

Richard A. Lipsey
Chair

Edward D. Markle
Vice Chair

Marty J. Chabert
Secretary

Joseph C. Rallo, Ph.D.
Commissioner of
Higher Education



Claudia H. Adley
Blake R. David
Thomas G. Henning
Robert W. Levy
Roy O. Martin III
Charles R. McDonald
Darren G. Mire
Wilbert D. Pryor
T. Jay Seale III
W. Gray Stream
Collis B. Temple III
Jacqueline V. Wyatt
Adarian D. Williams, Student

BOARD OF REGENTS
P. O. Box 3677
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3677
Phone (225) 342-4253, FAX (225) 342-9318
www.regents.la.gov

AGENDA

PLANNING, RESEARCH and PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

August 23, 2017 • 11:15 a.m.

Louisiana Purchase Room, W.C.C. Claiborne Building, Baton Rouge, LA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Consent Agenda
 - A. R.S. 17:1808 (Licensure)
 1. License Renewals
 - a. Texas Wesleyan University
 - B. State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) Institutional Renewals
 1. Louisiana Tech University
 2. Southern University - Shreveport
 - C. Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission
 1. Initial License
 - a. Louisiana Medical Certifications, LLC
 - b. Opelousas Academy of Nondestructive Testing
 - c. Premier Healthcare Training Solutions, LLC
 - d. Remington College
 - e. Vista College
 2. Change of Ownership
 - a. Cameron College
 3. License Renewals
- IV. State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) Institutional Applications
 - A. University of New Orleans
- V. R.S. 17:1808 (Licensure)
 - A. American Institute of Integrative Medicine (Initial License)
 - B. Southwest Kingston University (License Renewal)

Planning, Research and Performance Committee Agenda

August 23, 2017

- VI. 2016-17 Campus Climate Survey Report
- VII. Admissions Exceptions Update
- VIII. Other Business
- IX. Adjournment

Committee Members: Collis Temple III, Chair; Claudia Adley, Vice Chair; Blake David, Thomas Henning, Robert Levy, Roy Martin III, Charles McDonald, Jacqueline Wyatt

Agenda Item III.A.1.a.

Texas Wesleyan University Fort Worth, Texas

BACKGROUND

Texas Wesleyan University (TWU) is not incorporated in Louisiana. The university was originally licensed with the Board of Regents in 2003. TWU is a private, non-profit university located in Fort Worth, Texas and is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

ACADEMIC PROGRAM

TWU currently offers the Master of Science in Nurse Anesthesia (MSNA) and a Doctorate in Nurse Anesthesia Practice (DNAP) through the institution's Fort Worth facility. The Nurse Anesthesia program is professionally accredited by the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (ANEST).

FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Fifteen faculty teach in TWU's Nursing Anesthesia programs, nine full-time and six part-time. All fifteen faculty hold doctoral degrees and recruited, screened, and employed through the central campus in Fort Worth. The university reported an enrollment of 52 Louisiana students in its Nursing Anesthesia programs in the fall 2016.

FACILITIES

The institution offers Clinical Nursing Anesthesia instruction at hospital sites in Shreveport, Alexandria, and Monroe. Students receive instruction in a lecture format and through supervised clinical experiences.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Given the credentials of its faculty, the admission standards of the program, the institution's campus and program accreditation, and the oversight provided by the main campus, senior staff recommends that the Board of Regents accept the application for license renewal from Texas Wesleyan University, located in Fort Worth, Texas.

Agenda Item III.B.

Executive Summary

The State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) is a national initiative which seeks to establish comparable national standards for the interstate offering of postsecondary distance-education courses and programs. It is intended to make it easier for students to take online courses offered by institutions based in another state by reducing the cost and administrative burden on institutions seeking authorization in various states. SARA is a voluntary agreement among regional compacts (SREB, NEBHE, MHEC, and WICHE) and member states. Each member state approves their in-state institutions on an annual basis for SARA participation. Once approved, SARA member institutions may offer distance education programs in other SARA member states without additional authorization. Institutions approved by their home state are required to renew their membership annually.

Act 13 of the 2014 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature authorized the Louisiana Board of Regents to seek SARA membership on behalf of the State of Louisiana. In October 2014, Louisiana's application for SARA membership was approved by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA), effective December 1, 2014. Since then, 21 Louisiana institutions have joined SARA.

Two institutions (Louisiana Tech University and Southern University at Shreveport) have submitted renewal applications. Regents' staff have reviewed the renewal applications and determined that they meet all requirements for continuing their membership in SARA.

Senior staff recommends that the Planning, Research & Performance Committee approve the Renewal Application for Institutional Participation in SARA for Louisiana Tech University and Southern University at Shreveport, and authorize staff to submit the approved applications to NC-SARA for final approval of SARA membership.

Richard A. Lipsey
Chair

Edward D. Markle
Vice Chair

Marty J. Chabert
Secretary

Joseph C. Rallo, Ph.D.
*Commissioner of
Higher Education*



Claudia H. Adley
Blake R. David
Thomas G. Henning
Robert W. Levy
Roy O. Martin III
Charles R. McDonald
Darren G. Mire
Wilbert D. Pryor
T. Jay Seale III
W. Gray Stream
Collis B. Temple III
Jacqueline V. Wyatt
Adarian D. Williams, Student

BOARD OF REGENTS
P. O. Box 3677
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3677
Phone (225) 342-4253, FAX (225) 342-9318
www.regents.la.gov

Agenda Item III.C.
Minutes
Board of Regents' Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission
July 11, 2017

The Louisiana Board of Regents' Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission met on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 10:05 a.m., in Room 1-190 of the Claiborne Building, Baton Rouge. Chair Jones called the meeting to order, the roll was called, and a quorum was established.

