Baker and Hostetler, LLP

Baker & Hostetler LLP
3200 National City Center • 1900 East 9th Street
Cleveland, OH 44114-3485
Telephone: 216.621.0200 • Fax: 216.696.0740

Kentucky State University

Planning for Renewed Excellence

April 21, 2003

Executive Summary

Purpose and Process

This review of Kentucky State University came about as a result of a confluence of factors affecting the University from the mid-1990s through the first years of this decade: 1) a period of leadership instability; 2) severe fiscal problems partly in consequence of internal error and partly stemming from change in the state funding formula; and 3) conflict between the University and the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) as to how to interpret an agreement between the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the federal government (the Partnership Agreement of 1999) that settled a longstanding federal charge that the state was maintaining vestiges of a segregated system of higher education. An embedded factor in most of these issues was a difference of opinion, affecting essentially all parties including campus administration and faculty, as to what the University's true mission should be.

In order to resolve specific issues and to refocus the University on a clear mission, the University and the CPE issued an RFP in October of 2001 for an external review. The Ohio-based international law firm, Baker and Hostetler (B&H), assembled a team of experts, replied to the RFP, and was selected in November.

Core issues

The Review Team's report begins by identifying three "overarching" issues for special emphasis.

Effective Leadership

The Review Team emphasizes the responsibility of the Board of Regents, the governing body for Kentucky State University, to secure effective leadership and to work closely with the state government and the CPE. The responsibility of the Governor to appoint qualified individuals to the Board is especially noted. In response to the problem of leadership instability, the Review Team recommends that the next president be someone who can maintain continuous and effective leadership *for at least five years*. Finally, the Review Team observes that there is a lack of clear mission for the University and it charges the Board with leading the effort to develop a consensus.

Vision and Mission

A major challenge for the University is that its currently unfocused sense of mission comes from three different sources, that of being: an HBCU, a liberal arts institution, and a land grant university. The Review Team does believe that a synthesis of these into a single viable mission is possible, but it is a fact that many people at KSU appear to believe that these are irreconcilable. Differing interpretations have resulted in a number of problems, including internal conflict, a lack of responsibility in academic departments for the success of students entering college without sufficient preparation, and a sense of autonomy that has the various units sometimes working independently—a serious flaw in a small institution where synergy is a key to success.

The Review Team notes that the lack of a clear mission causes fundamental problems for the university. A particular concern is that, even though constrained resources make it imperative, the University has no method for setting priorities for academic programs. Further, although the University has an extensive fact-based assessment and evaluation system (noted favorably in the most recent regional accreditation report), in many cases complete sets of data are not actually secured or, when available, there is a disinclination to make effective use of information in decision making. Finally, the Review Team stresses that the University has not been entrepreneurial—there are many opportunities in the region, and for external federal and foundation grant funding, that have not been adequately pursued.

Operations

In considering the overarching issues affecting University operations, the Review Team singles out three factors: Incongruity with the CPE budget model; lack of economies of scale; and the need to rightsize the administration. The CPE budget model is a problem for KSU primarily because the "comparable institutions" have much larger enrollments and therefore greater economies of scale. Beyond rectifying this error, the Review Team believes that KSU should itself look carefully at ways to secure greater scale of operations, in part through increased enrollment. Finally, the Review Team suggests that KSU commit to keeping its administrative overhead as lean as possible, in order to focus the highest possible proportion of resources on student success.

Academic Programs

General Issues

The Review Team believes that KSU has some considerable strength in internal collaboration and interdisciplinary education, but that it has not taken the spirit of CPE's "program productivity" guidelines to heart in considering how to create programs that are academically excellent as well as efficient in the use of resources. Consistent with this, the Review Team suggests that the University consider suggestions to reorganize into fewer colleges. A particular opportunity for KSU would be to establish a Visiting Scholars Program that would have special appeal to African-American faculty at other universities who would appreciate the chance to teach at an HBCU.

General Education, Transfer, Developmental Education, First Year Experience

The KSU faculty are rethinking the Liberal Studies/ General Education core curriculum, and final recommendations were not available at the time of the site visit. In any case, the Review Team believes that KSU should reconsider the assessments of achievement that are now employed in this area. Developmental Education will be a principal responsibility of the University as long as it retains an access mission. The Review Team believes, however, that this critical area is not now getting the attention it deserves. KSU should draw on the emerging national models of success in this area to ensure that as many students as possible succeed to graduation. Another way of helping students is through the support of transfer from community colleges. At this point, only a few academic programs at KSU have shown success in building articulation agreements and in securing transfer students. The Review Team believes that KSU must put considerable emphasis on this area.

Arts and Sciences

The University has considerable strengths in this core area, including strong internal collaborations and a record of effective interaction with teacher education. There are, however, some serious problems. There are many vacant positions, excessive use of "overload" appointments, and lack of library, laboratory and other resources. Failure to distinguish priority areas makes it difficult to determine where enhancement funds should go. Weak enrollments in the upper division reveal a fundamental problem—the University first-year-to-graduation "pipeline" is leaky. Faculty seem to believe that this problem can be resolved through enhanced programs, but the Review Team believes that a careful systems analysis, focused on identifying and remedying problems, is essential and must be effected prior to decisions

about enhancement. The Review Team supports the prior recommendation, now being implemented by the University, of better integrating the Whitney Young College with the other programs in Arts and Sciences and also suggests membership in the McNair Scholars Program.

Education and Human Services

The teacher education programs at KSU have been troubled by poor performance on the Praxis II exam, which measures graduates' ability to be effective in the schools. The faculty and administration are actively engaged in a series of measures to improve this situation. The Review Team supports these and recommends that, once improvements are in place, there should be expanded programmatic activity in this area.

The nursing program curriculum has not yet been fully expanded into a baccalaureate level completion program although approval was granted in November 2001 by the Council on Postsecondary Education. The university currently awards the two-year associate degree in nursing. In light of expanded community college participation at the associate degree level, the Review Team supports the recommendation of previous reviewers for KSU to move forward with the establishment of a high quality Bachelor of Science degree--something that is in high demand in the service area, the state, and the nation.

Programs in Social Work, Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Sociology offer opportunities for both residential students and for the service region. Most of these programs appear to be stable and effective, but the Review Team suggests following through on the prior recommendation to discontinue Sociology.

Professional Studies

Computer Science appears to be an area of considerable potential, but the poor ratio of graduates to majors (~1:10) is an urgent concern that is mirrored elsewhere in the University. The Review Team recommends that enhancement be considered only if improvements in the attrition rate are made. Two-year programs in electronics technology and drafting and design technology could become the foundation of a B.S. in Industrial Technology, assuming that this is consistent with the new University mission.

Business and Public Administration

Business is one of the University's major areas of instruction with some fourteen faculty and between 250-300 majors. The Review Team believes that this area has great potential, including opportunities for new program areas, but will need additional investment to attract and retain strong

faculty and to achieve a higher level of accreditation. By contrast, Public Administration might be better served as a track in the Business program rather than a separate degree.

Graduate Programs

The University has a very small presence in graduate education at the moment, with Masters programs in Public Administration and Aquaculture/ Aquatic Sciences, but has the potential for substantial growth in these two programs and to support additional areas, both for residential students and for the service area. Specific areas of potential are the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Education. As the University expands its activities in graduate education, it should adopt the standard practice of a central office that will be responsible for consistency and quality.

Library and Information Technology

A strong and effective Library (including information technology) will be a critical central resource for the University no matter what mission it chooses. The existing Library has many strengths, but will need additional resources if it is to serve the University's drive to renewed excellence. As the University reconsiders its mission, library staff will need to better integrated in planning processes.

Planning, Assessment and Institutional Research

Nationally, the last decade has seen leaders in higher education come to a much greater appreciation of the need for effective planning, assessment and institutional research functions. KSU has much of the needed apparatus in place, but has not developed the habit of making effective use of data. The Review Team recommends a series of organizational, procedural, and philosophical steps for the University to take in this area.

Leadership

The role of the Board of Regents in University success cannot be understated, and the Review Team recommends that the Board itself undertake a process for continuous development. Once a new president has been selected, the Board should lead the process of arriving at a consensus on mission. The Board also needs to be engaged in core activities such as ensuring effective evaluation of the president, senior, and mid-level staff, and in working with the administration and faculty on such core issues as academic program review and general education.

Administrative Organization

The Review Team suggests that the Office of Assessment and Evaluation, the Title III operation, and the Office of Institutional Research be relocated. The Review Team also suggests a new approach to the KSU Foundation and the establishment of an enrollment management function for the University. Finally, as KSU considers dealing with outdated software for administrative operations, the Review Team believes that it should carefully consider outsourcing some or all functions to either the University of Kentucky or the University of Louisville.

Budget

The Review Team recommends that, if its analysis is confirmed by specialists in the student housing field, the Commonwealth find a way to provide the resources needed to renovate Young Hall. In the complicated issue of the Land Grant Appropriations Match, a conflict of opinion needs to be resolved by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Federal Legal Context

The United States Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has confirmed completion of a number of items stipulated in the Partnership Agreement, though some remain unfulfilled, particularly in regard to the teacher education program. The Review Team believes that the OCR conclusion in this area, due this month, should provide an opportunity for the University and the CPE to work together to build a model education program at KSU.

Key Next Steps

The Review Team emphasizes that the imposition of a planning template by outside consultants for the creation and implementation of a new mission is doomed to fail. A successful mission, one that is viable and functional, must be organic. The Review Team does offer a number of suggestions for action, but hopes that they will be taken as a reference, not as a mandate.

Summary

Kentucky State University has a distinguished history. The difficult situation in which it now finds itself is serious, but does not need to be more than transitory. The foundation for a restoration is in place. A coherent planning process for a new mission, coupled with a commitment on the part of all parties to maintain collegial relationships as implementation begins, can quickly bring renewed excellence.

Part 1 Introduction and Background

Background

In late 2002, Kentucky State University (KSU) and the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) jointly issued a Request for Proposals for an external assessment of the University.

The charge as stated by CPE was as follows:

- Review of the scope and diversity of programs and the related instructional functions
- Review of the availability and use of technology and library resources assigned to academic programs
- Review of program assessment tools and their use to assure quality
- Review of the overall resources available to the institution
- Review of the allocation of resources to the academic programs as compared to KSU assigned benchmark institutions and national norms
- Review of need to reallocate resources among programs if necessary
- Report and recommend conclusions about how resources are being used
- Review of other contributing factors that may be interfering with the proper management of the institution and its resources in a manner that best support accomplishing its assigned mission.

The Ohio-based international law firm, Baker and Hostetler (B&H), assembled a team of experts and replied to the RFP. B&H stated that it would provide:

1) An assessment of institutional planning in the context of Kentucky's goals for higher education, including consideration of new programmatic opportunities that may be appropriate in that context;
2) A strategy and accompanying methodology for improving undergraduate education;
3) A strategy and accompanying methodology for improving graduate education;
4) Suggestions on best practices in institutional budget/management including findings and conclusions on how resources are currently being used; and
5) Advice on appropriate actions in the light of federal legal mandates.

The B&H proposal was selected and, before the year was out, its Review Team (see Appendix A for membership and background) was at work reviewing materials provided by KSU and the CPE.

The reasons for the decision of KSU and the CPE to commission an external review are based on a confluence of factors. By most accounts, KSU, founded in 1886, had a very long run of outstanding success as what has become known as an Historically Black College or University (HBCU). According to the U.S. Department of Education web site, "The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, defines an HBCU as an institution established prior to 1964 whose principal mission was, and is, the education of Black Americans..."[1]

KSU stumbled, however, in the mid to late 1990s when it faced something of a "perfect storm" of very serious internal and external challenges. The two most visible of these were the appearance of leadership instability at the University, together with the advent of some severe fiscal problems that occurred in roughly the same time frame. Less remarked by outside observers, but nonetheless very important in creating challenges for the University, was the accelerating shift in enrollment patterns that was reflected in the high proportion of KSU's traditional student clientele choosing to attend other universities.

Also a very important challenge was a new approach to institutional funding established by the CPE. Decisions about how to position KSU with respect to the new funding formula, made by KSU leadership in a time of management crisis, appear to have exacerbated the University's fiscal problems.[2]

A final factor was the execution of a Partnership Agreement between the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the federal government, settling the longstanding federal charge that the state was maintaining vestiges of a segregated system of higher education.[3] The Partnership Agreement should have been an opportunity for KSU to establish an important new relationship with the state. However, in the opinion of the Review Team, the potential for productive implementation of the Partnership Agreement remains to be realized, largely because of the instability in leadership at KSU.

---

[1] http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/idues/title3b.html
[2] The Kentucky Postsecondary Education Improvement Act of 1997 required the Council to implement a new funding system.
[3] For more on the Partnership Agreement, see Appendix B.

The immediate and specific cause for the issuance of the RFP and the selection of the Review Team was KSU's proposal to the CPE for special enhancement funding, based on perceived mandates in the Partnership Agreement, which KSU presented to the CPE in October of 2001. The CPE did not accept—refused to consider—the October 2001 enhancement proposal for two basic reasons. First, the CPE simply noted that the proposal failed to meet state guidelines in that it came far too late for consideration in the budget process then underway. Second, the CPE did not accept KSU's contention that the Partnership Agreement required action on the part of the state beyond a number of enhancements that were already funded or in process.

As a result of their disagreement on the October 2001 enhancement proposal, KSU and the CPE agreed to work together to facilitate an external review, leading to the sequence of events described above. It is important to note that the timetable offered to the Review Team was accelerated at the last minute by a request to accommodate a legislatively mandated review that required input at the end of February 2003. B&H did agree to accelerate its work in order to accommodate the legislative review, although it has proposed, and the CPE and KSU have accepted, that the report appear in two stages: a document in "bullet" format that would be available by March 4, and a complete, full-text version that will be provided some weeks later.

Process

In approaching its task, the Review Team had the benefit of extensive previous study of KSU. Specifically, available documents included an overall management review conducted by the consulting firm MGT in 1994, a comprehensive regional accreditation review conducted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 1997-99, and a comprehensive review of academic programs completed by KSU for CPE in 2000. These reports, together with various more specialized studies and extensive data available on the University and CPE web sites, have greatly facilitated the review.[4] Offsetting the availability of these important data sources is the fact that leadership turnover at KSU has

[4] A discussion of the most important of the documents is provided in Appendix B.

left it with virtually no institutional memory.[5] As a consequence, it has been very difficult for the Review Team to get the "why" of many actions as well as information about follow-up, if any. Of equal concern, in some cases conflicting data have been presented.

The newness of the current University administration, together with the challenges of tripartite communication, caused the delivery of documents to the Review Team to be slower than any of the parties would have liked. Still, team members had access to extensive documentation in time to have numerous internal conversations about the information before the site visit (via conference call and e-mail). The Review Team communicated these to the University and the CPE in the form of follow up questions and suggestions as to whom team members should meet with during the site visit scheduled for February 2-4, 2003.

The site visit provided the opportunity for intensive conversations with University leaders, administrators, faculty, and students, as well as with members of the Board of Regents and CPE staff. The accelerated schedule, with its late February deadline, led to somewhat less on-site time than the Review Team would have liked, and caused it to occur somewhat earlier in the process than would have been preferred. Still, the visit was highly productive, covering nearly all of the ground considered essential by the Review Team. Gaps have been filled with follow-up electronic communications and telephone calls. The Review Team wishes to thank University leaders, especially the Interim President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Vice President for Business and Finance for their gracious hospitality and willingness to accommodate the Review Team's numerous requests for additional information and for changes to the schedule.

A Framing Statement

An important question needs to be addressed at the beginning of the Review Team's report, one that frames many of the suggestions and recommendations that follow—that of responsibility. This question has

[5] "Institutional memory" in this context refers to the presence of people in leadership who understand why actions were taken and the context of follow through, if any. The term is not intended to refer to institutional history. For those interested in this topic, there are a number of histories of KSU that were recommended to the Review Team: Smith, Gerald A., *A Black Educator in the Segregated South, Kentucky Rufus Atwood* (1994), by Gerald A. Smith; *A History of Blacks in Kentucky, 1760-1891 Vol. 1*, by Marion Lucas (1992); *A History of Blacks in Kentucky, 1890-1980, Vol. 2*, by George C. Wright; *Onward and Upward: A Centennial History of Kentucky State University – 1886-1986,* by John A. Hardin (1887); and *Against the Tide, An Oral History of KSU, as told by Ann J. Heartwell-Hunter.*

both a past and a future dimension. In the very controversial situation in which KSU finds itself at the moment, there is considerable emphasis on placing blame. The Review Team will not take a position on this question. B&H said in its response to the RFP that its report would be forward-looking, and the Review Team intends to adhere to that promise. Nevertheless, given the special attention devoted to this issue, the Review Team believes that it will be valuable to offer what we will call a "framing statement," one that speaks not to past blame but to future responsibility.

Responsibility for the future success of KSU must be shared. Recovering from the leadership and related fiscal problems of the recent past must fall under the aegis of the governing authority--the Board of Regents. It is up to the Board to ensure that KSU rebuilds from its problems and that the University is operated at a level of efficiency and effectiveness that is not merely satisfactory, but exemplary. On the other hand, the University's current difficulties do not relieve the Commonwealth of Kentucky of its responsibilities to strive for solutions that ensure that the institution is successful, nor do they relieve the Commonwealth of its obligations under the Partnership Agreement. Finally, as the Board exerts its leadership with the assistance of the CPE and the Commonwealth, it will be important for faculty, alumni, and others in the KSU family to strive for an atmosphere of cooperation and collegial governance.

The document that follows will describe a balance of factors. First, the Review Team will outline how the University—the Board and the new administration that it selects—should: 1) undertake to move quickly and decisively to ensure strong and stable leadership; 2) implement a process that leads to agreement on a *viable* mission and appropriate measures for assessing performance against that mission, and 3) move quickly to structure the operations of the University in a way that assures effective and efficient operation.

Put in even more direct terms, the Review Team believes that the University cannot just ask for more money. First, its leadership will have to demonstrate that it can be tough, decisive, and innovative in setting priorities and effectively implementing them. Simply forwarding enhancement "wish lists" to the Commonwealth and the CPE will not suffice as justification for additional support.

