity Criteria</b>	3
	1. Cooperative Planning and Collaboration	3
	2. Replication of Exemplary Programs and Practices	4
	3. Targeted Populations	4
	4. Content Priorities	5
	5. Techniques Priorities	5
	6. Activity Evaluation	5
	<b>E. State Education Agency Eisenhower Funds</b>	6
<b>V.</b>	<b>PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS</b>	6
	<b>A. Cover Page</b>	6
	<b>B. Abstract</b>	6
	<b>C. Table of Contents</b>	6
	<b>D. Proposal Budget Summary</b>	6
	<b>E. Budget Narrative</b>	6
	<b>F. Cooperative Planning</b>	6
	<b>G. Cooperative Planning Agreement</b>	7
	<b>H. Objectives and Anticipated Outcomes</b>	7
	<b>I. Achievement and Impact of Current/Previous Projects</b>	7
	<b>J. Activities</b>	7
	<b>K. Participants Involved</b>	7
	<b>L. Access of Underrepresented and Underserved Groups</b>	7
	<b>M. Evaluation Plan</b>	8
	<b>N. Replication and Dissemination</b>	8
	<b>O. Vitae</b>	8
	<b>P. Current Funded Projects and Pending Proposals</b>	8
	<b>Q. References Cited</b>	8
	<b>R. Statement of Assurances</b>	8
<b>VI.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL FORMAT</b>	8
<b>VII.</b>	<b>BUDGET GUIDELINES</b>	8
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>FISCAL PROCEDURES</b>	9
<b>IX.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	10
<b>X.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND DEADLINES</b>	11
<b>XI.</b>	<b>AWARD NOTIFICATION</b>	11
<b>XII.</b>	<b>APPENDICES</b>	
	<b>A. Proposal Packet</b>	
	<b>B. CPE Performance Indicators</b>	
	<b>C. CPE Evaluation Questionnaires</b>	
	<b>D. LEA 1997 Eisenhower Allotments</b>	
	<b>E. List of Distinguished Educators and School Districts Served</b>	



**TIMETABLE**  
**For**  
**1997-98 PROPOSALS**

August 1, 1997 ..... RFP Mailed

October 31, 1997 ..... Proposal Due Date  
(Must be received at the Council on Postsecondary Education by 4:00 p.m., EST)

November 14-16, 1997 ..... Review Panel Meeting

December 8, 1997 ..... CPE Approves Funding of Proposals

JANUARY 12, 1998 ..... First Quarter Funding Available

JUNE 30, 1999 ..... Project Closeout Date

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Kentucky's Higher Education Eisenhower Program is funded under the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. The Eisenhower Program has specific responsibility for initiating and supporting activities designed to improve teaching and learning through sustained and intensive high-quality professional development activities in mathematics and science and other core curriculum areas. Allowable activities include: sustained, high-quality professional development programs for the teachers and staff of schools and/or local school districts; and improving teacher education programs to better meet LEA needs for well-prepared teachers. Institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations of demonstrated effectiveness, including museums and educational partnership organizations, are eligible to submit proposals for funding.

During the past twelve years, the Council on Postsecondary Education has allocated over \$6 million to support activities designed to meet program objectives. The Council has received approximately \$750,000 in federal funds in 1997, and the money will be allocated through competitive grants for projects operating between January 1, 1998 and June 30, 1999.

## **II. PHILOSOPHY FOR ADMINISTERING EISENHOWER FUNDS**

The Eisenhower Program provides an excellent opportunity for the educational community to address serious concerns relating to instruction in mathematics and science and other core curriculum areas. The Council on Postsecondary Education hopes that by bringing collegiate faculty in academic and educational disciplines together with primary, middle, and secondary school teachers, an environment can be provided in which creative and effective ideas and methods of teaching can flourish.

The Council invites proposals that contain new or proven methods for addressing the complex issues surrounding teaching and learning. Proposals must address professional development needs inherent to the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) and must contribute to the Kentucky Department of Education's Plan for Professional Development. Furthermore, proposals must offer specific plans for: 1) developing and providing assistance to the teachers and staff of schools and/or local school districts for sustained, high-quality professional development activities; and/or 2) improving teacher education programs to better meet the need for well-prepared teachers.

The Council on Postsecondary Education, as required by legislation, has set specific direction for Kentucky's Eisenhower Program. A Performance Indicators System (**Appendix B**) has been adopted for the program. In order to be considered for funding proposals must be aligned with the objectives and indicators in that system. Successful proposals will clearly demonstrate how their projects will contribute toward the implementation of the Council's objectives and indicators. **Appendix C** contains instruments that will be used to evaluate funded projects' alignment with the performance indicators.



### III. GRANT AWARDS

Grants will be awarded in accordance with rules and regulations governing the Improving America's Schools Act, Section 2211(b). Grants will be awarded in the following categories:

- 1) \$600,000 for professional development proposals as outlined later in this RFP. **The maximum grant amount has been set at \$60,000.** Multi-year proposals may be submitted. However, funding beyond June 30, 1999 is contingent on future federal funding.
- 2) \$150,000 for continuation of projects funded in cooperation with the National Science Foundation (NSF), Partnership for Reform Initiatives in Science and Mathematics (PRISM), and/or other NSF initiatives of the Kentucky Science and Technology Council.

A recipient of funds under this section shall use such funds for professional development activities that provide for or result in sustained and intensive high-quality professional development for individual or teams of teachers and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel and administrators from individual schools or school districts. To achieve this objective proposals must provide one or more of the following professional development activities:

1. Direct training  
(e.g., workshops that provide professional development on specific knowledge and skills, including preservice programs)
2. Networking  
(e.g., capacity building projects that facilitate professional networking)
3. Indirect training  
(e.g., development, modeling, and dissemination of professional development plans)

### IV. PROGRAM GUIDELINES

#### A. Eligible Institutions

Eligible Kentucky institutions include accredited public and independent two and four year colleges and universities, and nonprofit organizations (NPO) of demonstrated effectiveness, including museums and educational partnership organizations. Nonprofit organizations are responsible for submitting documentation of their demonstrated effectiveness in delivering sustained high-quality professional development.

#### B. Activity Recommendations

The Council on Postsecondary Education recommends that projects focus on the following KERA professional development priorities:

- Implementing the new national standards for mathematics and science.
- Implementing the Kentucky Learning Goals and Academic Expectations for mathematics and science.
- Making connections among Kentucky's Core Content for the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS), curriculum development, and instructional strategies/practices in mathematics and science.



## **C. Activity Requirements**

The Council on Postsecondary Education requires that:

- Projects be aligned with professional development priorities of the Kentucky Department of Education and/or systemic reform initiatives in the state (NSF). [Indicator 7bi]
- Projects address NCTM Curriculum and Assessment Standards and/or the National Science Education Standards [Indicator 1aii]
- Direct training professional development projects that teach core content must have a minimum of 30 contact hours. [Indicator 1ci]
- Direct training programs must include at least two follow-up training sessions during the following school year. [Indicator 1ciii]

## **D. Other Activity Criteria**

### **1. Cooperative Planning and Collaboration**

- **Alignment with School and LEA needs**

Any proposal for a subgrant from the Council on Postsecondary Education must include evidence that the proposed activities are addressing specific needs as defined in the action plan of one or more school or LEAs. [Indicator 1aiii and 7ci].

- **Joint Effort within Higher Education Institutions**

If an applicant higher education institution has a teacher education program, its proposal must be the result of a joint effort of the teacher education program and the school or department of the specific discipline in which the professional development will be provided. Both parties, presumably, will participate in implementing the grant activities.

Colleges and universities are encouraged to determine whether similar initiatives may already exist at their institution, and to work cooperatively with existing initiatives in developing their proposal. These institutions should explore options for a continuing commitment, including establishment of formal courses in academic departments, to meeting the needs of the inservice teacher. Established Eisenhower projects are encouraged to explore with their colleagues in other institutions options for replicating their programs to meet the needs of the underserved in both urban and rural areas.

- **Participant Involvement in Planning**

Teacher participants and/or administrators from the school(s) to be served by the project must be involved in project planning and proposal preparation for all retraining and professional development projects. This requirement is intended to ensure that the nature, content, and academic credit (if any) for a course or workshop or other activities will meet the needs of the teachers to be served, and will promote efficient use of Eisenhower funds. Proposed activities must address local efforts toward the KDE's Professional Development Plan. [Indicator 7ai]

- **LEA Involvement in Planning**

Evidence of LEA involvement in project planning, and a formal agreement between the college or university and the LEA(s) or consortium of LEAs must be included in the proposal (see Cooperative Planning Agreement Form, **Appendix A**).

## **2. Replication of Exemplary Programs and Practices**

The Council on Postsecondary Education will give priority to proposals that utilize and expand resources for professional development practices. Priority will be given to those proposals that:

- **Expand the Service Area**

Priority will be given to those exemplary programs, particularly those that have been funded by the Council in prior years that expand their service area to include more participants. [Indicator 7di]

- **Share Exemplary Programs**

Priority will be given to those exemplary programs, particularly those that have been funded by Council in prior years, that providing indirect training to share their exemplary professional development content and techniques with programs in other regions of the State. [Indicator 7di]

- **Replicate Exemplary Programs**

Priority will be given to those proposals that replicate model professional development programs.

- **Use KDE Distinguished Educators**

Priority will be given to professional development proposals that are developed and/or implemented in cooperation with 'Kentucky Department of Education Distinguished Educators'. [Indicator 6bi] (**Appendix E**)

## **3. Address the Needs of Targeted Populations**

- **Underrepresented and Underserved Participants**

Proposals must assure that professional development programs will provide opportunity for equitable participation of teachers from both parochial and private schools.

Additionally, proposals should target teachers in minority populations for their subject area and grade level. (e.g., high school mathematics and science programs should target female and African-American teachers). [Indicator 2ai]

- **Underrepresented and Underserved Students**

Proposals must assure that professional development programs will address the need for greater access to and participation in mathematics and science for students from historically underrepresented and underserved (U/U) groups, including females, minorities, individuals with limited English proficiency, the disabled, migrants, the economically disadvantaged, and the gifted and talented. Specifically, the Council on Postsecondary Education places priority on proposals that target teachers in high-poverty schools, based on free and reduced lunch participation. [Indicator 2bi]



- **Administration and other Staff**

In order to facilitate the concept of a community of learners, the Council on Postsecondary Education will give priority to proposals that included administrators and other staff in the planning and as participants in their programs. [Indicator 6ai]

- **Schools Below Benchmarks on the KIRIS Assessment**

Priority will be given to proposals that provide evidence (planning with Distinguished Educators) that they coordinated their plans with schools in crisis, schools in decline or improving schools as defined by the Kentucky Department of Education. (Appendix E) [Indicator 1avi]

#### **4. Content Priorities**

The Council on Postsecondary Education encourages proposals that propose to address one or more of the following professional development issues: [Indicator 1ai]

- Professional development in the effective use of **technology**.
- Professional development to prepare teachers and other personnel to engage **parents, families** and/or others in the education of children.
- Professional development to prepare teachers and other personnel to provide equitable and quality education to historically **underrepresented and underserved populations** including disabled and gifted students.
- Program improvement for **teacher preparation programs** within an institution or a consortium of teacher education institutions.
- Programs to facilitate and encourage **networking** among teachers and administrators to share classroom knowledge and skills.