At the same time, the state must recognize that KSU has suffered from historical handicaps and that these make it unusually difficult for the University to compete effectively in a changing higher education environment. The state needs to create an environment—fiscal, regulatory, and collaborative—that provides KSU with the sustenance that will allow strong leadership to succeed.

Part 2 Observations on Overarching Issues

Introduction

The Review Team's overarching comments fall into three major areas:
1) Effective Leadership;
2) Vision and Direction; and
3) Operational and Budget Issues.

Although we have provided a separate section for each, the team cannot stress sufficiently the extent to which these are sequentially interrelated. Thus, an effective budget strategy depends on a vision and direction, and that in turn depends on effective leadership. This may seem obvious, but the fact is that KSU has lost its grasp of the connective thread and must regain it if it is to succeed. This overview section is intended to provide observations and some suggestions, with the latter reinforced and extended in the subsequent sections.

Effective Leadership

The leadership of any public institution of higher learning is the joint product of several entities. In the case of Kentucky State University, the essential components are the President, the Governor of Kentucky, the Board of Regents and, to a lesser extent, the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education. In the judgment of the Review Team, these components will have to work much more collaboratively in order for KSU to overcome its current problems and maximize its service as a comprehensive university in the Kentucky system.

The position of President at KSU has been characterized by instability and a lack of continuity for many years. Since 1978, the institution has had seven changes in the President's office, and five of those have occurred since 1990. In addition, there has been considerable turnover in several other key administrative posts at the University, including the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Business. This turnover has led to a significant loss of institutional memory and discontinuity of important initiatives such as the operation of a comprehensive planning and budgeting system and the implementation of recommendations and

suggestions from previous institutional studies and assessments. For KSU to address its current problems and serve its mission effectively, a competent and committed President must be appointed with appropriate contractual language for maintaining continuous and effective leadership *for at least five years.*

The governing board for KSU is the Board of Regents with eight members appointed by the Governor of Kentucky. The remaining three members are representatives from the faculty, the staff, and the student body, and they are elected by their respective constituencies. The Board of Regents is charged with the normal responsibilities of a governing board including establishment of institutional policies, approval of the institutional budget, the hiring of employees, and the determination of compensation for employees. There is currently a lack of consensus among KSU's various constituencies on the interpretation of the institutional mission statement and the direction for KSU. The Review Team believes that the Board of Regents will need to work closely with the President to guide the institution's constituencies towards the needed consensus. Given the university governance structure in Kentucky, KSU's future will depend directly upon the Board of Regents' selection and hiring of a new President, their adoption of appropriate institutional policies, their establishment of appropriate accountability measures, and their approval of the institution's annual budgets.

Because of the broad and far-reaching responsibilities of the Board of Regents, it is paramount that it be composed of persons who understand how an effective governing board should operate, and are committed to constructively contributing to its work. The University will need, therefore, for the Governor of Kentucky to appoint persons to the KSU Board of Regents who have the requisite knowledge, skills, experience, and commitment. KSU's faculty, students, and staff should endeavor to elect persons with those same characteristics.

The Kentucky Council for Postsecondary Education is the coordinating body for higher education in Kentucky. Among other things, this council sets the guidelines for new degree program development, approves new academic programs, monitors the productivity of existing programs, reviews the budget requests from Kentucky's colleges and universities, and forwards council on postsecondary education approved budgets recommendations to the Governor and Kentucky Legislature. The Review Committee believes that KSU will need to concentrate its scarce resources on its most important existing degree programs that are productive and essential to its mission, and on new programs that will help to increase its enrollment and better serve its multifaceted mission. To accomplish this, KSU will need to have a very good working relationship with the Council for Postsecondary Education.

As with any other organization, Kentucky State University will be successful only to the extent that it benefits from strong, effective leadership. The Review Team believes that this will happen only if the entities identified above collaborate to create and support it. Hence, the Governor must appoint excellent people to serve on the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents must then hire, support, and retain a competent and committed President. The President, in turn, will need to work with the Board to lead the University's various constituencies, including the faculty, staff, students, and alumni, through a process that builds consensus on the "right" interpretation of the KSU mission and the direction that the institution will follow in pursuit of that mission.

Vision and Direction

There appears to be a lack of consensus regarding the focus and operating mission of the University. KSU was founded as an HBCU. However, KSU's ethnicity is rapidly changing in its student body and tenure-earning faculty. At the same time that part of its mission is to be a liberal arts institution, a significant amount of time, effort, and funds are spent on Developmental Education,[6] something that some faculty do not consider to be an appropriate function of liberal arts education. The University also has a land grant mission, another aspect that some consider to be incompatible with liberal arts education. There even seems to be confusion about what it means to be a land grant institution and what the federal and state responsibilities are in funding that.) Either the University does have incompatible missions or the understanding of some of the faculty and others regarding its missions is incomplete.

The tripartite missions of being an HBCU, a liberal arts institution, and a land grant university may appear to be independent of each other. The degree of overlap of these missions depends on how the university implements them. The traditional HBCU mission, while still very real, must evolve in a world where the brightest African-American students are being recruited by all universities, and a third to a half of KSU's student body is white. Similarly, the land-grant mission no longer resembles the "college of agricultural and mechanical arts" envisioned in the original Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862. (The 1890 land grant

[6] 'Developmental Education' in this context refers to work intended for students who either took a course in high school and failed to master it, or for students who did not take needed coursework (many students do not take necessary mathematics or science courses in high school). This level of education is often called simply "remedial, " with the phrase 'developmental' being used for older, returning students who did undertake the required work in high school but whose skills have atrophied.

universities like Kentucky State were to be the "separate but equal" counterparts of the original land grants.) Only vestiges of the original land grant mission remain at Kentucky State, such as the human services programs and extension.

Adding the liberal arts mission to the university makes reconciliation of missions even more difficult, in the minds of many. For example, the land grant movement was a result of direct opposition to the European liberal arts tradition which valued contemplation over practical action. Justin Morrill in 1848 stated that he wanted to "lop off a portion of the studies established centuries ago as the mark of European scholarship and replace the vacancy – if it is a vacancy – by those of a less antique and more practical value."[7] Large universities with ten to twenty times more students than Kentucky State struggle with ways to incorporate both of these seemingly incompatible traditions. It is no wonder that KSU finds it challenging to meld them together in a coherent fashion.

Added to the lack of focus is that different faculty and administrators claim to have been hired with one or two of the missions in mind but not all three. While most recognize that KSU is an HBCU, some complain that their understanding is that they were hired to teach at a traditional liberal arts institution. In their minds at least, that definition does not include such matters as remedial education and applied programs of various kinds. Faculty in the applied, i.e., more vocational, programs don't seem to understand the disconnect; they never assumed it to be a liberal arts institution in the traditional sense. Consequently, either the University does have incompatible missions or the understanding of some of the faculty and others regarding its missions is incomplete. The Review Team, as noted elsewhere, does believe that a synthesis of these missions is both possible and practicable, but creating that will require a sustained, broadly-based effort at explaining each of the components and discussing how they can be connected.

Another area where there seems to be a lack of consensus is in the goals and outcomes of general education, including Developmental Education. It is not clear from the documents provided to the Review Team if there is a broadly based commitment among faculty and administration to the goals and learning outcomes for general education as defined by the committee charged with oversight of the Liberal Studies/General Education curriculum. Further, few assessment procedures have been implemented to determine success or failure of the general education curriculum. At the graduate level, there is no supporting centralized structure for the operation and development of

[7] Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 249

graduate programs. In a critically important academic support unit, the library, there is a disjuncture between the library holdings and the curricular needs of the faculty and students.

Yet another symbol of the lack of a consensus on direction is the fact that the University has operated for years without a facilities master plan tied to academic and student support priorities. Universities with a clear sense of direction know what capital resources will be needed to achieve their goals and they develop and execute appropriate plans to obtain those resources.

Given the lack of a clear and cohesive overall plan, each department and college acts as a virtually autonomous entity in the scramble for resources and the personnel to stay afloat. As a consequence, deliberative, realistic assessments about strengths, capabilities, and opportunities have been effectively abandoned. The only consensus seems to be that the campus is besieged.

Absence of a Clear Mission and Internal Conflict

An initial impression given to outsiders, based on explicit comments from many faculty and administrators, is that the faculty are split along lines of race/ethnicity and nationality. A more careful analysis suggests that much of this may be a symptom of lack of consensus about mission. Although there are exceptions, the split seems to be based, as noted earlier, on time of hire. For example, the younger faculty, who appear to be predominantly white and African, seem to have been hired when the University administration, or at least some of its leaders, were describing the University's future as that of a small, moderately selective, liberal arts institution. For example, in October of 2001 the University set as a core goal membership in the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges, whose members employ selective admissions.[8]

On the other hand, the older faculty, who comprise the largest proportion of the African Americans, think of the University in the context of its mission as an HBCU. To these faculty the core mission includes an emphasis on access for students coming from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds—something that is actually becoming more of a factor as many of Kentucky's academically stronger African-American high school graduates choose to attend other colleges and universities. The Review Team believes that a synthesis of the liberal arts and access missions is possible, both as a goal and as a reality. But achieving this requires the sort of patient, broadly-based planning that appears to have been absent from KSU for some time.

Although there are rhetorical flourishes in strategic planning documents about KSU eventually having three programs of national stature and

[8] See the Enhancement Request to CPE, October 2001. Part of this may also stem from the desegregation agreement with the Federal Government [1982] which emphasized KSU's role as a small liberal arts university.

reputation (i.e., programs that serve as both the anchor and the beacon for systemic excellence), interviews with the academic leadership made clear that not only is there no consistent idea of what those three programs are or would be, there is also no clearly delineated means to identify them, and no systematic plan on how to develop them. Without a functioning institutional apparatus to determine how to build on KSU's many strengths and align University programs and priorities with mission, societal need, student demand, and personnel and infrastructure capabilities, the messages to a range of external publics has been significantly weakened. Instead of resonating strength and purpose, KSU seems to communicate that it is an institution that does not control its own destiny but rather is at the mercy of the state, desegregation orders, larger universities nearby, and so on.

There is a perception on the part of nearly everyone the Review Team spoke with of a lack of shared governance, team building, and team sharing. Even deans and vice presidents do not know how major decisions have been made, and faculty are frustrated at being left out of decision-making processes, even when they might be more supportive of certain decisions if they only knew the reasons behind them.

Turnover in the President's office and among the top administrators has been frequent, leading to a sense of instability. The resulting variable commitment to support units such as the library and student affairs leaves them with less of a sense of direction and undependable budgets. Such instability has in many cases led to a sense of powerlessness which itself becomes a crutch, an excuse for inaction. Excellence with its high expectations, rather than powerlessness, must be institutionalized across the campus. Achieving this requires a commitment to collegial governance and cooperation that is the responsibility of all parties—including faculty and alumni as well as the Regents and the administration.

Internal fragmentation has gone beyond the campus as well. Only a few academic programs, for instance, have strong relationships with feeder high schools and community colleges, nor do they communicate well with graduate schools accepting their alumni and potentially providing them with faculty colleagues. What should be a relatively efficient seamless network is instead "catch as catch can." In a similar vein, there appears to be poor communication among the University's various constituencies.

Lack of identification and prioritization of programs

There seems to be a lack of an identification and assessment of what the University does or should do best followed by a prioritization of resources

for such programs. Announcing priorities can be threatening, especially to those who perceive themselves as not being in high priority activities, but saying that everything is or will be excellent is meaningless. One program, Aquaculture, has been identified as excellent primarily because it has leveraged external funds, not through internal prioritization or reallocation.

Developmental Education, which takes up a large portion of time, energy, and financial resources, is done almost apologetically with minimal coordination of activities and little assessment of results. This affects hundreds of students, versus the handful in Aquaculture, but Developmental Education faculty do not even participate in the state level professional association in the field, nor are there signs of continuing education on campus for faculty teaching these courses. Enthusiasm among some campus faculty and administrators for the role of Developmental Education on campus seems to be lacking, yet it is central to the success of the University in student retention and graduation, and there is a large and growing body of knowledge about how to succeed in teaching in this area.

Lack of accountability and a culture of evidence

Historically the University has not had a culture of evidence. Apparently decisions have been made based on something other than data pertinent to the situation. As an example, a question about potential maximum enrollment could not be answered; it appears that that issue has not been researched. Certainly, considerations such as the relative role of on-campus, off-campus, and on-line programs are difficult to address but nevertheless essential to consider in planning.

The pattern of lack of accountability and focus on data was similar in other areas of the University, such as technology (both instructional and administrative), library resources, capital maintenance, fundraising, admissions, student enrollment characteristics, remedial course success, student learning, retention and graduation assessment, placement information, and alumni affairs. When data gathering has been attempted, it often has been done in ways that minimize the benefit of the results (e.g. when return rates are very low on surveys).

Similarly, major funding proposals to the state and federal governments and private foundations lack the kind of support data that would assist the University's cause, thus limiting the chance of success.

Evaluation of administrators has not included input from faculty and others supervised. Although student evaluation of teaching is a factor

that should be employed as a regular part of assessment, the system appears to have been too dependent on this approach. Student course evaluations should never be employed exclusively or even primarily in determining faculty promotion, tenure, and salary decisions.

Reviewers of the draft report have disputed the assertions in this section, arguing either that the University has collected a great deal of data or that the available data have been used effectively, or both. The Review Team stands by its view, which is simply an observation about what has occurred. We saw numerous examples of data being collected and not used, as well as a pattern of data gathering employed more as an abstract activity, principally with an eye toward external regulators, than as a real tool for decision-making. This should not be taken as a criticism of individuals or groups now at the University but as a point of departure.

Lack of entrepreneurship

At this point the University lacks a brand, an external identity that would highlight it outside of its traditional constituencies. As noted, the Aquaculture program has been a first step in that direction, but two or more areas of excellence also need to be identified and differentially supported in order for the University to stand out, to be perceived as truly distinctive.

There does not seem to be a culture of entrepreneurship on campus that recognizes that the state and others will not solve all of the University's problems. The possibilities for non-legislative funding, especially in the areas of graduate teacher education and business and public administration, are enormous, but little has been heard about developing and marketing such programs. Off-site programs for state and corporate employees likewise present tremendous opportunities. Use of technology to expand course learning, especially in the local service region, presents a further opportunity for growth. Better collaboration and reciprocity agreements with other institutions such as community colleges and other universities present growth opportunities as well, but only two program heads (Criminal Justice and Social Work, and Child Welfare) discussed such activities. The University is very well situated to grow and prosper should it make a significant effort to do so. In the process it would provide a better level of service to the citizens of Kentucky.

Operational and Budget Issues

Incongruity with the CPE Budget Model

Apart from the current financial struggles being experienced by nearly all public institutions throughout the country, the Review Team believes the most significant financial issue facing Kentucky State University is the lack of an appropriate peer group against which to compare itself—both for funding purposes and for internal analytical purposes. The Commonwealth adopted a benchmark funding approach several years ago. Using IPEDS[9] data in a purely quantitative analysis, the CPE identified a list of potential peers for each public university. From this list, the CPE and the individual institution selected the group that would be used for benchmark funding purposes. The Commonwealth's commitment is to fund each institution at the 55th percentile within its peer ranking. Subsequent to the initial establishment of the peer group, campuses were given the option of replacing up to five peers. KSU took advantage of this option and replaced five of its original peers. This revised peer group was used for the 2002-2004 biennial period and, if no changes are made, will be used for the 2004-2006 biennium.

The University has not benefited from the benchmark funding approach because its funding level already is well above the 55th percentile within its peer group. As such, the CPE recommended that KSU received the same annual increase as other agencies of state government a modest (i.e., 2.4 percent) across-the-board increase for the 2002-04 current biennium (prior to the application of budgetary cuts being imposed on the campuses). KSU will continue to receive across-the-board increases (or cuts, as appropriate) until they fall below the 55th percentile within the peer group or the postsecondary education system adopts a different measure of central tendency.

The Review Team examined the process used to determine the benchmark peers and it is our conclusion that it has produced an inappropriate group against which to benchmark KSU. Irrespective of the impact on its funding, the majority of the institutions are so dissimilar to KSU as to produce relatively meaningless comparisons. For instance,

[9] From the IPEDS web site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/ The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), established as the core postsecondary education data collection program for NCES, is a system of surveys designed to collect data from all primary providers of postsecondary education. IPEDS is a single, comprehensive system designed to encompass all institutions and educational organizations whose primary purpose is to provide postsecondary education. The IPEDS system is built around a series of interrelated surveys to collect institution-level data in such areas as enrollments, program completions, faculty, staff, and finances.

using FY 2000 data, the enrollment range for benchmark institutions runs from a low of 1,590 students to a high of 8,427 students. KSU's enrollment is 2,254 students, or 19th out of the 20 institutions. The median enrollment is 4,487--nearly double the size of KSU's student body. Revenue analysis discloses similar distortion. KSU's total revenues amount to $46.2 million, placing it 13th out of the 20 institutions. The institution with the highest total revenues has $137.4 million while the lowest has $26.5 million.

The benchmark process may be appropriate for the other universities in Kentucky because their significantly larger enrollments accommodate the anomalies that may arise between institutions. For an institution as small as KSU, however, the net result is distorted comparisons. The Review Team believes that the benchmark process can work effectively for KSU, but not with the current weighting of factors to determine benchmark institutions. It is our recommendation that enrollment be given a significantly higher weight than the 16.67 percent that was used initially. Because of KSU's relatively low enrollment, we believe that this factor should be nearer to half of the overall weight. This would give greater recognition to the fact that the overhead and basic infrastructural costs at an institution the size of KSU are being spread over a much smaller base of students.[10]

Comparable Institutions
The Review Team has been asked to provide a list of colleges and universities to which Kentucky State should compare itself. The choice in the context of the CPE formula is a technical one and should be left to negotiations between KSU and CPE, along the lines described above. The question is even more difficult for academic purposes. The problem is that comparably-sized institutions are generally private and selective. To the best of our knowledge, there are very few, if any, public four-year institutions of KSU's size which would serve as aspirational benchmarks. In the Arts and Sciences section there is a reference to Xavier in New Orleans which, while private and different in some other ways, might serve as one example for KSU to follow.

Economies of scale

As suggested above, KSU incurs a significant amount of infrastructure and overhead costs relative to its enrollment. Every university incurs these costs whether it has a large or small enrollment. However, campuses with lower enrollment must spread these costs over a smaller student base. This means that a larger percentage of per-student revenue must cover these costs. It is important

[10] The Review Team does not have the data to recommend a specific enrollment goal for KSU. However, note that the MGT Report observed that, "...the University should place top priority on increasing enrollments to take advantage of its excess facilities capacity. It will cost the state of Kentucky far fewer dollars to add enrollments to KSU than to most other state universities where additional facilities will have to be added." See page 3-16.

to note that infrastructure and basic overhead costs tend not to vary dramatically with enrollments. For example, every campus has a president, a vice president for academic affairs, a librarian, etc. At some level, enrollment increases will necessitate additional staff in support units and, therefore, increase marginal overhead costs. Until that level is reached, however, the fixed per-student infrastructure and overhead costs will be relatively higher, as a percentage of total costs, at a campus with lower enrollment. The only viable way to reduce the per-student fixed costs is to increase enrollment so the costs can be spread over a larger base.

Although the current staff at KSU were unable to respond to questions regarding enrollment capacity, the Review Team believes there is an opportunity for the campus to serve a substantially larger enrollment. The additional cost of pursuing this strategy is believed to be relatively insignificant compared to the financial gains which would be realized.

Putting aside the question of residence hall capacity, information provided about existing space utilization indicates that the classrooms are under-utilized during all but peak weekday hours (i.e., 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.). Even if more traditional-age students cannot be housed on campus due to existing space limitations, there is an opportunity to increase enrollment among commuter students—both day and evening students—through enhanced offerings of interest, especially to state employees.

The financial benefits of such an effort would be substantial. With a modest investment in adjunct faculty in selected departments, KSU could offer additional programs/courses to achieve significant net financial gain. Alternatively, KSU could partner with other institutions to serve as a host institution for their programs. In addition to the increased tuition revenues that would result from increased enrollment, the University would improve its overall net financial performance because its fixed infrastructure and overhead costs would be spread over a larger number of students. The impact of this would be to enhance the net revenue (or expense) attributable to each student.

Rightsizing the Administration

The transitional nature of the current administration makes it difficult for the Review Team to ascertain with precision whether the University has too much administrative overhead. The MGT Report of 1994 did

provide data that showed KSU, at that time, at the high end for its peer group in Kentucky.[11]

Certainly, in the recent past the faculty believed that there was too much overhead. For example, The *Academic Program Review* document of December 2000 contains the following statement: "The University's FY 2001 operating budget allocates only 28.2% of operating funds (both unrestricted and restricted) to instruction [cites page 1 of the budget]. Although substantial academic support is going toward academic support efforts and other University priorities, with few exceptions little new funding is going directly to degree programs."[12]

MGT provided many thoughtful recommendations for improvement at KSU (a significant proportion of which have not been followed and still merit study), and this Review Team offers additional ones in various places in the report. It would be a serious mistake, however, to rely on outside experts to provide a blueprint for change in this area. Ultimately, the amount that a university spends on education vs. administration is in part a philosophical issue, representing the beliefs of the governing board and administrative leadership, and in part a management issue, reflecting the willingness of these two groups to follow through on a consistent basis. It may seem obvious to say that a university should strive to place the highest proportion of its expenditures on its core mission of education, but it is not uncommon for administrators to be preoccupied with other matters to the detriment of student success.

- *The Review Team recommends that the Board of Regents set as a high goal ensuring that the University is exemplary in the efficiency of its administrative operations and that it is a leader among similar institutions in ensuring that the maximum expenditure possible goes to supporting student success and related academic goals.*

[11] MGT of America, Inc. *The Final Report of the Organizational Management and Program Review for Kentucky State University,* 1994. See pages 3-13 to 3-15 and also Appendix A. MGT uses the following definition, "Overhead costs [are] defined as costs for institutional support, academic support, student services (including athletics), and physical plant operations." MGT estimated the overage in administrative cost vs. others in the state to be in the range of $600,000 per year.
[12] Page 4.

Part 3 Recommendations and Observations on Specific Academic Areas

Overall Academic Issues

Faculty and Staffing

Faculty teaching loads at KSU are at the high end of the scale for similar institutions. Faculty who are teaching 12 hours per semester are challenged to find sufficient time for academic advising, professional development, research, and service. The problem at KSU is exacerbated by the regular practice of using "overload" appointments that extend service beyond 12 hours.

The Review Team therefore recommends that:

- KSU move as quickly as possible to reduce the use of overload appointments to the extent that they are employed only in rare and unusual circumstances.

Program Collaboration/ Interdisciplinary Structures

KSU currently has extensive collaboration in its undergraduate programs. The Review Team particularly applauds the active role that Arts and Sciences faculty take in the secondary education area. KSU is to be applauded for taking strong steps in the direction that higher education in the rest of the country is just beginning to contemplate.

- The Academic Program Review Report recommends that "collaborative efforts be formally reflected in budget documents and line items when appropriate, such as when faculty in one academic unit teach part-time in another."[13] The Review Team endorses this recommendation.

Program "Productivity" and Academic "Economies of Scale"

The Academic Program Review was undertaken at KSU in response to a CPE mandate to look at "low productivity" programs. The CPE's productivity standards require that there be an average of 12 graduates per year for a program to be retained. The Review Team is not convinced that this is a

[13] Page 4.

reasonable benchmark if applied inflexibly. It is entirely possible that a small program be reasonably efficient and of high quality.

The CPE standard has had mixed results at KSU. On the one hand, it led to an excellent report—a thoughtful, well-reasoned, and well-researched document that will provide an effective resource as the University rebuilds. On the other hand, the only tangible outcomes to date are those that "game the system." For example, several programs that failed to meet the standards were combined—but only on paper. The Review Team was told that there have been no changes in curriculum or staffing.

The reasons for this lack of responsiveness appear to be twofold: 1) the University has lacked the leadership to follow through on substantive changes; and 2) the University does not believe that the standards should apply to it: "The University, in short, found itself in a dilemma: despite its mission to be a small, unique, liberal studies institution with the lowest student-faculty ratio in the Commonwealth, the CPE's new productivity standards penalize the University for meeting its mission and threaten the very existence of the University."[14]

The Review Team would be concerned if the CPE standards were applied inflexibly (it appears that there is flexibility), [15] but does not agree with the report's implied premise that the University should be exempt from striving for high levels of academic synergy and efficiency. A small university can be efficient through careful integration of academic content; in doing so, it will very likely achieve greater student success than would otherwise be the case. The Review Team therefore recommends that:

- The University work hard to find ways to integrate academic programs in a manner that makes good programmatic sense while emphasizing efficiency. As an illustration (not a recommendation), separate majors in history, English and Sociology could be combined into an American Studies major that would require fewer courses while stimulating students through interdisciplinary content and teaching. An integrated program of this kind could then be supplemented with the series of special courses needed to give students an international perspective.
- The Review Team suggests that the CPE emphasize flexibility in the application of its productivity standards for KSU for five years, until June of 2008, to give the University time to rethink its academic programs in a manner that is free of artificial constraints.
- The University consider outsourcing, perhaps to the University of Kentucky or the University of Louisville, academic programs in which

[14] *Academic Program Review* (December 6, 2000), *p. 1.*
[15] It appears to be applied flexibly. CPE states that "any program not meeting the base line requirement be given a waiver of the standard."

the scale of efforts on the campus makes costs unreasonably high. Such an approach could expand opportunities for students while keeping cost to the University at or below revenue.

Academic Organization

The Academic Program Review Report suggests several academic reorganization models, including "three-college" and "four-college" options. The ultimate disposition of this matter should be worked out by the faculty and the administration in a manner that allows for the Regents to have a clear understanding of the issues before they are asked to approve a change. The Review Team offers the following observations in advance of this process:[16]

- Fewer academic units is better. In a small university such as KSU, the large number of separate units increases overhead and inhibits collaboration.
- Academic units should be large enough to have some autonomy from central administration oversight in day-to-day matters. The over-centralization of the University is a key complaint of the faculty.
- Maintaining, and even extending, close relationships between arts and sciences and teacher education is highly desirable. In considering performance problems with the Praxis II examination,[17] the University should remember that a great deal of the content of the test is taught by arts and sciences, not by education. Success in the core University mission of teacher education is highly dependent on enhanced participation and *responsibility* from arts and sciences faculty.

An Academic Opportunity

One idea that the University could use to strengthen its teaching as well as the connection to its traditional mission would be to develop a visiting faculty program designed to attract outstanding individuals, especially

[16] Please note that the organization of this report's comments on academic programs (see below) does not imply a recommendation on structure; this was simply the easiest way for the Review Team to approach the topic.

[17] Praxis II: A series of professional assessments for beginning teachers. The Praxis II National Teacher Exam (NTE) is designed to assess qualifications of prospective teachers. It is used by state education agencies in making licensing decisions. The Praxis II Subject Assessments measure knowledge of the subjects that candidates will teach, as well as general and subject-specific teaching skills and knowledge. A set of Core Battery tests, as well as Specialty area tests in more than 140 subject areas, are included in this group. Many states require some or all of the Praxis II elements for teacher certification. See: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/glossary/p.asp

African Americans, to teach for a semester or a year at Kentucky State. The Review Team believes that many African American faculty who are currently at majority institutions would welcome the opportunity to teach at an HBCU at least once during their careers. The benefits of such a program would be mutual. The knowledge and experience of these individuals would be of immense value to the University, while the visitors would, among other things, gain insights into the challenges facing African American students in today's society.

Implementation of the KSU Distinguished Visitors Program could be undertaken in a series of steps: 1) first, the University would, as described elsewhere, define its mission and choose the handful of programs that are to be designated as programs to be raised to national prominence; 2) second, the University would establish a national advisory committee for the program—in addition to general assistance, its role would be to help identify and recruit visiting faculty, and to help with fund-raising; 3) monies would be raised from a variety of sources, including grants as well as gifts. The cost of a visiting faculty program need not be exorbitant. Much of the expense would be covered by vacant lines, with outside funds needed to cover salary differentials and expenses.

A visiting scholars program of this kind could complement active participation in existing programs such as the Fulbright Visiting Scholar program for African American-Serving Institutions.[18] Another opportunity would be the Ford Foundation International Fellows Program.[19]

General Education and Transfer

The terms general education and liberal education or liberal studies are frequently used interchangeably. General education is the component of the undergraduate curriculum that is required of most college students on a particular campus.

KSU's Program

Kentucky State University's current Liberal Studies/General Education curriculum of 53-54 semester hours was implemented in Fall 1984. The curriculum was developed in response to the State's 1982 Desegregation Plan which redefined the University as "the unique, small liberal studies institution in the state system." The University's General Education Program consists of selected disciplinary courses and a sequence of integrative

[18] See: http://www.cies.org/sir/sir.htm#african .
[19] See: http://www.fordfound.org/news/more/11272000ifp/index.cfm

studies courses organized around distribution requirements. The requirement is regarded as an essential component of the University's mission as a liberal studies institution.

There is agreement among KSU faculty that general education/liberal studies prepare students for lifelong learning, work, and citizenship, regardless of major. The importance of a solid foundation in the liberal arts for professional competence has been strongly articulated in a number of reports and self-studies prepared by faculty.

Oversight responsibility

In 1998, the President of the University appointed the Liberal Studies Core Program Coordinating Committee (LSCPCC) and assigned to this group oversight responsibility for "all aspects of the Liberal Studies Core Program to ensure that students receive a general education foundation that prepares them for upper level and discipline specific course work, and provides knowledge, skills, and values needed to be productive citizens and life-long learners." As an initial step in designing an assessment plan for the Liberal Studies/General Education curriculum, LSCPCC has developed twelve comprehensive general education goal statements and a learning outcome for each of these goals. According to University documents, the goal statements and learning outcomes were approved by the faculty in February 1998. Specific competency statements and related assessment measures for the learning outcomes have not yet been fully developed, however. As a consequence, the assessment system for the current Liberal Studies/General Education Program is incomplete.

Assessment

In KSU's December 1998 "Comprehensive Assessment and Evaluation Plan," the Rising Junior Assessment was identified as an assessment procedure for evaluating "the effectiveness of the Liberal Studies/General Education core program and the academic achievement of individual students." The Rising Junior Assessment is to be taken in the semester students complete 60 credit hours and includes a standardized test, the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress (CAAP), and a faculty-designed essay. Although the Rising Junior Assessment is University policy and described in the University catalog, participation rates have been low.

Suggestions

- The fundamental issue of whether CAAP is the most appropriate assessment test battery for "evaluating the effectiveness of instruction in the Liberal Studies requirements" should be given

further examination by the LSCPCC and by the KSU faculty. CAAP, as described in the ACT promotional brochure, is actually designed to document levels of proficiency in advanced academic skills, not in subject matter knowledge. As the LSCPCC moves forward with the next phases of a plan for a comprehensive assessment system for each of the Liberal Studies/General Education learning outcome statements, relevant competency statements and appropriate assessment procedures should emerge from ad hoc faculty subcommittees given the responsibility for drafting such standards and measures. Publications and meetings of the Association of American Colleges and Universities would be valuable resources for faculty in designing campus-specific customized measures or selecting standardized tests for evaluating student performance in a specific content area, subject, or academic skill.[20]

Report of the General Education Task Force

Only a limited number of substantive changes have occurred in KSU's Liberal Studies/General Education curriculum since its adoption in 1983. Because of the liberal studies focus of the University mission, a team of faculty and deans, in July 2000, participated in the Summer Academy of the American Association for Higher Education for the purpose of designing a process for reviewing and revising the General Education curriculum. The team described KSU's curriculum as "incoherent" and suffering from "severe credit hour creep."

Following the summer academy, the project team was expanded to include additional campus stakeholders and renamed the General Education Core Curriculum Task Force. This committee viewed general education reform on KSU's campus "as a pivotal part of the effort to strengthen deserving undergraduate degree programs." This was one of the priority goals included in the University's Spring 2000 Strategic Plan. Subsequently, in Spring 2002, the Task Force released its extensive report containing more than 20 recommendations for improving the quality of the Liberal Studies/General Education learning experiences for KSU students.

Suggestions

- In view of the centrality of the Liberal Studies curriculum to the University mission, these recommendations should be given careful attention and thoughtful discussion in a variety of venues, including the Faculty Senate, departmental meetings, divisional

[20] http://www.aacu-edu.org/issues/liberaleducation/

meetings, all-campus convocations, and student senate meetings. These recommendations should become the shared concern of all stakeholders within the University community.

Linkages with Developmental Education and the First-Year Experience

Observations- Developmental Education

KSU has a continuing commitment to provide broad access to students aspiring to a college degree. Accordingly, the University admits a sizable number of entering students with deficiencies in their preparation for collegiate study. The challenge for the University, therefore, is that of providing meaningful opportunities for under-prepared students to develop the academic competencies essential for raising their level of achievement in the Liberal Studies core curriculum as well as in their respective majors.

Developmental Education (DE) courses and the First-Year Experience Program, a federally funded initiative, are designed to retain freshman students and to enhance their academic skills and preparation.

Suggestions- Developmental Education

- In order for DE courses to be more effective, additional attention must be directed to resolving such issues as (1) staffing levels; (2) class size; (3) organizational structure; (4) staff assignments and expertise in teaching DE courses; (5) feasibility of appointing a director/coordinator to oversee all components of DE; and (6) faculty participation in state and national forums and conferences related to DE.

Observations- The First Year Experience

The First-Year Experience program is a Title III funded initiative[21], serving all freshman students through ten different program

[21] "The Aid for Institutional Development programs (commonly referred to as the Title III programs) support improvements in educational quality, management, and financial stability at qualifying postsecondary institutions. Funding is focused on institutions that enroll large proportions of minority and financially disadvantaged students with low per-student expenditures. The programs provide financial assistance to help institutions solve problems that threaten their ability to survive, to improve their management and fiscal operations, and to build endowments.

components, which appears to be successful in the achievement of most objectives. The DE courses and the First-Year Experience Program share the overarching goal of empowering students and retaining those with the potential to thrive in an academically challenging environment.

Suggestions- The First Year Experience

- Given the emphasis on student retention, empowerment, and preparation for successful collegiate level study by these freshman level program initiatives, collaborative efforts with the Liberal Studies Core Planning Coordinating Committee would probably result in the strengthening of all freshman level courses while also providing additional faculty resources for academic support services and retention efforts.

Transfer

Observations

The University's transfer admission policies are outlined in the institutional catalog. Noticeably absent from this section, however, is specific information related to community college students who have completed an associate degree and desire to transfer to KSU to complete a four-year degree program. The number of students transferring from community colleges into KSU undergraduate degree programs is extremely low. The two-year college sector is a viable resource for recruiting upper division students who have successfully demonstrated their abilities to persist and navigate a college environment. Currently, only a limited number of program articulation agreements seem to be operational. For example, faculty in the Child Development and Family Relations Department have established articulation agreements with three community colleges. Although faculty in the Criminal Justice and Social Work Department have established only one formal articulation agreement with a Kentucky community college, they are in discussion with other community colleges for similar agreements.

From its inception, one of the primary missions of the Title III programs has been to support the nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The Title III programs have been expanded to support American Indian Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions. The program also includes the Minority Science and Engineering Improvement program and the HBCU Capital Financing program." See: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/idues/

Suggestions

- Strengthening partnerships with Kentucky community colleges and technical colleges (and perhaps also those from neighboring states) through formal articulation agreements is a feasible strategy for attracting more upper division transfer students to the University and for building enrollment in junior-level and senior-level courses.
- Promote transfer of prospective students through statewide transfer agreements supported by CPE: General Education Transfer Agreement; and Applied Associate Degree Transfer Agreement.