#### **5. Technique Priorities**

The Council on Postsecondary Education encourages proposals that propose to utilize the following techniques in their professional development programs: [Indicator 1bi]

- Use **technology** for networking and outreach (e.g., use of listserve, website, or video conferencing technology).
- Use **experiential instruction techniques** (e.g., activity-based learning). These projects should include "make and take" units and/or lesson plans.
- Emphasize **depth** rather than breadth. Focus on the development of topics in-depth.
- Use techniques that have been **proven effective** in other professional development activities.

#### **6. Activity Evaluation**

- **Use of Evaluation Information**

Priority will be given to those proposals that utilize previous program evaluations to develop their program. These evaluations can be from prior Eisenhower programs or similar professional development programs.

- **Required Evaluation**

All funded programs are required to submit a final evaluation of their program [Indicator 7ei]. The majority of the final report data will be gathered using preliminary and follow-up participant questionnaires. Programs that provide direct training to teachers are required to conduct follow-up surveys from 25 percent of their participants to examine program effectiveness [Indicators 1aiv, 1bii, 1cii, 1di, 3ai, 3aii, 3bii, 3biii, 3bv, 5ai, 5bi, 5bii, 7eii]. Programs that provide indirect training are required to gather preliminary information. Programs that exclusively provide networking facilitation are required to gather only preliminary information. [Indicator 3biv] **See Appendix C for a copy of the required questionnaires.**

**E. State Education Agency Eisenhower Funds**

Use of Eisenhower funds allotted to local school districts by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) is encouraged in conjunction with funds requested in a Eisenhower proposal to the Council on Postsecondary Education. The KDE requires that LEAs submit their plans for the use of Eisenhower funds and other available resources by May of each year. The needs of parochial and private schools also must be addressed in these collaborative arrangements. **(See Appendix D for LEA Eisenhower Allotments)**

**V. PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS**

All proposals must be submitted on the official forms provided in **Appendix A**. Proposals must be typed and must adhere to the following format:

**A. Cover Page**

List of collaborating LEAs  
Signature of project director  
Signatures of appropriate officials of the applying institution

**B. Abstract**

A one-page concise summary which includes the collaborating groups and participants, main activities, and expected project outcomes

**C. Table of Contents**

**D. Budget Summary**

An itemized budget, including requested CPE's Eisenhower funds and any cost sharing  
Copies of completed Proposed Budget Forms.

**E. Budget Narrative**

Concise narrative description for each budget line item, including a description of time involvement, roles, and responsibilities of the project director and staff.  
Description of cost sharing, specifying source (university in-kind support, LEA support, and/or other agency support)

**F. Cooperative Planning**

Identification of specific local professional development needs that project will address. (e.g., alignment with school and/or LEA needs; participant involvement in planning; and use of KDE Distinguished Educators) Description of needs, roles, and contributions of



each collaborative unit, including how these collaborations fulfill needs identified in the Lea's professional development plan.

Description of how collaborative structure will enhance project's success.

**G. Cooperative Planning Agreement**

Description of collaboration and previous planning including methods used to involve nonpublic and parochial school personnel. Signatures of representatives of LEAs/agencies involved in project.

**H. Objectives and Anticipated Outcomes**

Objectives must be stated in concise terms and a measurable format.

Anticipated outcomes must address effect of project on target audience.

Each proposal must specify how each of the following are addressed:

- Implementation of the CPE professional development priorities
- Professional development that address state and national standards
- LEA/School Action Plans (Required beginning with 1998 proposals)
- If applicable, planning with "distinguished educators" to serve schools below benchmarks on the KIRIS Assessment. (e.g., schools in crisis, schools in decline and improving schools)
- Direct training proposals include a minimum of 30 contact hours.
- Direct training proposals include a minimum of two follow-up sessions.

**I. Achievement and Impact of Similar Current/Previous Projects**

(This section applies only if this project is an expansion or continuation of an earlier Eisenhower project of the project director or institution.)

Include data on previous project's effect on participants (e.g., how participants' involvement changed their ability in mathematics or science; changed their teaching methods; changed their attitudes and/or learning styles). Describe the relationship between success of previous project(s) and anticipated outcomes of proposed project.

**J. Activities**

- Description of proposed activities, including the following information for each activity: time allotted, staff person responsible, and relationship to a specific measurable objective.
- Description of how proposed activities would lead to meeting the measurable objectives.
- Description of how the activities address the content and technique priorities listed in sections D4 and D5 of the RFP. If the activities involve a college course and/or teacher workshop, a description which includes the following information: course of study or syllabus, identification of textbooks and/or reference materials, methods of participant evaluation, and name(s) of person(s) teaching the course/workshop.

**K. Participants Involved**

Provide an estimate of the number of teachers to be served.

Provide an estimate of the number of schools and/or school districts to be served.

**L. Access of Underrepresented/Underserved Groups**

Strategies for increasing project access and participation of U/U groups.

Description of recruitment methods and, if appropriate a list of targeted schools and local school districts.

If project does not focus on U/U groups, explain why the focus is not needed.



**M. Evaluation Plan**

Description of how the project will contribute to the implementation of the Council on Higher Education's Performance Indicator System and how the project will measure its success in those efforts.

**N. Replication and Dissemination**

Describe any plans for replication of project.

Outline plans for dissemination of project's successes.

**O. Vitae**

Provide a one-page vita for each of the following; project director, project staff members, graduate students, and teachers who have a major role in the project.

**P. Currently Funded Projects and Pending Proposals**

Provide a list of currently funded projects and pending proposals involving the project director and associated staff members, including title of project, project period, percent of individual's annual time or support, total award, and funding agency. *(If no funded proposals, enter "none" under this heading.)*

**Q. References Cited**

Full references must be provided for any materials cited in the narrative.

**R. Statement of Assurances**

The proper institutional representative must sign this section.

**VI. PROPOSAL FORMAT**

The proposal must follow the following format. The proposal narrative must not exceed 30 double-spaced pages, excluding the cover sheet, abstract, table of contents, budget summary, vitae (*one page per person*), cooperative planning agreement, statement of assurances, and references cited. All major subject headings must be underlined and/or highlighted. All pages must be numbered.

The Review Panel appreciates clear, concise, complete, carefully written, proofread proposals that meet the length guidelines. Proposals should follow normal standards for English usage, proofreading, and citations crediting the ideas and words of others.

**VII. BUDGET GUIDELINES**

The Council on Postsecondary Education recognizes the need for the Eisenhower Program to serve as many teachers as possible. With limited funds available and numerous proposals expected, proposal writers are encouraged to develop efficient and highly effective proposals that incorporate funds available from other sources when appropriate.

**Requested CPE Eisenhower funds may not exceed \$60,000.**

Projects involving course work for credit must follow one of two budget options:

- Grants may pay for regular tuition plus additional costs that might not be covered in conventional college courses. *(Any additional costs must be fully explained to ensure that there is no duplication of payment. The grant cannot support both the cost of full tuition for participants and salaries for instructors.)*
- Grants may pay the direct costs of the project.

The following budget guidelines are to be used in budget preparation:

- **Cost of Tuition or Salaries and Benefits**  
*EITHER summer or released-time for faculty salaries and fringe benefits; wages for secretarial assistance, graduate and undergraduate students; and/or peer teachers OR tuition may be charged. In no case will both be allowed.*
- **Clerical/Administrative Assistance**  
*Must be justified as nontraditional course cost if charged in addition to tuition.*
- **Consultant Fees**  
*Maximum of \$300 per day plus expenses for those employed as instructors. Must not exceed institutional salary levels.*
- **Supplies and Materials**  
*Must be for items not associated with a credit course and **MUST BE** fully justified.*
- **Instructional Fees**  
*(I.e., required fees which are not normally covered in tuition.)*
- **Participants' Living Costs**  
*For projects with participants requiring residential services.*
- **Travel and Conference Expenses for Staff and Participants**  
*Reasonable expenses for participants at in-state meetings integral to project success; travel for project staff to conduct on-site evaluations and follow-up.*
- **Teacher Stipends**  
*A maximum rate of \$50 a day is permitted.*
- **Equipment**  
*A maximum of \$500 for a single item is allowed; equipment must be for use of participants, not the institution; rental is encouraged.*

## VIII. FISCAL PROCEDURES

All federal funds for Eisenhower grants must be assigned to a specific account. If an institution receives more than one Eisenhower grant, separate accounts must be established for each. The recipient institution will receive an initial payment of one-third the grant amount. The second one-third of the grant amount may be requested once expenditures equal the initial payment. The final grant payment will be made after the project has concluded, and all reports have been submitted. Expenditures in excess of approved budget amounts will be the responsibility of the recipient institution.



## **IX. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA**

All proposals will be reviewed and rated by a review panel to be chosen by the Council on Postsecondary Education's Eisenhower Program director. The panel will include representatives of appropriate mathematics and science disciplines from public and private institutions, schools, professional organizations, and/or industries in Kentucky.

### **A. Demonstrated Need and Improvement of Instruction (25 points)**

Cooperative planning with one or more schools and/or school districts (including nonpublic schools if applicable) or members of a consortium.

Proposed activities that meet professional development needs identified by the schools and/or school districts involved in the planning.

Emphasizes priorities as listed in Section IVD, parts 4 and 5, of the RFP.

Project design that provides for measurable improvement in the quality of teaching, classroom performance of teachers, and/or student learning and performance.

Project design that emphasizes the needs of teachers from historically U/U groups.

Project has potential to serve as a model or provide information that other institutions and schools could use to meet similar local needs.

### **B. Plan of Operation (25 points)**

A management plan is proposed that will assure proper and efficient administration.

Projects staffing that is appropriate for proposed activities.

Project objectives that are reasonable, clearly identified and linked to local professional development needs, and containing anticipated outcomes that have potential for success.