Arts and Sciences

Overall Observations: Opportunities abound for the degree programs in Arts and Science to form the bedrock of a strong liberal arts university and, equally important, to serve as the enrollment and academic magnet that elevates Kentucky State into the ranks of other premier liberal arts institutions. Those opportunities have, unfortunately, been consistently undercut by a number of factors that have made it difficult for KSU to meet effectively its liberal arts *and* its HBCU missions. Both of those important and compatible missions require creating and sustaining an academic

Strengthening the Upper Division/ Securing the Resources to Improve Programs
Administrators and faculty at KSU are likely to say, and reasonably so, that they don't need external reviewers to tell them that it would be desirable to have more upper division students. However, the belief of many faculty seems to be that the best way to do this is to enhance the programs—"strengthen it and they will come." The Review Team agrees that enhancements are necessary, but believes that an active approach is best. Two things that can be done right away are: 1) greater focus on increased success in Developmental Education—i.e. making the pipeline less leaky; and 2) building articulation agreements with community colleges. For more thoughts on how to secure resources, see Key Next Steps in Section 9.

environment where students overwhelmingly succeed and faculty are intellectually empowered. Yet, at KSU only 28% of the students graduate after six years and the large number of unfilled tenure-track positions has left the existing faculty so overwhelmed that they appear to have little or no time to envision and develop the type of curriculum that would best meet the life-long learning needs of KSU students.[22]

What seems to be an almost assembly line process of getting students in entry-level courses has left both faculty and students operating well below their potential. Moreover, because so much faculty time must be devoted to entry-level instruction -- in English, for example, 82% of all courses taught in Fall 2000 were remedial or liberal studies core classes -- key upper division courses are offered sporadically or not at all. And because the departments are often staffed with just the bare minimum to operate – there are only two faculty, for example, to cover American, African American, Southern, European, African, Asian, and Latin American history from the Olduvai Gorge through the 20th century -- the array and diversity of those junior and senior level courses are also severely limited.[23]

The results of these staffing patterns are unfortunate. There is an increase in time to degree as students wait for required classes to be offered. To circumvent this, faculty then try to accommodate students by offering, on an overload basis, courses where only a few (often less than 5 and as low as 1 or 2) are enrolled. And by running departments on a shoestring, greatly constricting the upper division course offerings, and leaving little time for syllabi and curricular revisions, students are disadvantaged further. The external review of the Biology program made this point with clarity:

> Students generally feel that faculty members of the Biology Program were doing the best that they are capable of considering the heavy demands on their time, limitations of the facilities available, and the inadequate and out of date equipment available. . . .However, seniors expressed concerns about how well prepared they will be for entry into professional and graduate schools. Some of this anxiety comes as a result of conversations with earlier

[22] National Collegiate Athletic Association, "NCAA 2002 Graduation Rates Report: Kentucky State University," www.ncaa.org/grad_rates/2002/d2-3/Rpt00332.html; Ad Hoc University Program Review Committee, "Kentucky State University Academic Program Review," December 6, 2000, 15-16; ibid., [Biology], 20; ibid., [Chemistry], 24; ibid., [Computer Science], 28; ibid., [Criminal Justice], 30; ibid., [History], 38; ibid., [Mathematics/Mathematics Education], 42; Baker & Hostetler Review Team interview with Deans and Chairs, February 4, 2003.

[23] "English Program Review," 6; "Kentucky State History Program Review by Dr. Patricia A. Pearson," September 29, 2000; "Program Review: History Program by Dr. Richard Gildrie and Dr. John A. Hardin," October 25, 2000, 2-3; Ad Hoc University Program Review Committee, "Kentucky State University Academic Program Review," December 6, 2000, [Psychology], 48; ibid., [Mathematics/Mathematics Education], 42.

graduates who have had difficulties, one was mentioned as having to repeat the first year of medical school.[24]

The promise of a strong liberal arts education for students at KSU is further eroded by the fact that there is little opportunity for undergraduates to participate in research, although this is a very effective means for ensuring student success. The most research-intensive unit on campus, the land grant division, is too small and specialized to accommodate a university-wide student research program.[25] Yet, undergraduate research makes students active learners, it fully engages them in the creation of new knowledge, it firmly establishes a mentor/student relationship that anchors students to the institution and helps significantly with retention, and it helps provide the critical thinking and writing skills that are absolutely essential for post-baccalaureate studies and the world of work.[26] Kentucky, however, is the only Southern state and one of a handful in the entire nation, like Idaho and Maine, that does not have a McNair Scholars Program.[27]

The McNair Scholars Program has been instrumental in moving African American and other under-represented students from bachelor's degree programs into graduate school.[28] In addition to the obvious academic benefits that accrue to students, a federally-funded McNair program at KSU -- with an average award nearing $250,000 -- could provide some scholarship relief for both the students and the institution.[29] Although McNair Programs rarely range above 50 students, they are often part of a larger, extant undergraduate research enterprise on the campus. The fact that there is no McNair Program at KSU appears symptomatic of a culture that recognizes the importance of having such a program or something similar but does not routinely expect or incorporate undergraduate research into the curriculum.

---

[24] "Kentucky State University History Program Review by Dr. Patricia A. Pearson"; "Kentucky State University Biology Program Review: Report of External Reviewers Dr. James Wagner and Dr. Jerry Warner," 8-9; "Kentucky State University External Review Report: Music Degree Programs by Jimmie James, Jr. and Joyce J. Bolden," 7, 12, 13. The reference to running departments on a "shoestring" also refers to the small annual, non-personnel operating budgets for research materials as well as office supplies and photocopying that totaled only $22,926 for Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Applied Mathematics/Pre-Engineering, and History combined.

[25] "Kentucky State University Aquaculture Program: KSU's Program of Distinction, Annual Report—2001-2002," 9, 13, 15, 18-23.

[26] Margaret Loftus, "A Few Fine Names You May Not Know: Wonderful Schools that Aren't (yet) Renowned," *U.S. News & World Report: America's Best Colleges 2002*, www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/articles/brief/02cbschools.htm

[27] U.S. Department of Education, "List of Funded Projects for 2002-03," www.ed.gov/offices/ope/hep/trio/mcnair.html#fp.

[28] Idem., "A Profile of the Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program: 1999-2000," xii, 24.

[29] Idem., "List of Funded Projects for 2002-03," www.ed.gov/offices/ope/hep/trio/mcnair.html#fp.

Part of that lowered expectation stems from the reality of laboratories that are used primarily for instructional activities with little or no designated space for long-term research projects. It is amplified by outdated library holdings and limited electronic database access that hamper the ability of scholars to stay abreast of the latest literature and developments in the various fields, and faculty who are routinely called upon to fill the enormous instructional gaps in the survey and entry-level classes and therefore have little time to provide the one-on-one mentoring at the upper division that undergraduate research requires.[30] As the review of the Biology program summarized, "This is not what one would expect from a school with the lowest student-faculty ratio in the state."[31]

Around the country, however, the liberal arts powerhouses do expect the vast majority of their undergraduates to have a substantive, meaningful research experience. Those institutions, whether selective admissions (Truman State), Research Extensive (University of Missouri-Columbia), HBCU (Xavier University of Louisiana), private (College of Wooster), or public (Miami of Ohio), have also been able to develop strong, nationwide student recruitment initiatives because of the overall excellence of their programs and the singular superiority of one or two of those degree offerings. Xavier, for example, has become nationally respected and renowned for its science and Pre-Medical programs. Of course, Xavier is private and, on the surface, should be able to do that. But a closer examination reveals that its endowment is modest ($27 million), it receives no financial support from the church, its incoming class's standardized test scores are below the national average, and it "admits some under-prepared students." Yet, despite what many would consider being barriers to excellence, Xavier graduates nearly 60% of its students after six years, and, even more impressive, almost half of those go onto post-baccalaureate study, especially to the top medical schools in the nation. The following excerpt perhaps best illustrates what the successful melding of an HBCU mission with that of a strong liberal arts institution can achieve.

> Xavier is not a wealthy institution. It has learned to do much with limited means. Its historic mission to serve capable minority students strains all resources, especially because Xavier seeks to include those whose potential achievements have been hindered by financial problems or poor schools. But in Xavier's supportive environment, students can and do excel. Their

[30] See, for example, "Chemistry Program Review: Kentucky State University by Frank Shaw and Preston Miles," October 12 and 13, 2000, 2-4, 8; "Program Review: History Program at Kentucky State University by Dr. Richard Gildrie and Dr. John A. Hardin," October 25, 2000, 3, 6-7; "Biology Program Review," 6-7, 9, 11, 18.
[31] Ibid., 9.

> accomplishments have been featured in various national media, including *The New York Times, The Boston Globe, The Washington Post* . . . .[32]

In addition to demonstrating a commitment to undergraduate research and creating institution-defining degree programs, strong liberal arts institutions have also developed innovative curricular structures that permeate and enhance the overall undergraduate experience. For the College of Wooster, for example, it is the institution's nationally recognized Independent Study program, which ranks second only to Princeton's.[33] For the University of Missouri-Columbia, which won the Theodore Hesburgh Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Education, it was the Writing Intensive Program.[34] Hesburgh Award winners this year included another Research Extensive university, a highly selective public residential campus, as well as Minneapolis Community and Technical College, which was honored for its work in educating faculty on how to effectively teach students whose urban school systems have systematically left far too many children behind.[35] In short, there is a series of "best practices" in undergraduate education that is applicable and adaptable to a range of institutions. Kentucky State is no exception.

Availing itself of those opportunities for excellence requires the university community to seriously look at what it has. It must realistically assess what it can do and does well, and then build on those strengths. Those strengths are many. The university is ideally located to serve the educational needs of both a traditional and non-traditional student population. Its close proximity to state government, the hub of public policymaking in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, offers KSU students an incredible opportunity for service-learning and civic internships in important government offices that other students in the state do not readily have. If properly instituted and rigorously sustained, KSU could even develop a public policy niche that could provide direct opportunities at the top graduate programs in the nation, like Georgetown and Harvard, and, thereby the reap the same windfall that Tougaloo College has garnered for its solid relationship with Brown University.[36] KSU's strength also emanates from a statewide, liberal arts mission that clearly distinguishes it from regional or research universities in the Commonwealth and, thereby, provides an appealing alternative for those searching for a small liberal arts environment with a diverse, cosmopolitan student body. In short, the elements are there for the

---

[32] http://www.xula.edu/Quickfacts.html
[33] http://www.wooster.edu/admissions/rate.html
[34] http://admissions.missouri.edu/academics/index.php
[35] See the TIAA-CREF website: http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/micro_stories.pl?ACCT=840938&TICK=TIAA&STORY=/www/story/02-18-2003/0001893239&EDATE=Feb+18,+2003
[36] http://www.missouri.edu/~servlm/; http://www.tougaloo.edu/history.html.

university to think through how to meld those strengths into institution-defining programs that address the enrollment, financial, academic, and reputation needs of Kentucky State University.

The following observations and recommendations, based on extensive internal and external reviews, are focused on bringing the degree programs merely up to functional. To go "from good to great" requires the vision, consensus building, and mission focus that the Review Team has stressed for KSU throughout this report.

Humanities and Social Sciences

Observations: The programs in this area, History, Sociology, Political Science, and Psychology are all rather low-key programs on KSU's campus. Combined they accounted for 25 graduates in 1999/2000, although concerns were raised, especially in Political Science and Sociology, about the small number of graduates. In fact, during the last round of program review, Sociology was slated to be discontinued.

The distinguishing feature of all these programs is that they are rather indistinct, which is surprising on many fronts, especially because these are often the fields where the cutting-edge work on the conditions in the African American community, as well as the history and the public policy that affects that community, is done. The nondescript nature of the programs is also unexpected given that KSU's Interim Enhancement Request to CPE included, among other things, an expanded study abroad program in its funding request. Those types of international programs generally require robust political science and history curricula (as well as foreign languages), to adequately prepare the students to live, learn, experience, and appreciate a semester overseas.[37] There was no corresponding documentation supplied to the Review Team to indicate that the programmatic strengths were in place to accomplish a successful study abroad program that would be of the rigor to lead, as the enhancement request alluded, to greater opportunities for students in the Foreign Service.

The other degree program offered in this category is the bachelor of liberal studies under the Whitney Young College, which is the honors division at Kentucky State. The internal review of December 2000 raised concerns about curricular structure and other barriers that essentially isolated the College and its students from the rest of the campus. Since that time, according to the dean's report during the February 2003 site visit, the College has begun to implement the recommendations in the December

[37] William Wilson and G.W. Reid to Gordon Davies, October 22, 2001, attachment, 10-11; Ad Hoc University Program Review Committee, " Kentucky State University Program Review," December 6, 2000, [History], 38, [Political Science], 47, [Psychology], 48, and [Sociology], 54.

2000 report to more fully integrate the College and its students into the fabric of the university.

- *Suggestions* Implement the recommendations outlined in the Ad Hoc University Program Review Committee's report concerning faculty staffing patterns and, where applicable, retention and graduation of students.[38]

Math and Sciences

Observations: For the sciences, it is probably best to separate Aquaculture, which is overwhelmingly a graduate program, from Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, and Mathematics/Mathematics Education. The undergraduate programs in the sciences at KSU have several troubling themes running throughout their program reviews: "Overloaded faculty"—especially in Mathematics -- obsolete laboratory equipment, inadequate staffing of laboratories, and an over-reliance on soft money for operational expenses, including faculty personnel. Science, when it is one right, is an expensive enterprise. As expensive as it is, however, world-class science programs can also reap enormous benefits for the university, the students, the commonwealth, and the nation. To do so, however, requires strategic, consistent investment in equipment, facilities, and personnel. By raising and sustaining the overall quality of the program, it will make KSU much more competitive for National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation grants, many of which also have additional funding opportunities for minority student research fellowships.

An Opportunity for Excellence
KSU might consider, as a candidate for one of its areas of excellence, a combination of science and teacher education. The University already has a strong collaborative relationship between these areas. Science education is a critical need for the nation, and there are substantial outside funding opportunities for programs in this area.

During the site visit the Review Team, heard firsthand of the heavy load borne by the Mathematics program in developmental education without appropriate advanced warning and curricular and faculty development support. That was troubling. Equally disconcerting was the December 2000 Program Review, which noted that the high enrollments in remedial math courses was a "major concern" because the large number of students

[38] Ibid., [History], 38, [Liberal Studies-Honors], 40, [Political Science], 47, [Psychology], 48, [Sociology], 54.

preclude faculty from providing the individual attention necessary to help students master course content.[39]

Suggestions

- Explore why important opportunities, such as the designated seats in the medical program at the University of Kentucky for KSU grads, have not been realized. The conditions are that have created this situation must be resolved. The Review Team was perplexed and dismayed that such an opportunity, in such a critical area of need, was not fully seized upon by KSU.

- Implement the recommendations outlined in the Ad Hoc University Program Review Committee's report concerning faculty staffing patterns, laboratory personnel, and, where applicable, retention and graduation of students.[40]

Literature, Languages, and Philosophy

Observations

Although the 2002-2003 Kentucky State Catalogue lists majors and faculty in a variety of foreign languages, no program review material on these degrees were submitted to the Review Team. Nor were materials concerning the minor in Philosophy provided.

The major program in this division is English. The English program is comparatively large for KSU-- (ten faculty with the rank of Assistant, Associate or full Professor, plus five Instructors). Although the division has a small number of well chosen upper division offerings in literature, the majority of faculty energy is devoted to introductory and developmental composition and core liberal arts courses. As seen with all of the programs, English also appears to be hampered by outdated materials and limited operating budgets.

Suggestions

- Implement the recommendations outlined in the Ad Hoc Program Review Committee's report concerning collaboration with the Whitney Young faculty and updating of library, computing, and language laboratory resources.[41]

[39] Ad Hoc University Program Review Committee, [Mathematics/Mathematics Education], 42.
[40] Ibid., [Biology], 20, [Chemistry], 24, [Computer Science], 28, [Mathematics/Mathematics Education], 42.
[41] Ibid., 35.

Fine Arts

Observations

The Division of Fine Arts awards degrees in Art, Music, Speech/ Communication, Theatre, and Communications. The Art program offers two degrees, the Bachelor of Arts in Studio Art and the Bachelor of Science in Art Education. In the October 2000 academic program review report, faculty reported 34 majors for Fall 1999 and 6 graduates for Spring 2000. At that time, the undergraduate program in Art was staffed by 1 full-time faculty member and adjuncts.

External reviewers noted that the Art program, despite repeated challenges and struggles, had successfully prepared graduates for jobs and graduate schools since its inception. Yet, reviewers identified a number of issues related to the declining quality of the degree: too few full-time faculty to teach classes; minimal library resources; meager operational funding; insufficient resources for enhancing the major and establishing new specialties such as computer graphics; limited studio and gallery spaces; and lack of sufficient classroom facilities. One external reviewer described the Art program as one with "much potential but little promise" without the infusion of significant financial resources.

Two degrees in Music are available to KSU students: the Bachelor of Music in Performance and the Bachelor of Music Education. Both of these degrees are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. As such, these programs must meet minimum standards established by the accreditor. Eleven full-time faculty and one part-time faculty staff the music degrees, teaching a range of courses that include theory, literature, history, applied music, music education, and large and small ensembles. Statistics provided in the 2000 Summary Program Sheet show the number of majors averaging 50 over a five-year period from the 1995-1996 academic year to the 1999-2000 academic year. During this same period of time, program graduates averaged 4 each year.

External reviewers for the Music program provided several recommendations for program enhancements and ensuring continued growth: reduction in the excessive number of hours required for graduation; establishment of a Technology Laboratory and an in-house Listening Center, including a collection of CD's; attention to retention strategies, specifically more careful and intensive advisement and mentoring of majors; improvement in graduate rate of majors; and recruitment of academically and musically talented majors.

Suggestions

- Determine cost structures for sustaining a quality undergraduate major in Art with the addition of new specialties such as computer graphics.
- By June 2003, inform the campus community of the administrative decision to either discontinue or continue the Art program.
- Establish a timeline for either discontinuing the Art major over the 2003 – 2004 academic year OR for continuing it with substantive quality enhancements phased in over a period of three years.
- Evaluate the progress of the Music program in responding to the program enhancement recommendations contained in the Fall 2000 report of the external review team.

Education and Human Services

Observations

The Division of Education and Human Services houses degree programs in Teacher Education (TEP) and Child Development and Family Relations. These degrees lead to teaching certification in the following areas: Early Childhood Education (birth to primary); Elementary Education; Secondary Education in Biology, English, Mathematics, and Social Studies; and multi-grade programs in Art, Music, and Physical Education. Arts and Sciences departments collaborate with education faculty in the preparation of students for academic specialty areas.

KSU's teacher education programs are accredited by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board and by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The curriculum is organized around the theme of "Teachers as Liberators through Education," with course requirements in three areas: liberal studies/general education courses, liberal arts/specialty courses, and the professional studies core.

As an essential component of teacher preparation, the University's General Education/Liberal Studies requirement provides the broad foundation for specialty and professional courses. One of the objectives of the Teacher Education Program calls for "a strong liberal studies foundation which will enable students to think critically, express themselves with clarity, make independent and rational judgments, and become life-long learners."

The Program's Continuous Assessment Plan, required by the Kentucky Department of Education and described in the NCATE self-study, outlines a comprehensive system of performance-based assessments for monitoring the progress of teaching education candidates at different stages of the undergraduate experience. Multiple sources of data have been identified for marking student progress: students' portfolios, grades in individual courses, observations and evaluations of supervised teaching, the overall GPA and scores on the Praxis II exam. Because this assessment plan is essentially a work-in-progress and still in the beginning stages of implementation, sufficient evidence has not yet been obtained with regard to the effectiveness of the various components of the design in ensuring the competency of teacher education graduates to begin their professional roles in K-12 schools.

The pattern of low passing rates of students on the PRAXIS II exam continues to be disappointing for KSU education faculty. In the July 2002 written response to the site visit of the Board of Examiners of the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), conducted in June 2002, teacher education faculty addressed a number of issues relating to the enhancement of the quality of the degree program and to short- term as well as long-term initiatives for significantly improving PRAXIS II test results: (1) realigning and substantially revising curricula to meet the new Kentucky standards for preparation and certification; (2) compliance with standards for admission as articulated by EPSB; (3) evidence of mastery of basic academic skills for all education candidates; (4) development of a comprehensive student database to collect information and drive decision making; (5) a systematic and proactive approach to providing remedial help to students failing the PRAXIS II exam, including a two-credit course; (6) consistency in student advising; (7) alignment of PRAXIS II content with Arts and Sciences teaching specialties (8) preparation of students for the PRAXIS exam; (9) monitoring of field experience and (10) timeline for implementation of the requirement that all students must pass the PRAXIS II test prior to their semester for student teaching.

The Child Development and Family Relations program, within the Division of Education and Human Services, includes both a teaching option and a non-teaching option. As structured, the degree prepares graduates for teaching in pre-school and kindergarten classes, or for employment in related areas of early childhood education and care. The teaching option is also accredited by NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) and by the Kentucky Department of Education as a birth to primary teacher certification program. In the 2000 program review document, faculty reported an enrollment of 30 part-time students and 29 full-time students for fall semester 2000 and 10 graduates for the 1999-2000 academic year. Class size, according to

the Program Review report, averages approximately 23 students in major courses.

Over the past ten years, grant funding from the federal Department of Education has supported various regional and state-wide training initiatives sponsored by program faculty. Currently, this programmatic unit is staffed by one full-time faculty member and adjunct faculty, as needed. It is anticipated that a significant increase in enrollment will occur over the next few years as the demand for college trained preschool teachers, qualified Head Start teachers, and competent early care professionals accelerates in response to federal and state mandates.

Community Colleges and Teacher Education
Connecting community college programs to university teacher education efforts is a fast developing trend in the United States. In addressing the teacher shortage, community colleges bring much to the table. Especially notable are the ability of these colleges to help students with poor academic backgrounds develop needed skills, and their success in attracting and retaining minority students.

Child Development program faculty regard formal program articulation agreements with community colleges as an opportunity for building enrollments in upper division courses. Program faculty have established "2+2" articulation agreement with 3 community colleges. A weekend college format would be an attractive option for community college transfers.

Along with building and sustaining excellence in its Teacher Education Program, KSU should consider new investments in at least two areas: special education and a master's level degree. Currently, there is a critical shortage of special education teachers, especially in urban areas of the United States. A Master of Arts degree in Teaching would enable the university to respond to the advanced training and professional development needs of teachers in its geographical region.

Suggestions

- Raise expectations for student performance by establishing a timeline for implementation of the various components of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan for the Teacher Education Program.
- Ensure mastery of General Education/Liberal Education learning outcomes for higher order thinking skills and advanced oral and written competencies by embedding assessment of these intellectual skills into Teacher Education courses.
- Foster continued collaborations between Arts and Sciences faculty and teacher education faculty to ensure appropriate alignment

between PRAXIS II content and arts and sciences teaching specialties of students.

- Continue to respond, with urgency, to the recommendations for program enhancements from NCATE and the Kentucky Educational Professional Standards Board.
- Develop a minimum of two new degree offerings: a baccalaureate degree in Special Education and a Master of Arts degree in teaching. Both degrees should attract new students into the Teacher Education Program.
- Invest sufficient resources for transforming the Teacher Education Program into a Center of Excellence for the training of future educators for America's urban school environments.
- Examine the feasibility of a weekend college format for serving community college transfers and non-traditional, commuting students over the age of 25 in the Child Development and Family Relations Program.

Professional Studies

Computer and Technical Sciences

This area contains three programs: computer science, which is offered at the baccalaureate level, and three two-year programs, electronics technology, drafting and design technology, and administrative support services.

Computer Science

Observations

The Computer Science program effectively reveals the contradictions that exist at Kentucky State. This is a moderately large program (six faculty in the range of Assistant to full Professor and one Instructor), a large number of majors (over 100 in two tracks, business and mathematics), and an outstanding placement rate. On the other hand, the program lacks accreditation (has never applied for it), struggles to fill faculty vacancies, has only half its regular staff with the doctorate, and, most important, has very few graduates as a proportion of majors—roughly one graduate for every ten majors.

The problems with accreditation, faculty credentials, and hiring are not surprising for a department at a very small university, nor are they debilitating. The weakening of the computer science job market will probably make it easier to find qualified faculty—at least in the short term—and,

based on employment of graduates, the existing faculty appear to be producing a solid product.

What of the attrition problem? The Computer Science report speaks to this problem briefly, "The Program already attracts a lot of students, however, after the freshman and sophomore years many of them do not return for various reasons including poor performance or financial reasons..."[42]

The program's proposed solution to this problem is disturbingly familiar:

> The Program can attract more students through a multi-step process: first, the addition of three new faculty who could offer more sections of popular classes; second, redesign the curriculum to include more Internet based software development courses; third, the upgrade of student and faculty software and hardware; and continue on course to obtain Computer Sciences Accreditation Commission (CSAB) accreditation.[43]

While these changes might be somewhat helpful in attracting more students, that isn't really the most serious concern. Rather, the fundamental problem is that very few of those who choose to major in Computer Science actually go on to graduate from the program. It's not clear that additional resources, at least as described here, will have more than a marginal impact on this central challenge.

Suggestions

- The Computer Science program should conduct a systems analysis to determine why so few of its majors continue on to graduation. The object of the analysis would be to identify problems and develop solutions. It is recognized that some of the problems are certainly outside of the direct purview of the program—e.g. it is very likely that many of those who declare a major in computer science subsequently fail to succeed in mathematics. However, program faculty should not consider that problems elsewhere in the University are beyond their responsibility. The essence of change at Kentucky State will be for faculty in all disciplines to work (and with administrators, of course) together to find ways to ensure that students are successful.
- The Computer Science program should consider asking the University of Kentucky or the University of Louisville, or both, to assist in supporting some of their more specialized upper division courses or to provide additional specialties, in both cases most probably through distance learning. A move in this direction could ease staffing burdens in the program and increase options for students.

[42] *Computer Science Program Review*, (September 29, 2000) p.11.
[43] *Ibid.*

- Once the program has completed its systems analysis and implemented change, the University should consider this area to be a prime candidate for enhancement. The reasons for this are threefold: 1) there is a solid nucleus of quality; 2) even in a weak job market, students with baccalaureate degrees in this area will be successful; and 3) there is an excellent opportunity for synergy with other programs at the University. One opportunity that the program might consider, perhaps in cooperation with the Universities of Kentucky and Louisville, is a focus in computational science. This emerging field, a fusion of computer science, applied mathematics, and the various physical and biological sciences, offers the potential for enormous growth as business, industry, and research enterprises realize the possibilities of computer-based simulation and modeling.

Electronics Technology

Observations

Electronics Technology is a small program, one and a quarter FTE faculty, with excellent placement of graduates and an increasing number of majors (mid-40s). Although the data provided in the academic review are confusing, even in the worst case the graduation rate appears to be reasonably strong.

Suggestions

- Continue to support a successful program. Any growth would require additional faculty, which should be considered in the context of a possible B.S. program in Industrial Technology (see the Design and Drafting section, below).
- Explore the interesting potential of a biomedical technology specialization.

Drafting and Design Technology

Observations

Drafting and Design Technology is also a small program, also with one and a quarter FTE faculty. Placement is excellent, with the program reporting that about 20% of the students take jobs before finishing the degree. The number of majors has varied quite a bit, from the mid-teens to the low-twenties. The graduation rate appears to be good.

Suggestions

- The external review suggests that the University consider moving this program to the B.S. level (as part of a program in Industrial Technology, likely including much of the Electronics Technology curriculum). The reason for this proposal is that community colleges in Kentucky are beginning to take up the demand at the Associate degree level. This is a reasonable suggestion, and the demand at the B.S. level is very likely there, but the University should take such a step only after completion of the overall mission plan.

Administrative Support Services

Observations

Administrative Support Services is in the area of what was recently called secretarial science or something similar. The program has no full-time faculty; there are three to five courses per semester, all taught by adjuncts. Course enrollments average in the mid-teens.

Suggestions

- It is difficult to understand the relevance of a program like this to KSU, especially since there is no reasonable possibility of a baccalaureate in this area. On the other hand, there is reasonable demand. An option might be to ask a neighboring community college to assume responsibility.

Nursing

Observations

KSU's nursing program is currently a two-year, associate degree in nursing rather than a four-year baccalaureate degree nursing program. The associate degree structure provides limited career opportunities for the nursing professional. As such, the two-year degree does not prepare graduates for leadership and administrative roles or for positions in community health nursing. The 73 credits required for completion of the curriculum include 35 credit hours of general education/liberal studies courses. In November 2001, CPE approved the university's proposal for a baccalaureate degree completion program in nursing.

The two-year nursing degree is accredited by two accrediting bodies, the National League for Nursing (NLN) and the Kentucky Board of Nursing (KBN). Continued approval by KBN requires an overall 85% pass rate on the state licensing exam. Approximately 30 students graduate each year.

According to the 2000 external and internal review reports, 70 majors were enrolled in Fall 2000, and 9 full-time faculty and 2 adjunct faculty taught in the program. The student to faculty ratio may seem excessively low, but each faculty member teaches an 8 credit hour course (12 contact hours) or a 10 credit hour course (15 contact hours) each semester. Half of the contact hours take place in the clinical setting, and the Kentucky Board of Nursing has mandated a maximum of 10 students in the clinical setting.

Each semester, both day and evening nursing classes are offered to students who can enroll for full-time or part-time study. With this scheduling format, the program can accommodate students with employment responsibilities.

Two types of collaborative initiatives have been established, one for licensed practical nurses and the other for program completers. For example, the program articulation agreement with Kentucky Technical College-Jefferson State-Shelby County Extension facilities the transfer of Licensed Practical Nursing (LPN) graduates into the second year of the nursing program, following successful completion of a transitional or bridge course. The partnership with Spaulding University, a private institution in Louisville, Kentucky, facilitates the progression of eligible KSU nursing graduates into a baccalaureate weekend college track with junior year status.

A number of program strengths were highlighted in the 2000 academic program review conducted by the external reviewer. Three major concerns were also identified: (1) allocation of an adequate level of funding for updating library holdings in preparation for the 2004 accreditation visit; (2) allocation of sufficient funding for purchasing and maintaining necessary equipment and teaching supplies in support of student and programmatic needs; and (3) the lack of an additional dedicated classroom to avoid conflicts in the scheduling of nursing courses.

Both the internal review and external review reports, prepared in Fall 2000, recommended the addition of a baccalaureate level nursing completion program, the Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing. Under the RN-BSN curriculum, eligible associate degree graduates (Registered Nurses) would be required to complete junior level and senior level nursing courses as well as additional general education/liberal studies

requirements. The BSN completion program would attract not only KSU associate degree graduates, a significant number of whom reside and work in the region, but also licensed RN graduates from other community colleges across the Commonwealth, particularly if a weekend track were to be available.

The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN)[44] views the preparation of nurses at the baccalaureate degree level as the minimum qualification for functioning in professional practice roles. With the baccalaureate degree in nursing and the RN license, graduates of the KSU completion program would be prepared to function with more independence in clinical decision making and in case management and also to practice in a variety of health care settings, including critical care, outpatient care, public health, and mental health. The university catalog identifies nursing as one of the professional careers for which students will be prepared. Until the current associate level nursing program is expanded into a baccalaureate level completion program, KSU will fall short in the delivery of a comprehensive professional nursing program to the citizens of its service area and beyond. The BSN degree completion program will provide educational mobility for nurses trained at the associate degree level.

Suggestions

- Allocate sufficient financial resources to the nursing program and to the library for updating library holdings in preparation for the 2004 accreditation visit by the National League for Nursing.
- Allocate sufficient financial resources to the nursing program for purchasing and maintaining equipment and teaching supplies.
- Continue the two-year associate degree in nursing program. The program meets a community need for entry-level registered nurses (RN's) in hospitals, clinics, state and governmental agencies, nursing homes, and physician offices. Most associate degree students actually begin their nursing education with the goal of attaining a baccalaureate degree.
- Determine cost structures for the implementation of the Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing (BSN), a degree completion program which has already been approved by CPE. Baccalaureate-prepared nurses are trained to assume leadership in the delivery of health care in diverse settings. The BSN is consistent with the vision of the university to prepare students for professional careers and leadership roles.
- Establish a timeline for the implementation of the BSN degree.

[44] http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publicaton/positions/vision.htm

Social Work/ Criminal Justice/ Psychology/ Sociology

Observations

The Division of Criminal Justice and Social Work offers two baccalaureate degrees and is housed in the College of Professional Studies. The Chair of the division has oversight responsibility for both degree programs. These majors provide a solid background for a variety of careers in human and social services organizations and criminal justice and juvenile justice agencies and community organizations. Additionally, the two programs provide support courses for a number of degree programs outside of the division. Finally, the programs prepare students for graduate and professional study.

The undergraduate program in Social Work is designed to prepare graduates for entry level professional social work practice and for leadership roles in service delivery systems. The "generalist perspective" of the curriculum builds on the university's General Education/Liberal Studies core of courses. Graduates are expected to acquire the problem solving knowledge, skills, and values essential for providing quality service to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities with diverse populations. According to the 2000 internal academic program review report, the Social Work degree places special emphasis on "the development of African Americans and other minorities."

Program faculty, in the 2000 internal academic program review document, reported 45 full-time majors for Fall 1999, and an average of 12 graduates yearly between the years of 1997-2000. Faculty positions include 3 full-time faculty and 4 part-time faculty. The most recent accreditation visit of the Council on Social Work Education was conducted in 1995.

A number of partnership agreements currently exist: Child Welfare Certification Program Consortium; HIV/AIDS Certification program with Spaulding University; a distance learning Rehabilitation Counseling Certification program with the University of Kentucky; an Alcohol/Drug Abuse Prevention program with the Morehouse Medical School Consortium; and field practicum opportunities for students within government agencies and social services agencies.

Institutionalization of an assessment instrument for documenting student and program outcomes was one of the recommendations for

program enhancements proposed by the Social Work program external reviewer in the 2000 academic program review report.

The Criminal Justice Program offers students, particularly African American students, pathways to employment in criminal justice and related careers. Objectives of the Criminal Justice Program include: (1) preparing students for careers in criminal justice at the local, state, and federal levels; (2) preparing students to assume professional positions in Kentucky's law enforcement, corrections, and court related state and local agencies; and (3) providing opportunities for state government employees to continue their human service or public service education.

According to data provided in the 2000 internal academic program review report, 111 majors were enrolled in Fall 1999, and 25 graduates were awarded degrees in Spring 2000. Three full-time faculty have been allocated to the Criminal Justice program.

The following recommendations for program enhancements were among those presented by the external reviewers in October 2000: (1) adoption of minimum standards of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS)[45] for developing a continuous program improvement plan for the degree; (2) modification of curricular requirements to include core courses in both criminal justice and juvenile justice processes, as recommended by ACJS; (3) examination of the feasibility of cross-listing of a number of courses within the division as well as with other departments outside of the division; and (4) expansion of internships and linkages with community criminal justice programs as well as with organizations serving at-risk youth.

The Sociology undergraduate degree was recommended for discontinuation following the 2000 academic program review because of a consistent pattern of low productivity with regard to number of majors and graduates in recent years. As the university follows through with this recommendation, faculty should determine the primary role of a smaller complement of Sociology courses. All other Sociology courses could then be deactivated. For example, would the smaller complement of Sociology courses contain the Principles of Sociology course for inclusion in the General Education/Liberal Studies core? What specific Sociology courses would be appropriate to support the Criminal Justice and Social Work curricula?

[45] http://www.acjs.org/new

Suggestions

- Formulate articulation agreements with Kentucky community colleges to bolster enrollments in upper division courses of the Criminal Justice and Social Work degree programs.
- Implement a comprehensive assessment plan for documenting student learning outcomes and program effectiveness in the Social Work and Criminal Justice degree programs.
- Ensure mastery of General Education/Liberal Studies learning outcomes for higher order thinking skills and advanced oral and written competencies by embedding assessment of these intellectual skills into Criminal Justice and Social Work courses.
- Adopt minimum standards of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences to raise the level of program quality and student achievement in the Criminal Justice degree program.
- Ensure a balance of courses in the five core areas identified by ACJS for the baccalaureate Criminal Justice curriculum.
- Expand internship opportunities in community criminal justice programs and also in programs emphasizing at-risk youth.
- Establish a timeline and action steps for completing the phase out process for the Sociology undergraduate degree.
- Determine the role of Sociology courses in the university's degree offerings. Reduce the number of existing Sociology courses accordingly.
- Examine the feasibility of cross-listing selected Criminal Justice and Social Work courses in the curricula of other departments.

Business and Public Affairs

Business

Observations

The School of Business is a significant part of the academic community at Kentucky State University. It currently offers only the baccalaureate degree in business administration. Students are prepared to enter professional careers in accounting, business administration, management and marketing. The School of Business is accredited by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs.

There are fourteen academic lines attached to the School of Business. The teaching faculty is augmented in the classroom through the limited use of adjuncts. All earning tenure faculty have the appropriate degrees for business related instruction.