Evidence that LEAs (including nonpublic schools if applicable) were involved in the development of the proposal and the proposed workshop activities.

The timeline is appropriate for the planned program and appears to be reasonable

Proposed activities are practical, but creative, innovative and use state-of-the-art knowledge and practices.

Appropriate strategies are included for recruiting targeted participants, including those from historically U/U groups.

A recruitment plan to ensure opportunity for participation by public, parochial, and nonpublic school personnel.

### **C. Evaluation (10 points)**

An evaluation of the project's expected impact is included in the proposal.

An evaluation of participant expected outcomes is included in the proposal.

Assurances that the project will comply with the requirements of the Council on Higher Education's Performance Indicator System.

### **D. Resources (5 points)**

Proposed resources that are adequate to fully implement the project.

Institutional commitment to the project including appropriate staff time is apparent.

Qualifications and experiences of project staff fit proposed assignments.

### **E. Budget and Cost Effectiveness (10 points)**

A budget that is clear, concise, and justified in the proposal narrative.

A budget that is appropriate for the project's stated objectives and activities.

A budget that meets the requirements listed in the RFP.

A budget that is cost effective. *Includes additional resources, such as LEA matching funds (Eisenhower Funds) and/or in-kind support.*

**F. Overall Quality (15 points)**

Proposed project is well conceived.

Proposed project is appropriate for Eisenhower funding.

Proposal format is organized, clearly written, concise, complete, and meets the requirements stated in the RFP.

Proposed project has potential for replication in other regions of the state.

**G. Additional Emphases (10 points)**

Rural populations are included where appropriate.

Economically deprived populations are included where appropriate.

Assurances that minorities (racial, gender) will receive preference.

Other special features of the proposal

**X. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND DEADLINES**

Applicants must submit eight (8) complete, typed copies of the proposal stapled in the upper left corner.

Proposals must be received by 4:00 p.m., EDT, on Monday, October 31, 1997. Proposals received after that time will not be accepted. Faxed proposals will not be accepted.

Submit proposals to:

Wendell Cave  
Eisenhower Program Coordinator  
Council on Postsecondary Education  
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 320  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

**XI. AWARD NOTIFICATION**

Approval of grant awards is expected to be made by the Council on Postsecondary Education on December 10, 1998. All institutions submitting proposals will be notified in writing soon thereafter regarding funding decisions

Questions regarding the CPE's Eisenhower Program should be addressed to Wendell Cave. He can be reached by phone at (502) 573-1555, by fax at (502) 573-1535 or by e-mail at [wcave@mail.state.ky.us](mailto:wcave@mail.state.ky.us).



**APPENDIX A**

**Proposal Packet**

**1 PROPOSAL COVER PAGE**  
**9 KENTUCKY COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION**  
**9 DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MATHEMATICS**  
**8 AND SCIENCE EDUCATION PROGRAM**

Please check the proper category

Math Proposal \_\_\_\_\_  
Science Proposal \_\_\_\_\_  
Combination \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**1. INSTITUTION & PROJECT DIRECTOR**

College/University \_\_\_\_\_  
Street/Building/PO Box \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Director(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
Department \_\_\_\_\_ Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

**2. PROJECT**

Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Discipline(s) involved \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Type: Professional Development \_\_\_\_\_ Preservice Development \_\_\_\_\_  
Estimated Number of Teacher Participants \_\_\_\_\_ Grade Levels \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact Hours \_\_\_\_\_ Credit Hours (if any): Graduate \_\_\_\_\_ Undergraduate \_\_\_\_\_  
Main activities \_\_\_\_\_

**3. BUDGET**

Requested Eisenhower Funds \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Matching Funds \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Total Budget \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Eisenhower Cost per Teacher Participant \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**4. COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS (School Districts, Other Agencies and Representatives)**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**5. CERTIFICATION AND ENDORSEMENT**

The institution certifies the accuracy of the information in this proposal, and assures that the program and financial conditions stated in the proposal will be completed as proposed.

Project Director \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Institutional Representative \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



**ABSTRACT**

Please type a concise summary of your proposal in the space provided on this page.

**EISENHOWER PROGRAM  
PROPOSAL BUDGET SUMMARY**

**INSTITUTION:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**PROJECT DIRECTOR:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Check Option**  
 Regular tuition option \_\_\_\_\_  
 Direct costs option \_\_\_\_\_

1. PERSONNEL COSTS (List separately with names & titles)	EISENHOWER FUNDED MONTHS			REQUESTED EISENHOWER FUNDS	MATCH FUNDS	TOTAL PROJECT FUNDS
	ACAD	SUMR	CAL YR			
<b>A1. Salaries, Key Personnel (Faculty/Administration)</b>						
<b>A2. Fringe Benefits (at approved rates) ( %)</b>						
<b>B1. Salaries, Support Personnel (Clerical; Assistants, Grad &amp; U.G.)</b>						
<b>B2. Fringe Benefits (at approved rate) ( %)</b>						
<b>SUBTOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS (Add Salaries &amp; Fringe Benefits)</b>						
<b>2. CONTRACTUAL (Consultants, Other Subcontracts)</b> Provide Narrative Details						
<b>A.</b>						
<b>B.</b>						
<b>C.</b>						
<b>SUBTOTAL CONTRACTUAL SERVICES</b>						
<b>3. PARTICIPANT COSTS (Provide Details in Budget Narrative)</b>						
<b>A. Tuition</b>						
<b>B. Fees</b>						
<b>C. Books &amp; Course Materials</b>						
<b>D. Room &amp; Board</b>						
<b>E. Travel</b>						
<b>F. Stipend</b>						
<b>G. Teacher Substitutes (paid at local rate)</b>						
<b>H. Other (Identify)</b>						
<b>SUBTOTAL PARTICIPANT CONSTS</b>						



**PROPOSED BUDGET CONTINUED**

	<b>REQUESTED EISENHOWER FUNDS</b>	<b>MATCH FUNDS</b>	<b>TOTAL PROJECT FUNDS</b>
<b>4. TRAVEL (Field Trips; Meetings)</b>			
<b>A.</b>			
<b>B.</b>			
<b>SUBTOTAL TRAVEL</b>			
<b>5. SUPPLIES/INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (Provide Details in Budget Narrative)</b>			
<b>A.</b>			
<b>B.</b>			
<b>SUBTOTAL SUPPLIES/INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS</b>			
<b>6. EQUIPMENT (Rental; Purchase)</b>			
<b>A.</b>			
<b>B.</b>			
<b>SUBTOTAL EQUIPMENT</b>			
<b>7. COMMUNICATIONS (Provide Details in Budget Narrative)</b>			
<b>A.</b>			
<b>B.</b>			
<b>SUBTOTAL COMMUNICATIONS</b>			
<b>8. SERVICES (Duplication, Publication, Etc.) (Provide Details in Budget Narrative)</b>			
<b>A.</b>			
<b>B.</b>			
<b>SUBTOTAL SERVICES</b>			
<b>9. OTHER COSTS (Specify ) (Provide Details in Budget Narrative)</b>			
<b>A.</b>			
<b>B.</b>			
<b>SUBTOTAL OTHER COSTS</b>			
<b>10. BUDGET SUBTOTAL ( Sum of 1 – 9 Subtotals)</b>			
<b>11. INDIRECT COSTS ( 8% of Item 10 Requested Eisenhower Funds)</b>			
<b>12. TOTAL COSTS ( Sum of Items 10 – 11 )</b>			
<b>13. TOTAL REQUESTED EISENHOWER FUNDS</b>			

**COOPERATIVE PLANNING**  
**(THIS PAGE MUST BE COMPLETED FOR ALL PROPOSALS.)**

**Instructions:** Describe how this proposal has been coordinated with LEA professional development plans and how those plans are coordinated with the KDE's Professional Development Plan. Include dates of meetings, names of schools or school districts involved, number of participants involved, and job titles of participants. Use additional sheets as needed.



## INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATIVE PLANNING

**(Only institutions with teacher education programs must complete this page.)**

**Instructions:** Describe the collaborative institutional planning efforts that have occurred between the education and the mathematics and/or science schools or departments. Describe how both schools or departments will be involved with project implementation. Include dates of meetings, names of participants and schools and/or departments of participants.

**COOPERATIVE PLANNING AGREEMENT**

*This page must be completed for every proposal submitted*

\_\_\_\_\_, upon funding approval by the  
(Name of institution submitting proposal)

Council on Postsecondary Education, agrees to provide sustained, high quality professional  
development to the \_\_\_\_\_ school teachers of the undersigned  
(elementary, middle, high)

school district(s). The participating school district(s) agree to the terms and conditions  
of the proposal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name of School District                      Authorized Signature                      Date



**STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, chief executive officer/financial officer of  
(Typed name of person)

\_\_\_\_\_, hereby provide assurances to the  
(Typed institution name)

**Council on Postsecondary Education that should this institution receive a grant under the terms of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act, it will:**

- 1. Upon request, provide the Council on Postsecondary Education with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations;**
- 2. Conduct educational activities funded by this project in compliance with the following federal laws:**
  - a. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**
  - b. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972**
  - c. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973**
  - d. Age Discrimination Act of 1975**
  - e. Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**
  - f. Improving America's Schools Act of 1994;**
- 3. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources;**
- 4. Take into account during the development of programming the need for greater access to and participation in the targeted disciplines by students from historically under represented and under served groups;**
- 5. Ensure to the extent feasible the equitable participation of nonpublic and parochial schools in all programming supported by project funds; and**
- 6. The institution further assures that all program and evaluation reports required by the U.S. Department of Education and/or the Council on Postsecondary Education will be submitted in accordance with stated guidelines and deadlines.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date





**APPENDIX B**

**CPE Performance Indicators**

## **KENTUCKY EISENHOWER HIGHER EDUCATION**

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATOR SYSTEM**

#### **Objective 1: INCREASE DEGREE TO WHICH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES REFLECT BEST PRACTICES.**

**Indicator a.** To what extent do professional development activities address high priority professional needs of teachers, teacher candidates, and other school personnel?

- i. 100% of grantee programs will address the Kentucky Council on Posts Secondary Education's (CPE) professional development priorities defined in the RFP. **Source: Proposals.**
- ii. 100% of funded proposals will address state and national standards such as NCTM Curriculum and Assessment Standards and the National Science Education Standards. **Source: Proposals.**
- iii. By 1998, 100% of funded proposals will provide evidence that they are addressing the specific needs of school(s) and/or LEA(s) as identified in local action plans. **Source: Components of LEA/School action plans that are enclosed in proposals.**
- iv. 75% of direct training participants will report that the professional development addressed their most pressing professional needs. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F8a.**
- v. 100% of funded proposals will include specific strategies for implementing the Kentucky Core Content for KIRIS Assessment. **Source: Proposal.**
- vi. 10% of the funded proposals were developed in coordination with schools in decline, schools in crisis and/or improving schools as defined by the Kentucky Department of Education. **Source: Proposals.**

**Indicator b.** To what extent are professional development activities utilizing instructional techniques that reflect best practices?