The School of Business is located in the west end of the Bradford building. Two faculty members share an office and one faculty member shares a three-person office. Most business classes are taught in the east wing of the Bradford building which as last renovated in 1989. The School offers an extensive evening schedule of classes (after 5 PM). The School is given very limited classroom space to teach these courses.

Because of high teaching loads, School of Business faculty have a noticeable weakness in instructional development, applied and basic scholarship. The standard teaching load for business faculty is four courses with three preparations across two disciplines. This high teaching load will make the recruitment and retention of new young faculty a very difficult process. The recruitment of tenured business faculty is a very competitive process.

Student enrollment in the School of Business is approximately 18-20% of the total university. There are 250—300 students who have declared business as a major and an equal number of students who desire to become a business major. The School of Business graduates about 20 % of KSU's total four-year graduates.

Suggestions

- The School of Business should develop a major in management information systems through a partnership with the Department of Computer Science.
- All full-time, tenure earning faculty members in the School should have individual offices.
- The School of Business should develop two plus two articulation agreements with community/junior colleges KSU service area.
- KSU must upgrade the availability of technology to support academic instruction and research in the School of Business.
- The School of Business should begin the process of implementing a Master's level degree. The School should explore the options leading to a Master of Business Administration or a specialized master degree in management or a related functional area of business.
- The School of Business, given its geographical location, should explore a joint masters degree program with the School of Public Administration.

- The School of Business is accredited by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs. However, the School should strive for accreditation by AACSB International through the candidacy process. AACSB International is the leading accreditation body for Colleges of Business. The membership includes over 450 leading business schools

Public Administration

Observations

The School of Public Administration grants the Bachelor of Arts in Public Administration and a Masters of Public Administration. The masters program is described in other sections of this report.

The undergraduate program has low enrollment. Faculty, staff and resource issues must be addressed if the BA program is to have a chance to grow. Most universities do not offer an undergraduate degree in public administration instead they offer a certificate program. Also, there are no existing National Association of Public Affairs and Admininstration (NASPAA) guidelines for bachelor degree programs in public administration.

Suggestions

- The School of Public Administration should create a task force to study the possibility of implementing a joint program with the School of Business. The students could enroll in the business core courses and take their electives in public administration.

- The School of Public Administration should develop noncredit, certificate and summer institute programs for public employees in its service area.

- The undergraduate program should be repositioned as an evening program to attract governmental employees.

Graduate Programs

Observations

Currently, there are two active graduate degree programs at Kentucky State University. Both programs grant the Master's degree. The graduate degrees are the Masters in Public Administration and the Masters in Aquaculture/Aquatic Sciences.

The Master of Public Administration has an enrollment of 149 students and the Masters in Aquaculture has an enrollment of 12 students. Additionally, graduate students from other universities are enrolled in an online course in fish genetics. Each of the programs, given increased administrative and financial support, has substantial growth potential. However, it should be noted that the Aquaculture faculty has a strong desire to keep graduate student enrollment to a limited number and maintain its focus/status as a research faculty not a teaching faculty. An class size of 25-30 students might be achievable, however.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky has outlined a seven county service area for Kentucky State University. The University has a golden opportunity to expand its graduate offerings through enhanced graduate degree programs, online courses with the Kentucky Virtual University, credit and noncredit instruction. The two most logical program areas in which to increase graduate instruction would be in the College of Business and College of Professional Studies. Currently, there is no full or part time MBA or other graduate business degree offered by a public institution in KSU's service area.

A graduate degree in education coupled with a teacher's certificate program appears to be an attractive academic offering. Teachers could pursue the degree on a part time basis during the regular academic year. During the summer months, a full time offering would be very attractive to K-12 teachers and administrators. The Review Team recognizes that the University has an initial priority on strengthening the undergraduate program, but believes that this process should occur with the opportunity of a graduate program in mind.

Kentucky State University must develop a centralized administrative and academic unit to implement, coordinate and support graduate education. Currently, there is no coordinating authority for graduate education. Each academic unit is free to explore and act as "independent entrepreneurs." The academic units have total administrative control and academic responsibility for graduate programs. While maintaining academic control is important, for reasons of consistency of policy and quality, the administrative function should not be the responsibility of

each academic unit. Consistent with a coherent overall plan, KSU must work to build a cohesive graduate operation.

Suggestions

- KSU must create a centralized coordinating unit for graduate education.

- The following should be considered, where appropriate, in cooperation with the Kentucky Virtual University:

    - KSU should take full advantage of its service area and introduce a series of graduate educational opportunities.

    - KSU should begin a feasibility study to determine the appropriate graduate opportunities that exist in its service area.

    - KSU should explore opportunities for the introduction of graduate certificate programs, online courses, and credit and noncredit courses.

    - KSU should explore partnerships with other public/ private institutions in the Commonwealth to expand graduate education.

    - KSU, through the Aquaculture program, has a golden opportunity to develop a series of Internet-based graduate courses. A certificate program would have global appeal.

- Kentucky State University must develop a timeline for a decision to begin planning and coordinating the introduction of appropriate graduate programs. The planning and strategic thinking process should include but not be limited to: student recruitment, staffing, location of classes, coordinating authority as well as procedures for approval for new graduate offering from the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education.

Library and Information Technology

Observations

A university library exists to support the academic mission of its institution, and the Blazer Library has a qualified staff that is eager to fulfill that role. Frequent administrative turnover, however--especially in the position of Vice President for Academic Affairs--and a recent interim library director have created an environment of uncertainty in the library. Lack of clarity in KSU's mission and priorities, combined with years of a static library budget, have made it difficult for the library to offer the kinds of rich collections and user-oriented service programs that a strong university needs.

Blazer Library's well-documented budget problems have resulted in repeated assurances of increased funding that have not materialized. Library expenditures as a percentage of University E&G expenditures fell from 3.9% in 1989/1990 to 2.65% in 1995/1996, and to 1.3% in 2001/2002, the lowest among the budget benchmarking peers.

The library budget has benefited tremendously from Title III support for collections, positions, and equipment. Grant monies, however, cannot be considered a stable source of funding, especially for costs that are ongoing, and their use has resulted in an incomplete view of the library's budget needs. For example, Title III currently supports all of Blazer Library's electronic-resource purchases, an expenditure which can now constitute from 10% to 30% or more of an academic library's materials budget.

Private fundraising efforts for the library have been virtually nonexistent. The Grenzebach-Glier report suggested funding levels for library naming opportunities, but the lowest level was priced at $100,000. It appears that no action has been taken in seeking potential donors.

Partnership in the Kentucky Virtual Library is an excellent investment that has made a wealth of basic electronic resources available to the KSU community at a reasonable cost. Typically, academic libraries supplement statewide electronic projects with additional purchases of specialized databases for teaching, learning, and research at their own institutions. Blazer Library lacks funding for the ongoing costs of even key databases (such as JSTOR or Web of Science for liberal-arts programs).

Faculty and students have noted that subject coverage in the library collections is uneven and that materials lack currency. The majority of the Blazer Library materials budget is already committed to payment for standing orders, and the limited funds remaining for new acquisitions are usually devoted by necessity to whatever disciplines are coming up for accreditation. All library professionals share collection development duties, in consultation with faculty, but Blazer lacks a permanent collection manager; previous Title III support for such a position was eliminated this year. It appears that the faculty would like to take over the selection role.

Library support for potential new academic programs is assessed, but funding has not been added to the library budget to address identified deficiencies. Master's-level programs, in particular, require greater depth of coverage but have been launched without appropriate library support.

The development of the collections budget must take into account the current environment of scholarly communication and commercial publishing. The availability of electronic resources does not mean that libraries can achieve substantial savings by eliminating print purchases; libraries will need to support the dual print/electronic mode for years to come. Not only is the universe of publications expanding, but publications costs—especially for scholarly journals—increase annually at often exorbitant rates, while double-digit inflation erodes the purchasing power of the dollar.

Information technology has expanded the range of resources and services that an academic library can offer. Lack of funding, however, limits Blazer Library not only in additional database purchases, but also in professional staff who can produce new services to help library users. Maximizing the potential of information technology also requires a robust infrastructure with appropriate hardware, software, and technical support that is now lacking.

Some problem areas have been documented in the past but are not yet resolved. Blazer Library is unable to come to standard on required elements of its programs, including the state-mandated records and retention function and the federal depository program. The library has yet to hire an archivist to initiate the records and retention program and has been cited by the state auditor for this lapse. It is unclear whether the position, frozen since 1991, is still considered a vacant library position, and the University general counsel has had to perform some tasks relating to records and retention. In addition, Blazer Library is on probationary status with the U.S. depository program for inadequate staffing for its government documents depository. Loss of depository

status would deprive Blazer of its main current source of free, up-to-date materials.

The Curriculum and Instructional Technology Center has a very good collection of textbooks and educational materials, most obtained free through its repository status with the State Textbook Commission. It is rapidly running out of space, however, for materials and instructional technology equipment.

Space in the Blazer Library is adequate for its current enrollment and level of operation. Increases in factors such as enrollment, acquisitions rate, media and computer equipment, and staff, however, will all affect the capacity of the physical facility. Blazer Library's current facility is being diminished by use of its space for temporary faculty offices and for a listening lab. In addition, the quality of library space is affected by deferred maintenance, and problems with HVAC create an environment that is not conducive for library use or for preservation of materials. Lack of security staff could pose potential problems, especially for late-night patrons.

In the area of personnel, library faculty appear to be well respected on campus and play an active role in the academic life of the KSU faculty; their professional development activities are encouraged and financially supported. The interim University administration is supportive of the library administration and has set the stage for a renewed sense of commitment by library staff to KSU.

Salaries for library faculty and support staff have been very low compared with those offered by KSU's sister institutions in the state, often lower than those paid by community colleges or public libraries. Once hired and trained, new employees often leave for more lucrative positions, constituting a drain on time, effort, and morale of those who remain. Lack of staffing has resulted in the frequent use of professionals to perform support staff tasks or to cover duties of other positions, which has contributed to the turnover rate. Recent efforts to increase the number of library faculty and to raise the minimum professional salary are steps in the right direction, although the beginning salary is still comparatively low. Recruitment and retention of top candidates are especially difficult when national studies show that librarianship is an ageing profession, with fewer new recruits to the field and fierce competition from high-tech corporations for remaining candidates, especially those with experience and strengths in information technology and other specialized areas. On campus, salaries for library faculty (for 12 months) are not comparable to those paid to teaching faculty (for 9 months). It appears that insufficient funding for library faculty

sometimes affects a librarian's ability to be promoted to a higher rank requiring higher pay.

In terms of organizational structure, some library functions seem to be duplicated in other units on campus. For example, instructional technology functions and equipment are in both Blazer Library and elsewhere on campus. The Aquaculture faculty are establishing a "satellite library" of aquaculture resources, including personal faculty subscriptions to journals. Reliance on personal subscriptions to journals is to be avoided, because there is no guarantee of permanence of the resources and there is no access to those resources through the online catalog for the rest of the campus.

Inadequacies in the University's administrative infrastructure are affecting the library's ability to function efficiently (e.g., because of delays in fixing problems with computers or physical facilities). The lack of coin-operated printers in Blazer means that the library is losing a potential source of revenue to offset its equipment costs, while spending part of its operating budget to subsidize student printing. Delays in processing payment of library purchase orders have led to loss of Title III monies in the past.

KSU has an opportunity to make its library an additional reason for faculty, students, and staff to want to come to KSU to teach, learn, and work. A strong library is the cornerstone of an outstanding university--with strong collections, service programs, and staff, Blazer Library can help increase faculty productivity and produce students who can function effectively in the increasingly digital, global environment.

Suggestions

- As KSU confirms its mission and priorities, continue to integrate the library into the University planning process so it can develop collections and services that best support the academic program. Ensure follow-up mechanisms for the allocation of funding and implementation of goals. This includes ensuring that curricular changes are accompanied by not only a review of library adequacy but also the allocation of funds, if needed. Increases in enrollment must also consider their impact on the library, including the need to increase (enrollment-based) funding for the Kentucky Virtual Library and the potential need for more library faculty to instruct and assist students. Expanding evening, weekend, and distance education classes may also required additional library staff support.

- The determination of quantitative figures for an optimal library budget or collection size will take some time to calculate. No numerical national standards exist for the size of a university library budget or for its collection size, and the library profession is dropping previous quantitative standards in favor of qualitative ones. For example, several KSU reports mentioned a library standard of library expenditures' being 6% of a university's E&G; that figure has been eliminated from the latest version of the standards and replaced with language recommending an "appropriate" level of funding (ACRL Standards for College Libraries, 2000). For universities of KSU's size, there is no national organization (comparable to the Association of Research Libraries for large institutions) that compiles data and ranks libraries according to specific variables such as budget and collection size.

  Because the library is an academic support unit, these amounts cannot be arrived at on their own. Rather, they must follow the university's confirmation of its mission, goals, and priorities. Similarly, the selection of appropriate benchmarking peers for the library depends on the university's determination of the kind of institution it is (size of enrollment, program priorities, etc.). For example, the cost of collections support will vary greatly by disciplines (with science/engineering/technology being the most expensive) and by program level (with graduate programs requiring more in-depth support). The amount allocated to the library budget will also be limited by the ongoing funding available in the total university budget and by competing demands for monies within the institution.

  Once the university has taken those first steps, the library administration can develop management data needed to estimate budget and collections needs. This will include looking at the budget benchmarking peers and possibly other COPLAC institutions, land-grant universities, and HBCUs to select those most similar to KSU, but with the kind of funding support and the kind of libraries that KSU would wish to attain. Once institutions are selected, a useful Web-based tool for quick data analyses is the NCES Academic Library Peer Comparison Tool (http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/libraries/academicpeer/index.asp). In addition, the ACRL standards (http://www.ala.org/acrl/guides/college.html#budget) include lists of suggested input and output measures from which the Blazer library administration can select pertinent tools for comparative data.

- Follow up on the 1997-1999 self-study's recommendation of developing an "institutionally reliant" library budget, to gain a

realistic idea of the state appropriations it would take to support Blazer Library (treat Title III as supplemental funding). Include costs of equipment maintenance and replacement.

- Explore additional sources of state funding for the library. For example, it appears that library is not receiving its share of overhead research funds or a portion of the student technology fee.

- Explore additional avenues of private fundraising and grant-seeking. If the University determines that the library should be a priority for development activities, it would be advisable to pursue fund-raising at more affordable levels. For example, establish individual collections endowments at $10,000 each, or create a general collections endowment into which smaller donations to the library can be placed and begin generating interest income. Consider fundraising from other sources (e.g., senior class or alumni gifts). While Friends of the Library programs can help to generate donations, they can also be expensive to maintain and should only be undertaken after analyzing costs and benefits. Continue pursuit of library grants.

- The library should take the lead in devising more user-oriented services, once it achieves more stability with a full complement of staff. If KSU aspires to cutting-edge library services and makes it an institutional priority, it must fund qualified staff, equipment, and infrastructure to implement them. With appropriate funding and knowledge of what students and faculty most need (perhaps via focus groups), the library can determine its own priorities. Diverse and exciting possibilities for new services exist, ranging from high-tech reference help to offering an 800 number for distance education students, or simply promoting reference assistance via e-mail and fax. Introducing an on-campus document delivery service (e.g., to send photocopies of articles or books quickly and directly to a faculty member's campus address) may help to inhibit efforts to decentralize holdings in academic departments.

- Collection management deserves special attention. Continuing the liaison program between library and teaching faculty is invaluable for ensuring the active participation of teaching faculty and researchers in the selection of library materials. It is the responsibility of a professional collection manager, however, to oversee the growth of the collections as a whole (with knowledge of not only traditional print publishing but also rapidly growing electronic offerings), manage the collections budget, and conduct analyses of the collections (e.g., journal use and costs, for cancellation projects). The elimination of Title III funding for this position leaves a critical gap on the library

staff, and high priority should be given to establishing a permanent position for a full-time collection manager.

- Continue efforts to improve and preserve library space. "The library as place" is an important concept; an academic library has the potential to serve as a vibrant crossroads of intellectual and social interaction among faculty, students, and staff. Expanded applications of information technology will require additional wiring for networked connections throughout the building. Improve library security, whether with permanent library security staff for late hours or, at the least, by having campus police patrol the library during those times.

- Continue efforts to address the problem of recruitment and retention by increasing minimum salaries of library faculty and maintaining salary equity. Despite recent increases in the total number of professional positions, vacancies caused by high turnover and position freezes have resulted in an existing staff that is stretched thin, while operations in certain areas (e.g., archives, government documents) are essentially at a standstill.

- Revive the University Library Committee as an active advisory group to the library director on matters of library policy. Make its role in ensuring compliance with SACS criteria a secondary one and not its primary purpose, and establish a regular meeting schedule. With leadership by teaching faculty committed to the strengthening of Blazer Library, the committee could serve as an invaluable aid in administrative decision making and campus communications.

- Update and maintain library management data, including budget data (proportions spent on collections, personnel, and operating expenses) and usage statistics (e.g., of electronic databases). Develop ratio data pertinent to KSU, using suggested measures in the Association for College and Research Libraries' 2000 standards (e.g., ratio of volumes added per year to combined student/faculty FTE, or ratio of computer workstations to combined student/faculty FTE). Update and maintain comparative, same-year data with appropriate peers. Following the University's confirmation of mission and priorities, update plans for library staff hiring, including projections of level of position and salary, and relationship to University goals.

- Investigate ways to achieve organizational efficiencies by integrating similar functions within the University. For example, explore the possibility of merging instructional technology support services.

- Explore ways to improve the campus administrative infrastructure. For example, consider installing coin-operated printers in Blazer Library or instituting an "all-campus" type of debit card that can be used with library equipment as well as elsewhere on campus; improve University processing of purchase orders to ensure timely payment.

Part 4 Planning, Assessment and Institutional Research

Observations

The knowledge that could be gathered on the site visit regarding the areas of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research was minimal. Due to the lateness of the requests for interviews, sickness, and other unknown difficulties, many of the people best able to describe the status of the University in these areas were unavailable. These included the Director of Assessment and Evaluation, Director of Testing, Director of University Advancement, and members of the University Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Institutional Effectiveness Research Team. Those who were available, such as the Vice President for Academic Affairs, were recently hired and did not have much knowledge of the historical context or day-to-day operations; it should be emphasized, however that these individuals were extremely helpful and worked hard to provide the Review Team with materials and information.

Some of the individuals who have been involved in this area for a long time were quite helpful, as was the relatively new Director of Institutional Research.

The location of the Institutional Research office in the Student Affairs division is quite unusual, though there may have been good historical and personnel reasons to place it there at one time. Faculty and others are less likely to be comfortable with data from an office reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs than from one reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the President.

Similarly, the location of the Assessment and Evaluation office under the Vice President for Advancement is odd at best and undermines the trust of faculty and others in the objectivity of its work, regardless of how sound or fair the work itself is.

Turnover in the Institutional Research office historically has been a problem. The current director, though relatively new and inexperienced, seems conversant with the area and able to deal with the tasks that lie ahead.

The Fact Book produced by Institutional Research is online and extensive. While such documents can always be improved, this one is very well done, especially given the resources available at such a small university.

Whether turnover in the Assessment office is a problem is not known due to the absence of the director. From the documents received it appears that there has been less turnover in that position than in Institutional Research.

Several self-study documents produced in the past, particularly the Academic Program Review of 2000 , were quite well done. These include the 1997-99 Institutional Self-Study Report and the response to the report of the SACS Visiting Team after their March 29 – April 1, 1999 visit.

In addition to the Institutional Self-Study, the Comprehensive Assessment and Evaluation Plan adopted in October 1989 and revised in December, 1998 was a fine piece of work. It stated comprehensively what should be happening on campus and who was responsible for what, including a calendar of assessment surveys. Our visit discovered little evidence of follow-up and people being held accountable for following through on the goals of that report.

The Strategic and Operational Plan, Meeting the Millennium–2001-2005, dated October 23, 2000, very thoroughly lays out a plan of action for the entire institution. It may have been overly ambitious. In any case, there was little evidence of follow-through during our visit.

Section III of the 1997-99 Institutional Self-Study is the one that has most of the information about assessment and institutional research, though Section IV, noted below, has one part aimed at student learning of certain critical basic skills. Even sub-areas of assessment such as general education, student affairs, and other support services are addressed in Section III. While that section of the Self-Study was well written, it also pointed out some of the shortcomings of assessment data-gathering and especially usage at the University. A general description might be, "It is a mile wide and an inch deep." While there was a lot of paper produced before the Self-Study, there is little evidence of substantive discussions or use of data for decision-making purposes prior to that time or since then. In addition, entire units failed to participate in the data-gathering exercises, and those that went on at the institutional level, such as the Rising Junior examination, had so little participation as to make the results questionable. Some portion of the University community, when pressed, seems to be going through the motions, but little appears to be happening underneath the surface.

Perhaps the greatest shortcoming for assessment and institutional research at the University is the apparent lack of a culture of evidence, as mentioned earlier. Even where good, solid data do exist, such as those produced in the Fact Book, they do not seem to get integrated into the decision-making processes. Few people interviewed could come up with examples of how data and studies undergirded decisions. It is not clear how decisions are made, but a rational decision-making process based on data and other information does not appear to be part of the picture. One of the first questions external reviewers must ask is, what is the evidence of a feedback loop, of data supporting decisions? There did not seem to be much.

Suggestions

- Place both Institutional Research and Assessment in a unit that has University-wide responsibility, preferably in the President's office or that of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This should help protect the integrity of data gathered, as well as increase the confidence of others in their validity. These offices still need to serve a support function to all units on the campus

- Provide professional development opportunities to those working in Assessment and Institutional Research. Good ideas for program improvement can be garnered by sharing what one does and seeing what others do.

- Salaries in the area of assessment and institutional research must be competitive. Job opportunities are especially good for those with a few years of experience. Comparisons to the salary levels of incumbents in similar positions at peer universities are available annually in the *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

- Part of the negotiations between the President and vice presidents and the units reporting to them, including the colleges and departments, must be a consideration of how data are being used to make decisions. If budget allocations and salaries were based in part on performance in using data to support decisions, the University would be a better-managed organization. If administrators required supporting data before they would consider proposals for budget adjustments, there would be better data gathering and use. The problem is not that there are not enough data available in the University; there may even be too much in some areas. The problem is getting and using the most appropriate data to address the issues

being considered. This can and should be done at little additional cost to the University.

- When administrators, faculty, and staff are held accountable (e.g., through the annual reporting process), then a culture of evidence and accountability will develop. Documentation of results should be provided and stored for future reference (i.e., for future institutional and disciplinary self-studies). Less "gearing up" for site visits will be necessary in the future as a result.

- Consistent with the above, funding requests submitted to the CPE or others should include supporting data. All new program proposals, as an example, should be supported by needs assessments that suggest a sufficient audience for the programs.

- In the planning and assessment efforts, begin small and expect performance on one or two matters per unit. The size of the University and workloads of the faculty and administrators are such that overly ambitious plans are destined for failure. It is much better to have a few small, measurable successes than ambitious goals that are inherently unreachable.

Part 5 Leadership

In Kentucky State University, the Review Team found an institution that has floundered in recent years and now faces significant fiscal and effective leadership challenges. Overall, the team is convinced that effective leadership for KSU must result from the collaborative efforts of the Board of Regents and the President. This sentiment was anticipated in *2020 Vision: An Agenda for Kentucky's System of Postsecondary Education* with the following quotation: "Institutional governing boards and campus leadership will bring about the changes necessary to transform Kentucky's individual postsecondary education institutions into a coherent system of institutions that are distinguished among their peers." In the Kentucky system, KSU needs to continue to build and maintain a strong Board of Regents that is aggressive, policy oriented, analytical, data driven, and influential with the Kentucky Legislature. Hence, *the Review Team suggests that the Board of Regents continue to embrace its joint leadership role with the President for developing and setting institutional policies and aggressively working for institutional progress through an analytical, data-driven approach.*

In talking to several members of the Board of Regents, the Review Team learned that the board's recent history has been one of great division and extreme discord. We were told that for much of one recent year virtually every vote was split six to five. One current board member even referred to the board as "dysfunctional." A fractious board is unlikely to serve an effective partnership with the President to provide the sound continuous leadership that is needed.

- *Hence, the Review Team suggests that the Board of Regents formulate definitive plans for its continuous development.*

Such a development plan might include periodically scheduled Board retreats with a facilitator who is skilled in teambuilding as well as workshops on effective governance led by a facilitator from the Association of Governing Boards or someone with similar skills and experience. Also, The University may consider using the services offered by the Kentucky Institute for Effective Governance.

The interviews and documents reviewed by the Review Team revealed seven changes in the presidency at KSU since 1978. During that same time period, there have also been numerous changes in other key leadership positions such as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Vice

President for Business. The latter two positions would be critical in the establishment of schedules, processes, and procedures for such important functions as planning, assessment, and budgeting which the Review Team found to have deficiencies. Hence, the Review Team suggests that the Board of Regents take immediate steps to rectify the leadership instability at KSU.

- *Following the current planned period of leadership by an interim President, the Regents should provide competent, sensitive, "permanent" leadership for KSU as soon as possible.*

The Review Team found that KSU suffers from the lack of a common interpretation of its mission by its various constituent groups and the resulting lack of consensus on a clear vision for the direction of the institution. This has led to internal strife within the faculty, between the faculty and the administration, within the Board of Regents, and even within the ranks of the alumni. Agreement on the meaning of the mission and the vision for the institution by key supporters is a necessary condition for the progress of KSU.

- *The Review Team suggests, therefore, that the Regents partner with the permanent President to lead the various constituent groups, including the Council on Postsecondary Education, of the institution through a process that arrives at consensus on the mission of the institution..*

This process should specifically address the three competing elements of the current mission statement--"liberal arts" versus "HBCU" versus "land grant," and the racial undertones that seem to pervade much of the thinking at the institution.

The Review Team believes that effective leadership for KSU will have to result from the collaborative efforts of the President and the Regents. Specifically, the Regents will have to provide some critical support to the new administration after the permanent President has been hired. At a minimum, the Regents must provide timely constructive feedback on the President's performance and set guidelines for the regular evaluation of other senior administrators.

- *Hence, the Review Team suggests that the Regents develop and implement an appropriate evaluation system for the President. The Review Team also suggests that the Regents direct the permanent President to develop an appropriate evaluation system for senior administrators. Also, The University may consider using the services offered by the Kentucky Institute for Effective Governance.*

To assure consistency of vision and approach within the administration, appropriate standards of performance should also be established for middle management. *The Review Team further suggests, therefore, that the Regents require the permanent President to develop and implement a professional development program for middle management at the University.*

The Review Team gained insight from a number of documents including the Academic Program Review, the MGT Management Study, and several SACS Self-Study documents. Several of them appeared to have been very carefully and thoughtfully done. The team found that the recommendations from these studies, for the most part, had not been implemented, or none of the interviewees could state with certainly which ones had been implemented.

- *The team suggests, therefore, that the Regents work with the interim President, Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government Association to begin immediately to develop policies and procedures for addressing issues raised in the Academic Program Review and in the report of the General Education Task Force, and for implementing a comprehensive assessment system and a decentralized budgeting process that is linked to planning, assessment, and evaluation.*

Part 6 Administrative organization

The Review Team learned about several organizational anomalies that are probably detracting from KSU's efficiency and effectiveness. First, as noted above, the Office of Assessment and Evaluation reports to the Vice President for Advancement rather than to the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the President. The Assessment and Evaluation function should be broadly focused to cover every aspect of the University and the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs are usually the leadership positions that have the broadest view of the institution and the widest coverage. Certainly, the President is ultimately responsible for the entire institution. The Vice President for Academic Affairs is responsible for the University's core and largest component. There would appear to be a greater danger of the Assessment and Evaluation function's being treated as a lower institutional priority when located outside one of these two offices.

- *Hence, the Review Team suggests that KSU move the Office of Assessment and Evaluation to either the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Office of the President.*

The second organizational anomaly is that the Office of Institutional Research reports to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Traditionally, the greatest use of an office of institutional research is to provide data and analysis on various aspects of the institution's academic operations. Such an office, then, would probably be better situated to be responsive and helpful if located in the Division of Academic Affairs.

- *The Review Team suggests, therefore, that the Office of Institutional Research be relocated to the Division of Academic Affairs.*

Third, the Review Team learned that the University's Title III operation is managed through the Office of the Vice President for Advancement. Since Title III funds are intended to provide for the general strengthening of the institution, it would seem that this operation would more appropriately be placed in either the Office of the President or the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Additionally, moving Title III and the Office of Assessment and Evaluation from this division would allow the Vice President for Advancement to more effectively focus on advancement efforts and initiatives. This is especially critical given that the financial pressures on KSU are not likely to abate in the near future. Apart from enrollment growth, increased private support is believed to represent the greatest potential source of increased revenues for the University.

- *Hence, the Review Team suggests that KSU move its Title III operation under the management of either the President or the Vice President for Academic Affairs.*

Additionally, the Review Team discovered that the University's relationship with Kentucky State University Foundation is counterproductive and results in strained relationships between the two organizations. One would expect this situation to have a negative impact on donors and potential donors. This matter was discussed with the Board of Regents and it was acknowledged that the situation must be remedied. It will undoubtedly require effort on the part of the Board, but there also needs to be a senior administrator who has day-to-day responsibility for interaction with the Foundation. In light of the current schism, one can anticipate that the President will need to devote attention to this issue. However, once the relationship is repaired, it would be more appropriate for the Vice President for Advancement to have the ongoing interaction with the Foundation.

- *The Review Team suggests, therefore, that the KSU President and Board of Regents work together to establish a cooperative and beneficial working relationship with the KSU Foundation.*

As suggested above and elsewhere in the report, there is a glaring need for increased enrollment at KSU. The infrastructure is in place to support it, the program offerings appear to be of the type that would appeal to a broader audience, and the institution clearly needs the extra revenue a larger enrollment would bring. In order to achieve this, however, there must be a senior University official charged with the responsibility for recruiting the best possible students. At other institutions, this official typically is referred to as the enrollment manager. The effort requires a coordinated focus on admissions, financial aid (including tuition discounting), overall net revenue targets, and the student qualities sought for desired classroom and student life activities. When this issue was raised at KSU, the response suggested that the concept has not been implemented at the University.

- *Hence, the Review Team suggests that the establishment of an enrollment management function, with adequate resources, be made a high priority at the University.*

Finally, the Review Team learned of concerns regarding the level of support for information technology at the University—both administrative and with respect to instructional technology. The recent self-study addresses issues regarding instructional technology and the need for changes in the way such technology is deployed within the

University. If the steps detailed in the self-study are implemented, we believe this situation will be greatly improved. There is little mention, however, of issues related to administrative information technology.

KSU's administrative operations currently are served by a package software solution. The systems in place represent dated technology, which the University finds difficult to maintain. Although the particular package being used has the capability to provide much greater utility, KSU is unable to take advantage of it because of resource constraints. The net result is that the overall cost for the systems and their ongoing support represents a significant expense for the University. Rather than continue to attempt to meet its administrative information technology needs through self-operation, the Review Team recommends that KSU explore outsourcing arrangements with one of the two doctoral institutions in the state. Both the Universities of Kentucky and Louisville have sophisticated administrative information technology divisions that would be capable of supporting KSU's needs. Although it would have to be demonstrated through a formal cost analysis, the Review Team believes that significantly enhanced services could be received for the same or less than what is being invested currently.

- *Hence, the Review Team suggests that KSU carefully investigate the feasibility of outsourcing its administrative information functions.*

Part 7 Budget

Observations and Suggestions

Young Hall

A major concern on the part of the University is the current physical condition of Young Hall, a men's dormitory on the campus. Along with two other academic buildings, Young Hall was mentioned specifically in the Partnership Agreement referenced earlier. Unlike the two academic buildings, which have been (or are in the process of being) renovated, Young Hall remains in substandard condition. KSU officials contend that the Commonwealth has not met its obligations under the Partnership Agreement since no funds have been provided to address the deficiencies. Because the Commonwealth has policies requiring that institutional funds be used to address auxiliary facilities needs, CPE has authorized KSU to issue debt for Young Hall repairs and renovations.

The Commonwealth's policies in this instance appear to be clear, but they prevent the Commonwealth from satisfying the commitment it made in the Partnership Agreement. Based on a preliminary analysis of the financial operations of the KSU dormitory system, there appears to be no capacity to issue additional debt unless significant additional revenue sources can be identified. Although it might be possible to increase student rents if the facility is upgraded, it is believed that this would not provide sufficient funds to pay the debt service that would result from the renovation effort. Assuming this preliminary analysis is confirmed by specialists in the student housing field, it is the Review Team's recommendation that the Commonwealth find a way to make an exception to existing policies to provide the resources needed to renovate Young Hall—either through direct funding or by providing increased appropriation to cover the necessary debt service.

Land Grant Appropriations Match

The University believes that the Commonwealth has failed to provide the funds needed to match appropriations received as a result of KSU's land-grant status. The terms of the land-grant programs require that funds provided by the federal government be matched with other resources. More

specifically, the terms of the program require that matching funds be additive. In other words, resources already provided and otherwise available cannot be designated as matching funds to satisfy the program requirements.

Because the appropriation process under benchmark funding does not identify matching funds separately, KSU staff believe that the Commonwealth has failed to meet its commitments. CPE staff contend that the requirements have been met because the base funding level, established when the benchmark funding approach was adopted, already include the required matching funds.

It is important to note that the Commonwealth's higher education funding philosophy provides significant flexibility to individual campuses. The appropriation is provided as a single amount and the campuses have flexibility in allocating it to meet their mission objectives.

The CPE staff indicated that the matching funds have been provided as part of the base appropriation since 1982. Given that the initial allocation under benchmark funding, as well as subsequent allocations, begins with the historical base, the land-grant match is being provided by the Commonwealth. Various documents were provided by CPE to demonstrate how the Commonwealth has met its responsibilities. With the exception of a two-year period (FY 2001 and FY 2002), it appears that KSU has received sufficient funding to satisfy the matching requirements established for the land-grant appropriation.

The documentation for FY 2001 and FY 2002 disclose shortfalls of $244,856 and $473,567, respectively. When approached about the documented shortfall, CPE staff indicated that former CPE staff and a former KSU President agreed that KSU would absorb the shortfall. No documentation of such an agreement has been provided to the Review Team. As such, with the exception of the two years discussed above, it is the Review Team's conclusion that the Commonwealth has complied with the legal requirements for land-grant matching. The above conclusion is based solely on the Review Team's understanding of the legislation that established the matching requirement.

One might think that addressing the financial shortfall referenced above would be sufficient to bring this issue to closure but that is not the case. The University believes the Commonwealth has a greater responsibility than what is specified in the legislation. They believe that the intent of the legislation is to provide new supplemental funding to meet the match. In other words, KSU believes that using the historical appropriation to demonstrate that the matching requirements have been satisfied does not

satisfy the intent of the legislation. As support for this position, KSU references correspondence from various individuals including representatives of the Council of 1890 Presidents and Chancellors as well as representatives of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Both organizations, which clearly have an advocacy role with respect to this issue, have expressed their belief that the proper interpretation of the legislation is to require incremental funding beyond historical appropriation levels.

Based on the request and recommendation of KSU, the Review Team contacted the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to gain additional information to help resolve this issue. The referral provided by KSU is the same person who documented, in a July 2001 letter to CPE, the correctness of the CPE's interpretation of the statutory requirements. During discussions with the Review Team, the individual indicated that his July 2001 letter was a response to specific questions raised by CPE. He further indicated that the CPE's interpretation, though technically accurate, failed to address the intent of the legislation. Per this individual, the legislation was intended to encourage the states to provide incremental funding to the institutions (including KSU) but, for political reasons, the legislation did not mandate this.

It is the above situation that creates the current dilemma. The CPE has written documentation from the USDA that their interpretation satisfies the requirements of the legislation. On the other hand, the same individual—as well as various advocates—indicates to KSU that the legislation was intended to provide incremental funding.

It is believed that this matter must be brought to closure in order for KSU and CPE to achieve an effective working relationship. The Review Team recommends that CPE and KSU jointly craft a letter to the USDA seeking written confirmation of the intent of the legislation. If the response from USDA confirms that KSU should be receiving incremental funding, CPE should work with the appropriate processes to determine how these funds can be provided. However, if USDA will not indicate in writing that the intent of the legislation is different from what was enacted, it is the Review Team's recommendation that the issue be considered closed.