- i. 100% of funded proposals will include professional development techniques recommended in the RFP. **Source: Proposals.**
- ii. 75% of direct training participants will report that the instructional techniques used during the professional development were appropriate for reaching the intended objectives. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F8b.**



**Indicator c.** To what extent are professional development activities and their follow-up of sufficient duration and intensity?

- i. 100% of funded direct training professional development programs that teach core content will have a minimum of 30 contact hours. **Source: Proposals**
- ii. In a follow-up survey of participants, 75% of direct training participants responding to the follow-up survey will report that the professional development program provided ample time to achieve the stated objectives. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F8c.**
- iii. 100% of funded direct training professional development will include at least two followup training sessions during the following school year. **Source: Proposals.**
- iv. 75% of direct training participants, responding to the follow-up survey, will report that the professional development program provided adequate follow-up. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F8d.**

**Indicator d.** To what extent are professional development activities providing participants with methods for transferring new knowledge and skills to the classroom?

- i. 75% of direct training participants, responding to a follow-up survey, will report that the professional development program provided useful methods for transferring new knowledge and skills to the classroom (e.g., lesson plans or materials). **Source: Follow-up survey question #F8e.**

**Objective 2: INCREASE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT TO APPROPRIATE TARGETED POPULATIONS.**

**Indicator a.** To what extent do teachers and teacher candidates from historically underrepresented groups utilize professional development activities?

- i. By 1999, the proportion of teachers from gender or ethnic minorities that participate in the professional development programs will exceed their proportion in the state teaching population (The minority group is defined for each activity based on the subject area and school level. e.g., in elementary levels male teachers are in the minority, while females are in the minority in the math and science high school teaching population). **Source: Preliminary survey questions #P5 and #P6 compared with state figures.**

**Indicator b.** To what extent do teachers and teacher candidates who work with (or intend to work with) students from historically underrepresented groups utilize professional development activities?

- i. By 1999, participants from schools with high-poverty student populations will participate in the professional development program at rates comparable to or higher than the rates for teachers in other schools. **Source: Preliminary survey question #P4 compared with state figures.**

**Objective 3: STRENGTHEN CAPACITY OF THE TEACHING WORKFORCE.**

**Indicator a.** To what extent do teachers and teacher candidates who participate in professional development activities acquire new knowledge and teaching skills in mathematics, science, technology, and other core academic subjects?

- i. By 1998, 100% of direct training professional development programs will provide follow-up evidence that their participants acquired new knowledge or skills. **Source: Preliminary and follow-up survey questions #F9, #P8/F12 and #P9/F13.**
- ii. 75% of direct training participants, responding to a follow-up survey, will report that their teaching capacity is improved (e.g., increased confidence in their skills, effectiveness and interest). **Source: Preliminary and follow-up survey questions #P8/F12(a-c).**



**Indicator b.** To what extent do teachers and teacher candidates who participate in professional development activities enhance their interest in and capacity for networking?

- i. Beginning in 1999, the number of teachers and administrators involved in networking activities will increase by 2% annually. **Source: Reports of participant counts. Baseline year is 1998.**
- ii. 20% of direct training professional development participants will report on a follow-up survey that they have enhanced their interest and capacity for networking (e.g., joined a professional association or attended a professional association conference, maintained contact with other participants, and/or established a network). **Source: Follow-up survey questions #F10(a-d) and #P8/F12d.**
- iii. 40% of direct training participants will report that they shared new knowledge and skills with their colleagues. **Source: Follow-up survey questions #F10f and #F10g.**
- iv. 10% of networking activity participants attended the meetings on the recommendation of a colleague who had attended prior meeting. **Source: Preliminary survey question #P7.**
- v. Where applicable, 25% of direct training professional development program participants, responding to a follow-up survey, will report that they have or would recommend this program to their colleagues. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F10e.**

**Objective 4: STRENGTHEN CLASSROOM PRACTICES OF TEACHERS.**

**Indicator a.** To what extent do teachers who participate in professional development activities use classroom techniques that reflect best practices?

- i. By 1998, 75% of direct training professional development participants responding to a follow-up survey will report that they applied their new knowledge or skills to their classrooms. **Source: Preliminary and follow-up survey questions #F9d and #P9/F13.**



**Objective 5: INCREASE STUDENTS' LEVEL OF INTEREST AND ACHIEVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS, SCIENCE, AND OTHER CORE ACADEMIC SUBJECTS.**

**Indicator a.** To what extent are students becoming more interested and involved in mathematics, science, technology, and other core academic subject areas?

- i. 20% of direct training professional development participants, responding to a follow-up survey, will report that, as a result of their participation in the program, their students are more attentive and involved in classroom activities. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F11a.**

**Indicator b.** To what extent are students improving their academic achievement in mathematics, science, technology, and other core academic subject areas?

- i. 20% of direct training professional development program participants, responding to a follow-up survey, will report that, as a result of their participation in the program, the quality of their students' work is noticeably improved. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F11b.**
- ii. 10% of direct training professional development program participants, responding to a follow-up survey, will report that, as a result of their participation in the program, their students' scores on statewide student assessments have improved. **Source: Follow-up survey question #F11c.**

**Objective 6: ENHANCE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY OF SCHOOLS TO SUSTAIN A COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS.**

**Indicator a.** To what extent are schools engaging teachers and staff in ongoing professional development?

- i. By 1998, at least 50% of the funded projects will include participants other than teaching faculty (including principals, administrators, and policymakers). **Source: Preliminary survey question #P1.**

**Indicator b.** To what extent are schools increasing the cadres of experienced teacher educators and role models available for professional development?

- i. At least 10% of professional development programs will be developed and/or implemented in cooperation with 'Kentucky Department of Education Distinguished Educators'. **Source: Proposals.**

**Objective 7: STRENGTHEN COORDINATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND MANAGEMENT OF EISENHOWER-ASSISTED PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.**

**Indicator a.** To what extent are stakeholders involved in the development and monitoring of professional development programs and activities?

- i. 100% of funded projects were planned with the assistance of teachers and administrators from the LEAs and schools to be served. **Source: Proposals.**

**Indicator b.** To what extent are policies and practices of professional development programs and activities integrated with other professional development and reform efforts?

- i. 100% of funded projects will be aligned with professional development priorities of the Kentucky Department of Education and/or systemic reform initiatives in the state (NSF). **Source: Review of proposals.**

**Indicator c.** To what extent do professional development programs and activities conduct needs assessments and outline priority plans that address the professional development needs of teachers and other school personnel?

- i. By 1998, 100% of funded proposals will provide evidence that they are addressing the specific needs of school(s) and/or LEA(s) as identified in local action plans. [Note: This is the same as indicator 1aiii] **Source: Components of LEA/School action plans that are enclosed in proposals.**

**Indicator d.** To what extent is the availability of professional development being increased

- i. At least 5% of all funded proposals will provide outreach to multiple schools and districts or provide a mechanism for sharing their techniques with other regions of the state. **Source: Proposals.**

**Indicator e.** To what extent are program data being collected and used to strengthen programs and activities?

- i. 100% of funded projects will submit a final program report. **Source: Final program reports.**
- ii. Grantees will provide evidence that they conducted post-activity surveys on at least 25% of their direct training professional development participants. **Source: Final program reports.**



## **DEFINITIONS**

### **1. Categories Of Professional Development Activities**

Grantee Eisenhower Higher Education Professional Development Programs can be categorized using one or more of the following categories.

**Direct training** (e.g., workshops that provide professional development on specific knowledge and skills)

**Networking** (e.g., capacity building projects that facilitate professional networking)

**Indirect training** (e.g., developing, modeling, and disseminating professional development plans and policies)

### **2. Activity**

A distinct event or integrated set of events in the grantee's program. If a grantee provides several different courses for professional development (e.g., technology, content, and hands-on teaching) to different sets of participants, each of these courses would be considered to be a distinct activity.

### **3. Evidence**

Findings that the professional development is aligned with standards or has the impact described. The strongest evidence of impact would be improved student test scores linked to grantee activities. Also important are changes in teachers' knowledge and skills and changes in their actual classroom instruction because of participation in grantee activities, as observed by evaluators or by the teachers themselves. **Note it is important to show the linkage between the professional development provided by the grantee and changes in teachers' knowledge and skills, classroom instruction and student achievement.**

### **4. School Staff (other)**

Staff includes anyone, other than teachers and administrators, who plays a role in assisting teachers, administrators, and students in the school. (e.g., teachers' assistants and aides, office staff, librarians, media and computer specialists, and guidance counselors.)



APPENDIX C

CPE Evaluation Questionnaires

**KENTUCKY COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION**

---

**EISENHOWER HIGHER EDUCATION  
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR SYSTEM**

**Questionnaires for Professional  
Development Participants  
And Administrators**

May 6, 1997

---

*Prepared With the Assistance of Westat, Inc.*



# Preliminary Survey

## For Assessing The Effectiveness Of Kentucky Council On Higher Education Eisenhower Professional Development Activities

### Participant Survey

#### PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

P1. What is your current position? (Check all that apply)

- Teacher
- Preservice teacher candidate
- Teacher aide or assistant
- Other school staff
- School or district administrator/supervisor
- State level administrator/supervisor
- Policymaker
- Other (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

P2. What level best describes where you are currently working or preparing to teach? (Check one)

- Early childhood
- Primary
- Intermediate
- Middle School
- High School

**IF YOU ARE NOT A TEACHER, PRESERVICE TEACHER CANDIDATE, OR TEACHER AIDE OR ASSISTANT, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION P4.**

P3. Select the response that best describes the main subject area you are currently teaching or preparing to teach? (Check one)

- Self-contained class (responsible for teaching all or most academic subjects to one class)
- Math only
- Science only
- Math and science only
- History/geography/social studies/civics only
- English/language arts only
- Other or multi-subject combinations (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

P4. Approximately what percentage of the students in your school is eligible for free or reduced-price lunches? (Check one)

- None
- Less than 10%
- 10-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- More than 75%
- Don't know
- Not Applicable (e.g., I am not currently teaching)

P5. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

P6. Which of the following categories best describes the way you define your racial/ethnic background? (Check one)

- White, non-Hispanic
- Black, non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Other, not indicated above

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INVOLVEMENT**

P7. Which of the following influenced you to become involved in this particular professional development program? (Check all that apply)

- Applied on my own initiative
- Participation was required by school district
- School district provided incentives to participate
- Invited to participate by provider
- School staff agreed that the program was needed
- Invited/encourage to attend by a former participant
- Other reason (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)



P8. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

(Circle one on each line)

	Strongly Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree
a. I have a good understanding of fundamental core content in my discipline.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. I believe I am an effective teacher.....	1	2	3	4	5
c. I am excited about teaching in my subject area.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. I am interested in networking with teachers and other professionals.....	1	2	3	4	5





## Follow-up Survey

### For Assessing The Effectiveness Of Kentucky Council On Postsecondary Education Eisenhower Professional Development Activities

#### Participant Survey

#### PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

F1. What is your current position? (Check all that apply)

- Teacher
- Preservice teacher candidate
- Teacher aide or assistant
- Other school staff
- School or district administrator/supervisor
- State level administrator/supervisor
- Policymaker
- Other (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

F2. What level best describes where you are currently working or preparing to teach? (Check one)

- Early childhood
- Primary
- Intermediate
- Middle School
- High School

If you are not a teacher, preservice teacher candidate, or teacher aide or assistant, please skip to question F4.

F3. Select the response that best describes the main subject area you are currently teaching or preparing to teach? (Check one)

- Self-contained class (responsible for teaching all or most academic subjects to one class)
- Math only
- Science only
- Math and science only
- History/geography/social studies/civics only
- English/language arts only
- Other or multi-subject combinations (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

F4. Approximately what percentage of the students in your school is eligible for free or reduced-price lunches? (Check one)

- None
- Less than 10%
- 10-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- More than 75%
- Don't know
- Not Applicable (e.g., I am not currently teaching)

F5. What is your gender?

Female

Male

F6. Which of the following categories best describes the way you define your racial/ethnic background?

White, non-Hispanic

Black, non-Hispanic

Hispanic

Asian/Pacific Islander

American Indian/Alaskan Native

other, not indicated above



**THIS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

Please describe this Eisenhower Higher Education professional development program by responding to the following items.

F7. Did you receive any of the following types of credit after participating in this program: (Check all that apply).

- Graduate credit
- Undergraduate credit
- Credit toward salary increase
- Credit toward continuing education
- Credit toward certification
- Other (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- No credit given

F8. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about the quality of this professional development program?

(Circle one on each line)

	Strongly agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly disagree
a. The professional development addressed my most pressing professional needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructional techniques used during the professional development were appropriate for reaching the intended objectives.....	1	2	3	4	5
c. The professional development provided ample time to achieve the stated objectives.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. The professional development provided adequate follow-up.....	1	2	3	4	5
e. The professional development provided useful methods for transferring new knowledge and skills to the classroom (e.g., lesson plans or materials).....	1	2	3	4	5



F9. To what extent did you agree with each of the following as a result of this professional development?

(Circle one on each line)

As a result of the professional development...		Strongly Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree
a.	I learned new concepts, facts, and definitions.....	1	2	3	4	5
b.	I learned new instructional approaches...	1	2	3	4	5
c.	I learned about alternative forms of assessment such as portfolios, hands-on performance, and observation.....	1	2	3	4	5
d.	I participated in hands-on activities that I now use in my own classroom.....	1	2	3	4	5

F10. Do you agree with each of the following statements about impact the program had on you?

As a result of the professional development...

(Circle one on each line)

a.	I have maintained contact with other participants from the professional development.....	Yes	No	NA
b.	The program led to the establishment of a professional network among participants.....	Yes	No	NA
c.	I have joined a regional, state, or national professional organization.....	Yes	No	NA
d.	I have attended a professional association conference.....	Yes	No	NA
e.	I have or would recommend this professional development program to other teachers.....	Yes	No	NA
f.	I have shared what I learned with colleagues through <b>informal</b> interactions.....	Yes	No	NA
g.	I shared what I learned with colleagues through <b>formal</b> interactions.....	Yes	No	NA

F11. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about impact of the program on your students?

(Circle one on each line)

<b>As a result of my participation in the professional development program...</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>		<b>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</b>		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	
a. My students are more attentive and involved in classroom activities.....	1	2	3	4	5	
b. The quality of student work is noticeably improved.....	1	2	3	4	5	
c. Student scores on statewide student assessments have improved.....	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

F12. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about the professional impacts of the program?

(Circle one on each line)

<b>As a result of my participation in the professional development program...</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>		<b>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</b>		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
a. I have a good understanding of fundamental core content in my discipline.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. I believe I am an effective teacher...	1	2	3	4	5
c. I am excited about teaching in my subject area.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. I am interested in networking with teachers and other professionals.....	1	2	3	4	5





# Final Program Report

## Summary Report Of Kentucky Council On Postsecondary Education Eisenhower Professional Development Activities

### Administrator Survey

#### Participation

A 1. Use questions P1 and F1 to provide the following descriptions of your participants.

Provide the number of participants in the SAHE grantee activities by each of the following positions: (List only under the category that is the participant's primary function.) Also include a count of the participants that responded to the follow-up survey.

Include information ONLY about participants who are educators or education policy decision-makers. Do NOT include students, parents, or community members. Also, you do not have to include information about participants for whom counts may be impossible to determine, such as people who only received materials through Eisenhower support.

	P1 Total # of Participants	F1 Total # of Participants
a) Teachers	_____	_____
b) Preservice teacher candidates	_____	_____
c) Teacher aides and assistants	_____	_____
d) Other school staff*	_____	_____
e) School and district administrators/supervisors	_____	_____
f) State level administrators/supervisors	_____	_____
g) Policymakers	_____	_____
h) Other (Specify _____)	_____	_____
i) <b>Total</b>	_____	_____

A 2. Use questions P2 and F2 to provide the following descriptions of your participants.

	P2 Total # of Participants	F2 Total # of Participants
(Duplicated Count)		
a. Early Childhood	_____	_____
b. Primary	_____	_____
c. Intermediate	_____	_____
d. Middle School	_____	_____
e. High School	_____	_____

A 3. Use questions P3 and F3 to provide the following descriptions of your participants.

Select the response that best describes the main subject area you are currently teaching?	P3 Total # of Participants	F3 Total # of Participants
a. Self-contained class (responsible for teaching all or most academic subjects to one class)	_____	_____
b. Math only	_____	_____
c. Science only	_____	_____
d. Math and science only	_____	_____
e. History/geography/social studies/civics only	_____	_____
f. English/language arts only	_____	_____
g. Other or multi-subject combinations (Specify _____)	_____	_____

A 4. Use questions P4 and F4 to provide the following descriptions of your participants.

Approximate percentage of students in your school eligible for free or reduced-price lunches?	P4 Total # of Participants	F4 Total # of Participants
a. None	_____	_____
b. Less than 10%	_____	_____
c. 10-25%	_____	_____
d. 26-50%	_____	_____
e. 51-75%	_____	_____
f. More than 75%	_____	_____
g. Don't know	_____	_____
h. Not Applicable (e.g., pre-service teachers)	_____	_____

A 5. Use questions P5 and F5 to provide the following descriptions of your participants.

What is your gender?	P5 Total # of Participants	F5 Total # of Participants
a. Female	_____	_____
b. Male	_____	_____

A 6. Use questions P6 and F6 to provide the participations\* in your program for each of the following categories: (Unduplicated count)

	P6 Total # of Participants	F6 Total # of Participants
a) White, non-Hispanic	_____	_____
b) Black, non-Hispanic	_____	_____
c) Hispanic	_____	_____
d) Asian/Pacific Islander	_____	_____
e) American Indian/Alaskan Native	_____	_____
f) Other, not indicated above	_____	_____
g) Total (Should equal C-2 total)	_____	_____

A 7. Use questions P7 to provide the following information about your participants.

Why did you become involved in this particular professional development program?	Total # of Participants
a) Applied on my own initiative	_____
b) Participation was required by school district	_____
c) School district provided incentives to participate	_____
d) Invited to participate by provider	_____
e) School staff agreed that the program was needed	_____
f) Invited/encourage to attend by a former participant	_____
g) Other reason ( <i>Specify</i> _____)	_____

A 8.. Use questions F7 to provide the following descriptions of your participants.

Provide the number of participations\* in your program receiving each of the following types of credit after participating in the program: (List all types of credit received. This will be a duplicated count.)

	Follow-up Survey # of Participants
a) Graduate credit	_____
b) Undergraduate credit	_____
c) Credit toward salary increase	_____
d) Credit toward continuing education	_____
e) Credit toward certification	_____
f) No credit given	_____
g) Other ( <i>Specify</i> _____)	_____



A 9. Use questions F8 to provide the following information about your participants.

		Number Circling Each Response				
To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about the quality of this professional development program?		Strongly agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Strongly disagree
		1	2	3	4	5
a.	The professional development addressed my most pressing professional needs.					
b.	The instructional techniques used during the professional development were appropriate for reaching its intended objectives.					
c.	The professional development provided ample time to achieve its stated objectives.					
d.	The professional development provided adequate follow-up.					
e.	The professional development provided useful methods for transferring new knowledge and skills to the classroom (e.g., lesson plans and materials).					

A 10. Use questions F9 to provide the following information.

		Number Circling Each Response				
To what extent did you agree with each of the following as a result of this professional development?		Great extent				Not at all
		1	2	3	4	5
a.	I learned new concepts, facts, and definitions.					
b.	I learned new instructional approaches.					
c.	I learned about alternative forms of assessment such as portfolios, hands-on performance, and observation.					
d.	I participated in hands-on activities that I now use in my own classroom.					

A 11. Use questions F10 to provide the following information.  
*Do you agree with each of the following statements about impact the program had on you?*

		Number Circling Each Response		
As a result of the professional development.		Yes	No	NA
a.	I have maintained contact with other participants from the professional development.			
b.	The program led to the establishment of a professional network among participants.			
c.	I have joined a regional, state, or national professional organization			
d.	I have attended a professional association conference.			
e.	I have or would recommend this professional development program to other teachers.			
f.	I have shared what I learned with colleagues through informal interactions.			
g.	I shared what I learned with colleagues through formal interactions.			

A 12. Use questions F11 to provide the following information.

	To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about impact of the program on your students?	Number Circling Each Response					
		Strongly Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<b>As a result of my participation in the professional development program.</b>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
a.	My students are more attentive and involved in classroom activities.						
b.	The quality of student work is noticeably improved.						
c.	Student scores on statewide student assessments have improved.						