Part 8 Federal legal context

During the mid to late 90's, the Commonwealth of Kentucky was one of many states with public HBCUs that were reviewed by the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) for determination as to state compliance with longstanding federal compliance plans designed to resolve issues of equal access to higher education for African American students. In December 1999, the Commonwealth of Kentucky entered into a three year plan (the Partnership Agreement) designed to bring final resolution to issues of equal access in the state's system of higher education. The plan had two components: 1) minority student access to traditionally white institutions and 2) the strengthening of Kentucky State University, the Commonwealth's historically black institution, in its role in the postsecondary education system. The latter component had its basis in addressing the education provided at an institution that has traditionally and continues to serve significant numbers of African American students and to fully incorporate that institution into the state system of higher education by making it attractive to students regardless of race.

In February 2003, the Council on Postsecondary Education's Committee on Equal Opportunities reported that a final determination of the status of Kentucky's compliance with the federal plan is due by March 31, 2003. With regard to Kentucky's requirement to strengthen Kentucky State University pursuant to the 1999 compliance plan, OCR has indicated in previous reports that the Commonwealth has completed several portions of its commitments. Those items that OCR has reported completed are:

- renovations of the Carver Hall classroom building
- Kentucky State University's development and implementation of a program of communication and diversity training
- CPE's analysis and assurance that the benchmark funding process will not disadvantage Kentucky State University
- KSU, UK, University of Louisville, and CPE's collaboration to enhance and strengthen KSU's education program.
- The Governor and the Postsecondary Education Nominating Board's assurance that the KSU Board of Regents is of the highest caliber.

CPE has reported that those commitments that remain to be fulfilled are:

- The renovation of Hathaway Hall classroom and office building
- The renovation of Young Hall dormitory
- KSU's assurance to substantially narrow the gap between the performance rate of its students on the PRAXIS II as compared to the Kentucky statewide performance average

The renovations must be addressed within the context of Kentucky's budget process. The state has reported to OCR that KSU is working with Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board and the other public institutions to strengthen and enhance its academic programs, in particular the education program.

As was noted in the introduction, the Partnership Agreement should have been an opportunity for KSU to establish an important new relationship with the state. OCR looks to KSU and the state to work together to bring the state into compliance with the federal civil rights issues which the Partnership Agreement was designed to resolve. The need to improve the education program at KSU should not be viewed as a matter solely of federal compliance but as an opportunity for KSU to play a substantive role in the state's ability to satisfy an increasing need for qualified teachers. Clearly, KSU has not been able to use the Partnership Agreement to fashion a relationship with the state to build a model program for teacher preparation. This inability is due largely to unstable leadership at the institution and lack of vision and political skill necessary to form the relationships beneficial to KSU that would create a winning situation for KSU and the state's system of elementary and secondary education.

The OCR report that is due in March will most likely comment on the continued need for improvement of KSU's education program. Although the Partnership Agreement technically ended in December 2002, the state could have continuing obligations under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act if an analysis shows that the stated goals have not been achieved. It is very likely that OCR will conclude that the state's efforts under the Partnership Agreement have not resulted in significant improvement of KSU's education program. Such a conclusion would actually present an opportunity to create, within the context of seeking federal compliance, a comprehensive and concentrated strategy that will in a statewide collaborative method bring together stakeholders in a charge to build a model education program at KSU. This strategy should be one that presents the institution as a significant and reliable component for supplying Kentucky with much needed prepared and dedicated teachers for the state's elementary and secondary schools. Effective leadership could utilize the federal compliance issue as an additional (and strong) incentive to effectuate such a strategy.

Part 9 Suggested Next Steps

Suggested Next Steps

In considering the next steps described here, University readers should be very cognizant of the fact that it would be very unwise to attempt simply to implement the ideas of outside consultants. No process will be valid unless it fairly reflects the views of the entire university community.

Begin with the Board

- After the Board and the administration have considered this report, and any other evidence of value, they should develop a plan for next steps. Such a plan could have the following characteristics:
    - The plan must avoid even the appearance of promulgating; it will be a guide, not a mandate;
    - This first plan is essentially a plan to plan-- faculty and others in the community must be involved in all substantive planning;
    - The plan would avoid spending time on a rhetorical mission statement; instead, valuable time and energy should be focused on a *functional* mission—that is to say one that can be accomplished;
    - Avoid putting much effort into a vision statement—these tend to waste time, since including everyone's idea and words often results in a kind of rhetorical pablum.
- The planning process must be a broadly-based and wide-ranging discussion, including open discussion of what falls into the mission and what doesn't. Here are some examples, by no means an exhaustive list, of topics for discussion: Does a liberal arts institution have to be selective? Can an access institution aspire to have excellent programs? How does a liberal arts mission mesh with the offering of applied disciplines such as nursing and even business? What does it mean to be a land-grant university when the traditional land-grant disciplines of agriculture and engineering are not present? What role should the library and related information technology have in any new approach?
- Again, the focus should be on developing a plan that is pragmatic and achievable in the near term—for example, five years (a plan will have been extensively modified within five years in any case.)

- The planning effort needs to avoid blame; it must look forward exclusively. If existing tensions make this difficult, the University may wish to employ a facilitator.

As the Plan develops

As the plan develops, remember these points:

- Unless the plan is broadly-based, it won't be worth the effort--buy-in is key.
- Avoid choosing too many data elements as benchmarks--winnow the data to find those key elements that can actually be useful on a regular basis.
- Don't let planning become an end; the idea is to implement desired changes as quickly as possible:
    - Look for actions that be taken right away—these will build psychological momentum;
    - Expect to improve administrative operations quickly;
    - Recognize that academic change will occur more slowly, but make a strong effort to find those things, e.g. articulation with community colleges, that can occur quickly.

Develop a culture of action

Effective planning includes everyone, and everyone should be able to regularly report progress. The Review Team describes the need for a "culture of evidence." This should be complemented with a "culture of action;" the two need to go together.

A summary of specific actions to consider

In the section on academic programs the Review Team recommends a number of changes, many of which will require new investment on the part of the University. A reasonable person might ask, "How can Kentucky State afford to invest in stronger academic programs?" The following, which summarizes points made throughout the Report, will help provide an answer.

- Rightsize the administration (Part 2, Operational and Budget Issues, Rightsizing the Administration; and elsewhere)
    - Become leaders in lean administration
    - Outsource where possible
- Rationalize the funding formula (Part 2, Operational and Budget Issues, Incongruity with the CPE Budget Model)
    - The Review Team believes that KSU needs to reposition itself vs. peer institutions in the CPE formula
- Expand in areas where costs will be lower than revenues

  - Larger enrollment overall (Part 2, Operational and Budget Issues, Economies of Scale and elsewhere)
  - Expand community college transfer efforts (Part 3, Transfer; and elsewhere)
  - Consider outsourcing some academic programs where KSU's lack of scale makes costs unreasonably high (Part 3, Overall Academic Issues, Program "Productivity" and Academic "Economies of Scale")
  - Expand and develop graduate and professional programs (Part 3, Graduate Programs)
- Secure more grant funding
  - There appear to be many opportunities for federal and foundation support that KSU is not employing (Part 3, Arts and Sciences, and elsewhere)
- Seek additional support from the Commonwealth
  - KSU might seek one-time support, perhaps as a loan against start up costs, once it has demonstrated the exemplary nature of its activities

It is important to emphasize that steps such as the above should not be undertaken except in the logical context of a viable (which is to say organically developed and widely accepted) and functional (practical, accomplishable) mission.

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Review Team Membership

Appendix B: Summary of Key Resource Documents

Appendix A: Review Team Membership

Anderson

Carol Anderson, is an assistant professor of history at the University of Missouri-Columbia. She is the author of *Eyes Off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955*, (Cambridge University Press, 2003). She is also the author of several articles including "From Hope to Disillusion: African Americans and the United Nations, 1945-1947," published in *Diplomatic History* Professor Anderson is also the recipient of five awards for outstanding teaching at the University of Missouri.

Prior to coming to the University of Missouri-Columbia, Anderson was the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic and Access Programs at the Ohio Board of Regents and had significant strategic planning responsibilities for state universities in transition. During her tenure at the Board Regents, she also created a program to diversify the professorate, which was recognized by the Council on Graduate Schools as one of the top five diversity programs in the nation and was the recipient of a major grant from the Cleveland and Gund Foundations. Dr. Anderson earned bachelor's and master's degrees from Miami University and the Ph.D. from Ohio State University.

Burnim

Dr. Mickey L. Burnim is Chancellor of Elizabeth City State University, a constituent institution of the University of North Carolina system. Previously, he served as Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at North Carolina Central University, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs for the University of North Carolina system, and an economics faculty member at the Florida State University. Burnim is also a member of the Executive Council of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. He holds three degrees in economics, the B. A. and M. A. from North Texas State University, and the Ph. D. from the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Davis

Dr. Jinnie Y. Davis is a library consultant and Librarian Emerita at the North Carolina State University Libraries, where she established its Scholarly Communication program with the first intellectual property attorney on an academic library staff. She also has experience in library planning and research, publications and external relations, library development, cataloging, and acquisitions. Davis has also taught at the Graduate Library School at Indiana University and worked at Auburn University, The Ohio State University, and the Smithsonian Institution. She is the author of several books in library science and numerous professional articles. In 2000, she was awarded the Order of the Long Leaf Pine by the state of North Carolina. Davis has a Ph.D. in Library Administration from Indiana University, master's degrees in Library Science from the University of Michigan and in Hispanic Studies from Auburn University, and a B.A. in History from the University of Michigan.

Goldstein

Larry Goldstein established a management consulting firm, Campus Strategies, to provide services to colleges and universities as well as organizations serving higher education. In addition to serving as president of the firm, he is a Senior Fellow in the Center for Accounting, Finance, and Institutional Management (Center) at the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). Goldstein also serves as an SCT Fellow with the Global Education Systems division of Systems and Computer Technology Corporation. He is actively involved with various efforts related to higher education accounting, finance, and management issues.

Immediately prior to establishing Campus Strategies, Goldstein served as NACUBO's Senior Vice President and Treasurer (SVPT). Goldstein earlier spent 20 years in higher education financial administration, including the University of Louisville, the University of Chicago, the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, and the University of Virginia. Goldstein, a certified public accountant, earned a Bachelor of Accountancy degree from Walsh College and a Master of Science degree from the University of Virginia.

Muffo

John A. Muffo is director of the Academic Assessment Program at Virginia Tech. He has spent over twenty-five years in the fields of institutional research and assessment and is a past Forum chair and past president of the Association for Institutional Research. He has served on numerous accrediting bodies, has taught business as well as higher education administration, and has consulted on every continent except Antarctica. His primary scholarly interests are in the use of quantitative and qualitative data for academic program improvement and in comparative higher education. Dr. Muffo earned a Ph.D. from the University of Denver.

Pierce- Team Leader

Raymond C. Pierce is a partner in the law firm of Baker & Hostetler, a full service national law firm. Mr. Pierce is a member of the firm's Business and Legislative Practice Groups where he represents clients in business transactions and in matters involving government affairs. Mr. Pierce also maintains an education practice representing state higher education systems, public school districts and education related businesses. Prior to joining Baker & Hostetler, Mr. Pierce served as a Deputy Assistant Secretary in the U.S. Department of Education through a political appointment in the administration of President Bill Clinton. While at the U.S. Department of Education, Mr. Pierce led the development of federal policy in the area of higher education desegregation with particular emphasis on Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Mr. Pierce negotiated compliance plans with six states involving federal civil rights issues and Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Mr. Pierce has also participated in the development of federal policy in the areas of: testing, school accountability, teacher development and special education. Mr. Pierce is the recipient of the Thurgood Marshall Fund National Leadership Award for his accomplishments in the area of higher education. He has delivered the commencement address at five college graduation ceremonies. Mr. Pierce is a graduate of Syracuse University and Case Western Reserve University School of Law.

Smith

Dr. Rayma E. Smith is currently the Dean of Humanities and Sciences at Cincinnati State Technical and Community College in Cincinnati, Ohio. She serves on a number of major institutional committees, including a role as co-chair of Cincinnati State's Quality Action Project for General Education, one of the projects included in the College's alternative model for accreditation sponsored by the North Central Association. At the state level, Dr. Smith is a member of the Articulation and Transfer Advisory Council of the Ohio Board of Regents and has been recently appointed to the Articulation and Transfer Policy Review Committee.

Prior to her employment at Cincinnati State, Dr. Smith was Director of Degree Programs at the Ohio Board of Regents, overseeing program approval and review at all levels from associate through doctorate. Before joining the Ohio Board of Regents, she served as Chair of the General Studies Division of Wilberforce University. Dr. Smith received the Bachelor of Science degree in Speech Pathology and Audiology from Miami University and the Master of Arts degree in Speech and Hearing Science as well as the Ph.D. degree in Educational Policy and Leadership from Ohio State University.

Stith

Dr. Melvin T. Stith is currently Dean, and Jim Moran Professor of Business Administration, College of Business, Florida State University. Under his leadership, the College of Business has been consistently ranked as one of the top fifty, and currently in the top forty, undergraduate programs in the country according to *U.S. News and World Report*. His research deals with the impact of value systems on consumer purchase behavior and key influences on black and white consumption patterns. His works have appeared in the leading marketing and psychological journals. He is a board member of a number of corporations and frequently serves leading businesses as a consultant and lecturer. Prior to assuming the deanship at Florida State, Dr. Stith was Director of Graduate Programs, Syracuse University; Associate Dean/Assistant Professor, College of Business, University of South Florida; Visiting Professor, School of Business and Industry, Florida A & M University; and Associate Professor/Chairman, Department of Marketing, College of Business, Florida State University. Dr. Stith received his undergraduate education at Norfolk State University and his MBA and PhD in Marketing from the School of Management at Syracuse University

Walters- Associate Team Leader

Dr. Garrison Walters is Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Economic Advancement with the Ohio Board of Regents, where he has been responsible for a number of projects, including development of OhioLINK (a statewide library and information system), a statewide review of doctoral education that resulted in major restructuring of investment, a research commercialization effort (the Ohio Plan), which has become the $1.6 Billion Third Frontier Project), and the state's new 1,600 mile "dark fiber" Third Frontier Network. He is the author of *The Other Europe* (Syracuse University Press, 1988) and *The Essential*

Guide to Computing (Prentice Hall, 2001). Dr. Walters' academic specialty is the history of Eastern Europe, Russia, and the Soviet Union; he completed his dissertation research in Romania on a Fulbright Scholarship. Walters earned a Ph.D. from Ohio State University, and the M.A. and B.A. from Boston University, all in History.

Appendix B: Summary of Key Resource Documents

The Review Team had access to a great many documents of a wide variety of types. The following are given special mention because of their general application and because of their continued importance to the University as a whole.

The MGT Report (1994)

This report, commissioned by President Mary Smith at the beginning of her tenure, is an excellent document. MGT developed and analyzed a great deal of data for the report. Categories include: Future Trends in Higher Education; University-Wide Issues Facing KSU; Current Organizational Structure; Academic Management; Student Services; Overview of Administrative Function; and Strategic Directions. In fact, MGT covered everything except academic programs in considerable depth. The Review Team received a document, *MGT Implementation Plan: Accepted Recommendations (1994)*, which was the follow up to the MGT report. Unfortunately, this response came too early to show significant change—and there was no further comprehensive action of which we are aware. The lack of attention to the MGT document, in our view, has been a real tragedy for KSU. The Review Team strongly recommends that senior members of the administration as well as members of the Board of Regents reread this document and consider its many recommendations and approaches to data analysis and presentation.

The SACS Accreditation Process (1997-1999)

KSU did an excellent job of preparing for the SACS review. The key KSU document, the *Institutional Self-Study Report*, (and its *Addendum*) reveals a very thoughtful approach to the future of the University, particularly with regard to the area of assessment. Taken in the abstract, that is to say absent the reality of leadership turmoil at KSU, this would provide an excellent foundation for a university focus on continuous improvement for student success (the SACS response document, while remarkably positive, was very general and offered little in the way of useful advice). As with the MGT report, the Review Team believes that University leadership should consider its submission to SACS as a very important foundation document.

The Partnership Agreement (1999)

This agreement is actually a federal compliance plan that the Commonwealth entered into in partnership with the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights to address lingering issues of Title VI compliance related to African American students' equal access to higher education in the state of Kentucky. The Partnership Agreement had a term of three years having expired in December 2002. The Office for Civil Rights is due to submit a report as to the Commonwealth's compliance with the commitments contained in the agreement. The agreement

basically requires increased minority student access to traditionally white institutions and enhancement of KSU to attract a more diverse student population and improve the quality of education available to minority students attending that institution. The Review Team referred to this document as a tool to be used for establishing a collaborative effort within the Commonwealth for the overall improvement of KSU. Legally, the federal government does not separate KSU from the Commonwealth for civil rights compliance purposes but views them both as "the state". The Commonwealth and KSU are obligated to work together to resolve all questions regarding compliance with federal civil rights laws. This legal reality actually presents the Partnership Agreement as a vehicle for the collaborative effort the Review Team feels will be necessary to advance KSU.

The Academic Program Review (2000)
The Review Team has commented on this study at numerous points in its Report. We believe that the Program Review was very well done. The process was well constructed, involving extensive faculty discussion and thoughtful external review. The authors are clear about both successes and weaknesses, and offer many very good suggestions for improvement. Again, as noted with respect to the documents cited above, we believe that KSU should treat this study as a very positive anchor point for its next stages of planning. An update in

Kentucky State University Interim Enhancement Request (2001)
The Review Team has included this document, which is of a quite different type than the others in the list, to make a point. The Enhancement Request, which was sent by KSU to the Board of Regents in October of 2001, is a wonderful example of what not to do in planning and leadership. The flaws are not in the document itself—it includes a great many ideas which might well be adopted by the University as it goes forward. There is insight and good thinking in this document. But there are at least three serious problems: 1) many of the ideas lack clear supporting data—they appear to be based on hunches rather than fact (for example the study abroad proposal, described earlier); 2) the request came forward at the last moment and (more important) with very little consultation on campus; and 3) the tone is unbalanced—KSU is asking the Commonwealth to fund a long list of initiatives without stipulating what the University would do to become a more efficient and effective platform on which to build change.