A 13. Use questions P8 and F12 to provide the following information.

	To what extent do you agree with each of the following	Number Circling Each Response				
		Strongly Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree
		1	2	3	4	5
a.	I have a good understanding of fundamental core content in my discipline.					
	Preliminary					
	Follow-up					
b.	I believe I am an effective teacher.					
	Preliminary					
	Follow-up					
c.	I am excited about teaching in my subject area.					
	Preliminary					
	Follow-up					
d.	I am interested in networking with teachers and other professionals.					
	Preliminary					
	Follow-up					



A 14. Use questions P9 and F13 to provide the following information.

<b>Pair A</b>					
	Classroom interaction consists of teacher-led lecture with limited response from students			Classroom interaction involves a dialogue among teacher and students	
	1	2	3	4	5
Preliminary Responses					
Follow-up Responses					

<b>Pair B</b>					
	Students generally work in groups cooperatively			Students generally work independently	
	1	2	3	4	5
Preliminary Responses					
Follow-up Responses					

<b>Pair C</b>					
	Instruction focuses on the central ideas of a discipline, covering fewer topics in depth			Instruction emphasize broad coverage of information with little depth	
	1	2	3	4	5
Preliminary Responses					
Follow-up Responses					

<b>Pair D</b>					
	Student role is to receive/recite factual information or employ rules and algorithms through repetitive routines			Student role is to manipulate information and ideas in ways that transform their meaning and implications	
	1	2	3	4	5
Preliminary Responses					
Follow-up Responses					

<b>Pair E</b>					
	<b>Students generally learn concepts and processes using hands-on approaches</b>			<b>Students generally learn concepts and processes through readings, lectures, and demonstrations</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Preliminary Responses</b>					
<b>Follow-up Responses</b>					

<b>Pair F</b>					
	<b>I am generally successful in encouraging effort and participation among all students</b>			<b>I find it difficult to encourage the efforts and contributions of certain students or groups of students</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Preliminary Responses</b>					
<b>Follow-up Responses</b>					

<b>Pair G</b>					
	<b>I generally assess students' progress using conventional methods (e.g., paper and pencil tests such as multiple choice, fill-in-the-blank, true/false)</b>			<b>I generally assess students' progress using alternative methods (e.g., open-response questions, hands-on performance, portfolios, observation)</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Preliminary Responses</b>					
<b>Follow-up Responses</b>					

## ACTIVITIES

A 15. Circle the letter of the one activity below that best describes the major focus of your Eisenhower Higher Education Professional Development Program.

- a) **Recruiting** potential teachers and administrators into preservice professional development
- b) **Preservice** professional development programs for teacher candidates
- c) **Inservice** professional development for teachers to improve their skills and knowledge (including specialization in a new discipline)
- d) Professional development for **school administrators and other school staff\***
- e) **Other or combination** (e.g., creating networks and supporting certification efforts)

A 16.. Circle the letter of the one subject area below that best describes the major focus of your Eisenhower Higher Education Professional Development Program.

- a) Mathematics
- b) Science
- c) English (Reading/Language Arts)
- d) Civics and Government
- e) Foreign Languages
- f) Arts
- g) Geography
- h) History
- i) Economics

Integrated subjects (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

- k) Not focused on a specific subject



A 17. Because of the importance of sustained and intensive professional development the U. S. Department of Education is tracking the duration of Eisenhower activities. Please circle the letter of the one category below that best describes the number of contact hours per participant, including follow-up, for your professional development program.

- a) Less than 3 hours
- c) 7-18 hours
- d) 19-30 hours
- e) 31-40 hours
- f) 41-80 hours
- g) More than 80 hours

**ADMINISTRATION**

A 18. Which of the following programs, agencies, and organizations provided additional or joint funding for grantee activities\*? (Circle the letters of all that apply)

- a) U.S. Department of Education (ED)
  - 1) Eisenhower SEA funds
  - 2) Title I
  - 3) Goals 2000
  - 4) Other ED program funds (Specify Program \_\_\_\_\_)
- b) National Science Foundation (Specify Program \_\_\_\_\_)
- c) Other Federal funds (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- d) Other State funds (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- e) Higher Education funds
- f) Local public funds
- g) Local private funds including business funds
- h) Foundations/Non-profit organizations
- i) Other funds (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

A 19. Other than Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education personnel, who was involved in planning and/or administering your Eisenhower program? (Circle all that apply)

- a) State Education Agency (SEA) personnel
- b) Other State personnel
- c) District administrators
- d) School administrators
- e) Teachers
- f) Other school staff\*
- g) University faculty and staff
- h) Parents
- i) Other (Specify \_\_\_\_\_)

A 20. How many local school districts are involved in the planning and/or as participants in your professional development activity(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Please list the names of the local school districts.

---

---

---

---

---

---

A 21. Was the professional development: (check one)

- \_\_\_ A stand-alone activity?
- \_\_\_ Part of an ongoing series of activities throughout the school year?
- \_\_\_ Part of an ongoing multi-year series of activities?

**APPENDIX D**

**Local School District Eisenhower Allotments**



**APPENDIX E**

**DISTINGUISHED EDUCATORS AND SCHOOLS SERVED**

**1997/98 AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET**

---

**Recommendation:**

That the Council adopt a preliminary 1997/98 continuation agency operating budget consistent with action by the 1996 General Assembly and create a reserve for any new funds appropriated to the agency operating budget by the General Assembly during the 1997 Extraordinary Session.

**Rationale:**

- The attached agency budget is consistent with action taken by the 1996 General Assembly and creates a reserve for agency operating funds appropriated by the General Assembly during the 1997 Extraordinary Session.
- This action does not include pass-through programs and trust funds appropriated to the Council. This action affects only the agency's operating budget.
- The 1996/98 Appropriations Bill (House Bill 379) with accompanying language in the Budget Memorandum and as set forth in the *1996/98 Budget of the Commonwealth* provides parameters for the internal operating budget.
- Traditionally, the agency operating budget is presented to the Council for approval. Because of the transition to the new organization it is important for the interim Council to be on record as supporting only a continuation budget for the 1996 Regular Session appropriation and as supporting the creation of a reserve for all new funds appropriated in support of agency operations during the 1997 Extraordinary Session.
- The 1997/98 agency operating budget is again displayed and controlled under a single appropriation unit. The change to a single control unit was initiated in 1996/97 to simplify budgeting and accounting decisions.
- The budget includes sufficient funds for a 5 percent annual salary increment and for a 3 percent operating expense adjustment consistent with the treatment afforded other state agencies.

**Background:**

The parameters of the agency operating budget are set by the General Assembly through the Appropriations Bill. The budget presented here is consistent with legislative action.

Additional operating funds were appropriated by the General Assembly during the 1997 Extraordinary Session. These funds are reported here to give the Council a full report on legislative appropriations, but it is recommended that the new funds provided during the 1997 Extraordinary Session be put into a reserve to await action by the new Council on Postsecondary Education.



**Council on Postsecondary Education  
Preliminary 1997/98 Continuation  
Agency Operating Budget  
Fiscal 1997/98**

	<b>Budgeted 1996/97</b>	<b>Budgeted 1997/98</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
<b>SOURCE OF FUNDS</b>			
General Fund			
1996/98 Regular Appropriation	\$3,056,000	\$3,276,100	7.2 %
1997 Extraordinary Session	0	647,900	N/A
Agency Receipts	0	0	N/A
Federal	4,137,200	3,984,600	(3.7)
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,193,200</b>	<b>7,908,600</b>	<b>9.9</b>
<b>USES OF FUNDS</b>			
General Fund Support Programs			
Agency Operations by Object of Expenditure			
Personnel Costs	2,272,400	2,405,000	5.8
Operating Expenses	584,200	601,700	3.0
Capital Outlay	54,400	54,400	0.0
Budget Reserve – 1997 Extraordinary Session	0	647,900	N/A
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2,911,000</b>	<b>3,709,000</b>	<b>27.4</b>
 Ky Community Service Commission	 145,000	 215,000	 48.3
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>145,000</b>	<b>215,000</b>	<b>48.3</b>
 <b>General Fund Subtotal</b>	 <b>3,056,000</b>	 <b>3,924,000</b>	 <b>28.4</b>
Federal Programs			
Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Educ. Act	1,207,200	1,044,600	(13.5)
Community Service Commission	2,930,000	2,940,000	0.3
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4,137,200</b>	<b>3,984,600</b>	<b>(3.7)</b>
 <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	 <b>\$7,193,200</b>	 <b>\$7,908,600</b>	 <b>9.9 %</b>



**BIENNIAL BUDGET PROCESS**

---

**Information:**

The enactment of House Bill 1 during the May Special Session of the General Assembly will result in a 1998/2000 biennial funding recommendation process for postsecondary education much different than has existed in previous biennia. Council staff discussed a potential biennial budget process for postsecondary education with the Governor's Office for Policy and Management (GOPM), and Ron Carson, Deputy State Budget Director, has written a memorandum to State Budget Director Jim Ramsey outlining that potential process. A copy of that memorandum is attached. Also attached is a copy of correspondence transmitting this memorandum to the university presidents.

Following is a summary of the most significant points of this revised biennial budget process for postsecondary education.

- Institutions will not submit biennial budget requests to the Council on September 1, 1997.
- The previous funding formula no longer exists in statute and will not be used in making the 1998/2000 funding recommendation.
- The General Fund Budget Outlook presented during the Special Session anticipates providing a current services (i.e., inflation-related) operating funds increase of slightly less than 3 percent each year of the biennium for universities, the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) (including community colleges and postsecondary technical schools), the Council, and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority (KHEAA).
- There will be approximately \$47 million in 1998/99 and \$77 million in 1999/2000 for the Strategic Investment and Incentive Trust Funds established by HB 1.
- The focus of the Council's biennial operating funding recommendation should be on the allocation of available funds each year among the six trust funds as well as on development of eligibility criteria (including required matching funds and/or funds reallocation) for each trust fund.
- The Council's funding recommendations must be forwarded to the Governor and General Assembly by November 15, 1997.
- The Council's performance funding system has been replaced by the Strategic Investment and Incentive Funding Program. Selected performance funding indicators could and should be incorporated into the revised accountability program.



- All postsecondary education entities will be required to complete the biennial branch budget request forms as adopted by the Legislative Research Commission (LRC) based on the Council's biennial funding recommendations.
- 1998/2000 tuition rates must be established by the Council for universities, community colleges, and postsecondary technical schools.
- Although the 1998/2000 biennial capital projects request for community colleges has already been presented by the University of Kentucky and the 1998/2000 biennial capital projects request for postsecondary technical schools will be presented by the Workforce Development Cabinet, the Council will seek advice from KCTCS on these biennial capital projects requests prior to action by the Council. (The transition to the new KCTCS structure and responsibility will be completed prior to the Council's next, i.e., 2000/02, biennial budget recommendation process.)

Council staff will continue to work with GOPM, LRC, and the institutions to refine and further clarify as necessary the 1998/2000 biennial budget process.




KENTUCKY COUNCIL  
ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Gary S. Cox  
Executive Director

## MEMORANDUM

TO: University Presidents  
Ben Carr  
Sandy Gubser

FROM: Gary S. Cox 

DATE: July 7, 1997

SUBJECT: 1998-2000 Biennial Budget Development  
Process for Postsecondary Education

Attached is a memo from Ron Carson to Jim Ramsey outlining the 1998-2000 biennial budget development process for postsecondary education. Some of you may have seen an unsigned draft of this memo. This final signed version of the memo reflects some changes made by GOPM to the original draft.

Please call Ken Walker, GOPM staff, or me if you have any questions or comments.

cc: Jim Ramsey  
Ron Carson  
Ken Walker



*Governor's Office for Policy and Management*

284 Capitol Annex, 702 Capitol Avenue  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

**Paul E. Patton**  
Governor

(502) 564-7300  
FAX: (502) 564-6684  
Internet: contact@msmail.state.ky.us

**James R. Ramsey**  
State Budget Director

TO: James R. Ramsey, Chairman  
KCTCS Statewide Transition Team

FROM: Ron Carson, Chair  
Budget Process Group *Ron Carson*

DATE: June 27, 1997

SUBJECT: Draft 1998-2000 Biennial Budget Development  
Process for Postsecondary Education\*

The enactment of House Bill 1 from the May Special Session of the General Assembly will likely result in a 1998-2000 biennial funding recommendation process for postsecondary education much different than has existed in previous biennia. The following represents some preliminary thinking regarding the upcoming budget cycle and the relationships within that cycle between and among KCTCS, CPE and the broader statewide budget process from the perspective of the Governor and the General Assembly.

### **Operating Funding Recommendation**

Historically, the biennial budget process for higher education was initiated by the Council on Higher Education's (CHE's) approval of biennial budget request guidelines designed to result in a request made to CHE by each university and the community college system. Since the early 1980s, a funding formula calculation has been the central feature of these request guidelines. The institutions, working with Council staff, would complete the formula calculation and would then use those results in their biennial requests submitted to CHE on or about September 1. CHE would then use this information in developing its biennial funding recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly by November 15. As a result of the recent Special Session, however, in my judgment there will be no need for the institutions to submit a biennial budget request to the CPE in the upcoming 1998-2000 budget cycle.

\*This document is an adaptation of an earlier draft originated by Ken Walker of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) staff.



During the Special Session, the State Budget Director, on behalf of Governor Patton, presented a "General Fund Budget Outlook" through fiscal year 2004. At this point, we need to focus only on the next two years of this Budget Outlook, the 1998-2000 biennium, which calls for a 2.9 percent increase in base postsecondary education appropriations in fiscal year 1999 and an additional 2.8 percent increase in base appropriations in fiscal year 2000 above the revised fiscal year 1998 operating base. The Budget Outlook also planned for an additional \$38 million for postsecondary education in fiscal year 1998, \$70 million in fiscal year 1999, and \$100 million in fiscal year 2000. The \$38 million increase was provided by House Bill 4 during the Special Session; \$23 million of that total can be viewed as a recurring base adjustment to the enacted fiscal year 1998 appropriations for universities, community colleges, and CPE (i.e., "the revised base") with the remaining \$15 million available for the Strategic Investment and Incentive Funding Program for universities, community colleges, and postsecondary technical schools.

Thus, from a postsecondary system perspective, the Budget Outlook anticipates providing:

- Slightly less than a 3 percent "current services" increase each fiscal year over the respective bases for universities, KCTCS (including community colleges and postsecondary technical schools), CPE, and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority (KHEAA) (based on a national economic forecast of CPI annual change);
- Approximately \$47 million in Strategic Investment Funds in fiscal year 1999 above the 1998 revised base; and
- Approximately \$77 million in Strategic Investment Funds in fiscal year 2000 above the 1998 revised base.

HB 1 also calls for CPE to adopt a "strategic agenda" to identify specific objectives to implement the long-term goals for postsecondary education as identified in HB 1. The "first cut" at the development of a strategic agenda, i.e., the identification of specific objectives related to long-term goals for the system, needs to occur before July 1, 1998; however, I do not believe that it can or even needs to be developed before November 15, 1997. Given the phased-in implementation schedule envisioned in House Bill 1, the following possible budget development approach for the upcoming biennium results:

- The revised base budget (the fiscal year 1998 original appropriation plus the relevant portion of the \$23 million recurring base adjustments to the fiscal year 1998 appropriations described above) for each university, the community college system, the postsecondary technical schools, CPE, and KHEAA should be maintained and supplemented by a "current services" increase (an inflation-related adjustment) in both fiscal year 1999 and fiscal year 2000.

- The focus of the CPE biennial operating funding recommendation should be on the allocation of the approximately \$47 million in fiscal year 1999 and approximately \$77 million in fiscal year 2000 among the six Strategic Investment and Incentive Trust Funds as well as on the development of eligibility criteria (including required matching funds and/or funds reallocation) for each Trust Fund.
- The CPE must also address and provide for "necessary base adjustments," i.e., normal debt service adjustments on existing bond issues, adjustments in the University of Louisville hospital contract, and approved M&O on new facilities coming on-line during the 1998-2000 biennium.

The following are some additional thoughts on other related issues:

- All postsecondary education entities will be required to complete the biennial branch budget request forms as adopted by LRC based on the CPE biennial funding recommendations.
- CHE's previous funding formula no longer exists in statute. Thus, new funding policies will need to be developed by CPE and those policies should be based on the strategic agenda embodied in House Bill 1. A significant issue in the development of any new funding policies will be the development of an approach for funding the postsecondary technical schools.
- Beginning in the 1998-2000 biennium, the previous CHE performance funding system will be replaced by the new CPE Strategic Investment and Incentive Funding Program per HB 1. Selected performance funding indicators could, and probably should, be incorporated into the revised accountability program; however, previous CHE actions of establishing goals for each performance funding indicator, tying funding to each indicator, and other associated actions, are now moot. The products of this revised accountability system could be used by CPE as background information supporting its funding recommendations, or CPE may want to consider recommending setting aside a portion of the planned base budget increase as an identifiable financial reward for achieving desired accountability results.
- The 1998-2000 biennial tuition rates for the system of postsecondary education, including the postsecondary technical schools, must be established by CPE.

### **Capital Funding**

There are several issues which should be addressed as soon as possible to ensure a timely completion of the postsecondary education capital funding recommendation. We may want to consider advising CPE and KCTCS to use the following general approach.



- KCTCS will need to take action on the 1998-2000 biennial capital projects request for the community college system and the postsecondary technical schools prior to action by CPE.
- CPE will probably want to expand its capital planning contract to include a review of projects for the postsecondary technical schools.
- A conventional capital projects request will probably need to be developed because HB 1 does not envision that the Physical Facilities Trust Fund be the only state-funded capital budget mechanism for postsecondary education.
- It should be recognized that all universities, the University of Kentucky Community College System, and Kentucky Tech/Workforce Development Cabinet have already submitted Six-Year Capital Plans to the Capital Planning Advisory Board under existing capital planning/capital construction law. The practical effect of this is certainly a point for further discussion and potential revision by CPE.

**Possible Postsecondary Education Budget Development Schedule for the 1998-2000 Biennium**

- June 26                      LRC Subcommittee on 1998-2000 Budget Preparation and Submission adopts statewide budget instructions
- July 1                         Deadline for LRC approval of 1998-2000 Budget Guidelines
- July                            Present information item for discussion at CPE meeting (current members)
- July 17-18                    Capital Planning Advisory Board public hearing to review all 1998-2002 capital plans (including individual universities, the University of Kentucky Community College System, and the Kentucky Tech/Workforce Development Cabinet priorities).
- July-August                 Present item for discussion or action at KCTCS and CPE meetings (new members)
- August-September        Present approach to SCOPE



Dr. James Ramsey  
June 27, 1997  
Page 5

- November                   KCTCS and CPE meetings to make biennial funding recommendations
- January 1998               Governor introduces Executive Budget to the 1998 General Assembly

These are some very preliminary thoughts which need to be further refined and discussed with a wider audience.

:jr/23

cc: Dr. Ben Carr  
Ms. Sandy Gubser  
Mr. Ken Walker

**PADUCAH REGIONAL CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE July 21, 1997****Information:**

The initial meeting of the Paducah Regional Center Advisory Committee (RCAC) was held at the Crisp Center Building in Paducah at 9 a.m. (CDT). All members of the RCAC were present. Since this was the initial meeting, Gary Cox prepared the agenda and generally conducted the meeting. Mr. Cox indicated that he would send a copy of the Postsecondary Education Improvement Act (HB 1 as enacted during the 1997 Special Session of the General Assembly) and a summary of the Act to each member of the RCAC.

Mr. Cox distributed agenda materials which had been prepared to provide background on the action by the Council on Higher Education (CHE) which led to the creation of the RCAC by the 1996 General Assembly. He stated that CHE members Jim Miller and David Porter were the prime authors of the Framework as adopted by the CHE in November 1995. The ultimate objective of the Framework is to bring the region together around a common educational agenda. The specific duty assigned to the committee is the submittal of an annual report to the new Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE). Since the Framework was adopted by the CHE, it has been given the force of law in the 1996/98 Appropriations Act.

The Owensboro Citizens Committee concept served as a model for the RCAC, and Mr. Cox suggested that RCAC might wish to invite leaders of the Citizens Committee to meet with them to learn about their success.

Meeting materials also included background information on funding provided by the 1996 General Assembly as well as the 1997 Special Session of the General Assembly for engineering programs to be offered at the Regional Center in Paducah. Mr. Cox indicated that the RCAC should consider advising the CPE on any additional funding needs associated with the engineering programs.

President O'Hara provided a status report on the engineering programs, including the new facility currently under construction. He also indicated the importance of goodwill among all participants (PCC, MuSU, UK, and RCAC) in the Regional Center to ensure proper functioning of the Center.

President Alexander reported that while some issues (e.g., MuSU faculty who will participate in the engineering programs have received UK appointments) have been largely resolved, the issue of determining course content (course descriptions) and course numbers still remains. He asked Mr. Cox to again contact President Wethington concerning transfer of the Crisp Center Building to MuSU prior to the start of the fall 1997 semester. Mr. Cox agreed to contact President Wethington on this matter.

President Alexander also indicated the need for the RCAC to address all educational needs (not just engineering programs) of the region. Dr. Deborah Collins presented the results of a regional needs survey funded by MuSU. Dr. Collins' survey of students indicated the greatest needs for four-year programs to be in the areas of business, preprofessional studies, education, and child development. Her survey further revealed that students pursuing two-year programs were interested in business, marketing, health occupations, technology, and communications. A copy of the report was given to committee members.

The meeting concluded with general discussion among the members. The following points were raised:

- Measures of success for the engineering programs need to be established.
- An increase in the number of engineers in the region will result in a need to produce more engineering technologists and technicians within the region.
- RCAC needs to understand the various missions of MuSU, PCC, and West Ky Tech, along with the role and mission of UK (as specified in the 1995 resolution).
- RCAC needs to discuss the relationship between industry and education within the region.
- CHE should report on its work of mission differentiation among institutions.

The Committee agreed that these issues would be addressed in future meetings. The Committee also agreed that Lee Hicklin, School Director of West Ky Tech, should be added as a member of the Committee and that one of the ten lay members of the Committee should be identified as the third co-chair of the Committee. It was agreed that President Alexander and President O'Hara would select one of the lay members to serve as co-chair and that future meetings would be jointly planned by the three co-chairs.



**GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON  
HIGHER EDUCATION TRUSTEESHIP**

---

**CPE (M)  
July 21, 1997**

**Information:**

The annual Governor's Conference on Higher Education Trusteeship is scheduled for September 21-22, 1997, at the Louisville Marriott East. Plans are being made for this to be a hands-on training workshop for the new CPE members as well as the members of the university boards of regents and trustees. It is anticipated that Governor Patton will attend and will play a major role in the planning of this conference. Registration materials will be mailed in mid-August.

M-2

## LICENSURE REVIEW: SUE BENNETT COLLEGE

CPE (N)  
July 21, 1997

### Information:

Sue Bennett College, located in London, Kentucky, is a private, nonprofit institution licensed by the Council. The college is affiliated with the National Division of General Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church and is considered by them as a "mission project."

In June 1996, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS), the regional accrediting agency for colleges and universities in the south, placed Sue Bennett College on probation for six months. The probation was later extended for another six months. In issuing the probation, SACS cited such deficiencies as a failure to show "sufficient resources and services to support the courses, programs and degrees offered," and inadequate financial resources.

In June 1997, the Commission acted to remove Sue Bennett College from membership of SACS--in effect to remove accreditation. Sue Bennett College filed an appeal with SACS which has the effect of continuing their accreditation under probationary status. Action by SACS on the procedural appeal is anticipated mid-September.

A loss of accreditation will have two immediate and long-term impacts: the institution would no longer qualify to participate in federal and state financial aid programs; and, other institutions would probably refuse to accept transfer of courses from Sue Bennett College. A loss of federal financial aid would reduce access and enrollment and undoubtedly would affect the financial stability of the institution.

Sue Bennett also failed to file annual reports to the Council in 1995 and 1996, specifically failing to provide a statement by an independent certified public accountant confirming that the institution has sufficient financial resources to meet the tuition refund provisions required by the state. The Council has notified Sue Bennett College on several occasions of the need to comply with the reporting guidelines.

### CPE Statutory and Regulatory Responsibilities and Authority in Licensure

KRS 164.945 to 164.947 and 164.992 assign responsibility for the licensure of nonpublic institutions to the Council and also assign specific responsibilities to the president of the Council. The licensure statute has two avowed purposes: (1) to protect bona fide institutions; and, (2) to protect citizens of the Commonwealth from fraudulent practices, unfair competition or substandard educational programs.

Activities performed under the statutes' authority are conducted through an administrative regulation titled *13 KAR 1:020. Private College Licensing*. The administrative regulation provides a framework for initial licensing, license renewals, supplementary applications, annual reports and resolution of consumer complaints.



Two provisions of the administrative regulation have a bearing on the current situation. 13 KAR 1:020, Section 4(2) and (2)(g) and (2)(h) provide:

(2) An application for license renewal, or a supplementary application in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the president, shall be required within thirty (30) days following any of these developments:

(g) Action by an accrediting agency which results in a college being placed in a probationary status for more than one (1) year, or which results in the loss of the college's accreditation; or

(h) Determination by the president that other sufficient cause exists which requires a supplementary application or an application for license renewal.

Section 4(2)(g) requires action only when the probation by the accrediting agency is for more than one year or when accreditation is removed. The action taken by Sue Bennett College to appeal the removal of membership has the effect of continuing their probationary status and results in a period of probation longer than one year. This triggers the thirty-day period in which the president of the Council must initiate a licensing review.

#### *Next Steps*

1. A letter will be sent to Sue Bennett College informing them of their noncompliance with the annual reporting requirements and notifying them that the Council is initiating a license review based on their failure to comply with financial reporting guidelines and their probationary accreditation status.
2. The letter will request that Sue Bennett College notify the Council of steps taken to correct deficiencies cited by SACS and that sufficient funds are available to refund student tuition should the institution close. Provisions for tuition refunds are required by state and federal regulations. This letter also will seek assurances relative to the financial stability and viability of the college.
3. The new president of Sue Bennett College, Dr. James Cheek, has been invited to attend the Council meeting and be available to answer questions. A copy of a letter sent by Sue Bennett College to all students informing them of the college's status is included in this material.
4. Once a response has been received from Sue Bennett College, staff will evaluate the response and then determine whether further action is necessary.

July 17, 1997

Timothy Ballard  
PO Box 81  
Grand Marais, MI 49839-

Dear Timothy:

I am writing to you on behalf of Sue Bennett College to inform you of the recent events concerning our institution. As you may already know, President Bunnell has resigned his position with the College. Dr. Cheek, the Academic Dean, has agreed to serve as President. Everyone is encouraged by his leadership experience and look forward to his tenure.

It has been reported in several newspapers and radio stations that Sue Bennett College is closing. This is not true. I want to confirm that we are in an appeal procedure regarding our accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. I want to assure you that we are an accredited college. We should know of the results of this appeal sometime in August. We are very confident in Dr. Cheek's ability to guide us through this process. All of the faculty and staff of Sue Bennett College are demonstrating a very supportive attitude for each other and the students.

I want to personally thank you for your support because we would not be a college without you the students. I do realize that you may have questions about what you may be reading in the newspapers or hearing on the news, so I have set up a telephone number that you may call directly or collect, between the hours of 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. (noon) Monday - Friday. The number is (606) 864-2660.

Please feel free to call with any questions that you may have regarding the recent events of Sue Bennett College.

Sincerely,

Dean Adams  
Dean of Student Affairs



**Information:**

KRS 164.945 to 164.947 and 164.992 assign responsibility for the licensure of nonpublic institutions to the Council on Postsecondary Education. In June 1994, Mr. C. Chad Perry III of Paintsville, Kentucky, inquired about the Council's licensure requirements for a proposed Southern College of Osteopathic Medicine (SCOM) to be located in Eastern Kentucky to help solve the shortage of primary care physicians. The Council sent the related KRS, administrative regulation *13.KAR 1:020. Private College Licensing*, and the required application packet.

In an effort to satisfy all accreditation requirements, Mr. Perry and his associates were in contact from the beginning with the American Osteopathic Association (AOA), the specialized accrediting agency for osteopathic medicine, and remained in contact with the Council. AOA requires a school to have a state license. To satisfy the Council's licensure requirements, staff was provided copies of correspondence between Mr. Perry and AOA documenting that the college was actively working toward accreditation. Based on this correspondence, in December 1994, the college was licensed to proceed in the development of the proposed Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine program to be offered in Paintsville, Kentucky, upon approval of the AOA. This initial licensure period was effective for one year, during which time Council staff participated in an AOA pre-accreditation site visit.

In November 1995, the Council was notified that discussions were underway for SCOM to merge into Pikeville College to further satisfy accreditation financial and facility requirements, and an AOA merger approval was requested. In December 1995, a one-year license renewal to January 1997 was granted by the Council based on the college's continued efforts to seek accreditation. In June 1996, President Owens of Pikeville College notified the Council that the SCOM had officially become a part of Pikeville College and that the name had changed to Pikeville College School of Osteopathic Medicine. The merger and name change were approved by the AOA, and the school was granted pre-accreditation June 1, 1996, indicating initial registration with AOA.

The licensure implication of this merger is that the Osteopathic Medicine program is now considered a new program of Pikeville College, and licensure of any new program in medicine requires approval of the appropriate accrediting organizations. The college received a substantive change approval from the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in June 1997. AOA approved the school's provisional accreditation on July 11, 1997, which allows the institution to enroll students beginning Fall 1997. The President of Pikeville College has submitted copies of their letters from SACS addressing the substantive change and from the AOA granting provisional accreditation. Based on these approvals, the Council will amend Pikeville College's license to include the Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine (D.O) to be offered by the Pikeville College School of Osteopathic Medicine, Pikeville, Kentucky. Council approval will be contingent on continued AOA approval. The program will be registered in the Council's Independent Program Inventory at CIP 51.1901.



A RESOLUTION commending Governor Patton and the Kentucky General Assembly and encouraging the leadership of postsecondary education in Kentucky to join together in achieving the goals set out in the Kentucky Postsecondary Education Improvement Act of 1997.

WHEREAS, the Kentucky General Assembly convened in Extraordinary Session in May of this year and enacted a sweeping reform of postsecondary education proposed and advocated by Governor Paul Patton; and

WHEREAS, the Kentucky General Assembly appropriated, upon the recommendation of Governor Patton, \$38 million in new funding for Kentucky's system of postsecondary education; and

WHEREAS, prior to the enactment of House Bill 1, Kentucky's system of postsecondary education had suffered from chronic underfunding; and

WHEREAS, House Bill 1 made needed changes in the coordination and governance of postsecondary education; and

WHEREAS, the former Council on Higher Education was a strong advocate for the reforms contained in House Bill 1; and

WHEREAS, House Bill 1 establishes a series of goals for the system of postsecondary education which are to be achieved by the year 2020; and

WHEREAS, Governor Patton has pledged his ongoing support to the enhancement of postsecondary education; and

WHEREAS, the staff of the Council has worked diligently to provide support to Council members and to the Governor during the reform effort;