Commission Members Present

Melanie Amrhein
James Dorris
James Fontenot, Vice Chair
Theresa Hay
Keith Jones, Chair
Raymond Lalonde

Staff Members Present

Nancy Beall
Chandra Cheatham
Carol Marabella
Larry Tremblay

Commission Members Absent

Richard D'Aquin
Sherrie Despino

Guests Present

(See Appendix A.)

The first item of business was approval of the minutes from its meeting of May 9, 2017.

On motion of Ms. Hay, seconded by Mr. Lalonde, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously adopted the minutes of the May 9, 2017 Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission meeting.

The next agenda item considered by the Commission was five initial license applications, the first from Louisiana Medical Certifications, LLC, Avoyelles Campus, located in Mansura, Louisiana, and represented by the school's owner, Ms. Lisa A. Gunnells. Ms. Marabella reviewed the materials for the Commission, informing the members that if this application is approved by the Board, it will be Ms. Gunnells' second licensed proprietary school. Her original school, located in New Roads, Louisiana, was licensed in March 2016. Ms. Gunnells is proposing to offer the Certified Nursing Assistant program, which is a three week, 100.0 clock hour program that is inclusive of both classroom and clinical experience. The program has received the required approval of the Louisiana Department of Health, Health Standards Section. Louisiana Medical Certifications, LLC, Avoyelles Campus, had met all the legal and administrative requirements to be approved for an initial license.

Following further discussion regarding the reason the owner desired to open a second school, proposed hours of operation, availability of clinical sites, and current job placement rate at the original school,

On motion of Mr. Fontenot, seconded by Mr. Dorris, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve an initial operating license for Louisiana Medical Certifications, LLC, Avoyelles Campus, located in Mansura, Louisiana.

The second initial license application considered by the Commission was from Opelousas Academy of Nondestructive Testing, located in Opelousas, Louisiana, and represented by the school owners, Mr. Derrick N. Mayo and Ms. Jessica E. Mayo. Ms. Cheatham reviewed the materials for the Commission members, informing them that this institution is proposing to offer two programs of study--NDT Basic Program and NDT Advanced Program, both of which are a six week, 288.0 clock hour program. The Opelousas Academy of Nondestructive Testing had met all the legal and administrative requirements to be approved for an initial license.

Following further discussion regarding the definition of “non-destructive testing”, wide range of employment opportunities available to graduates, national certification awarded upon successful completion of the program, pay range of individuals employed in the NDT field, and comparison of the proposed program offerings to those offered in other area schools,

On motion of Mr. Fontenot, seconded by Mr. Lalonde, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve an initial operating license for the Opelousas Academy of Nondestructive Testing, located in Opelousas, Louisiana.

The third initial license application considered by the Commission was from Premier Healthcare Training Solutions, LLC, located in Opelousas, Louisiana, and represented by the school’s owner, Ms. Shawanna M. Guillory. Ms. Cheatham reviewed the materials for the Commission members, informing them that this institution is proposing to offer one program of Study, Certified Nursing Assistant, which is a four week, 80.0 clock hour program that is inclusive of both classroom and clinical experience. The program has received the required

approval of the Louisiana Department of Health, Health Standards Section. Premier Healthcare Training Solutions, LLC, had met all the legal and administrative requirements to be approved for an initial license.

Following further discussion regarding the competition within the market area, owner's reason for opening a proprietary school, availability of clinical sites, owner's experience in the allied health field, and class times and length,

On motion of Ms. Hay, seconded by Ms. Amrhein, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve an initial operating license for Premier Healthcare Training Solutions, LLC, located in Opelousas, Louisiana.

The fourth initial license application considered by the Commission was from Remington College, located in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and represented by the school's Campus Director, Mr. Thomas Becker. Ms. Marabella informed the Commission that this institution was previously licensed as a proprietary school and is currently licensed by the Board of Regents as an academic degree-granting institution. Remington College is proposing to offer one program of study, Heating, Ventilation, & Air Conditioning, a twelve month, 59.0 quarter credit hour/960.0 clock hour program. Remington College (Baton Rouge Campus) had met all the legal and administrative requirements to be approved for an initial license.

Following further discussion regarding the reason to offer the HVAC program, comparison of the length and cost of the anticipated program to other area schools, availability of financial aid to students who qualify, benefit of a degree vs. a diploma in the

HVAC field, and corporate plans to expand program offerings in the future,

On motion of Mr. Fontenot, seconded by Mr. Dorris, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve an initial operating license for Remington College, located in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The fifth and final initial license application considered by the Commission was from Vista College, located in Lake Charles, Louisiana, and represented by Ms. Renee D. Gaddis, Senior Director of Compliance. Ms. Cheatham reviewed the materials for the Commission, informing the members that this institution would be offering one program of study, Medical Assisting, a 69.0 Quarter Credit Hours/1,020.0 clock hour program with an estimated completion time of forty-five weeks. Vista College had met all the legal and administrative requirements to be approved for an initial license.

Following further discussion regarding the primary duties of a medical assistant, potential employers of medical assistants, locations of other sister campuses, reason for locating in Lake Charles, competition within the area market, comparison of the proposed tuition cost to tuition in other area schools, availability of financial aid to students who qualify, and programs to be proposed in the future,

On motion of Ms. Amrhein, seconded by Mr. Fontenot, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve an initial operating license for Vista College, located in Lake Charles, Louisiana.

The next agenda item considered by the Commission involved a change of ownership license application from Cameron College, located in New Orleans, Louisiana, and

represented by the institution's Executive Director, Mr. James H. Keen. This change of ownership application is being filed as the result of the death of the school's owner, Ms. Eleanor Cameron Skov. Cameron College has been licensed since 1983. Ms. Marabella reminded the Commission that the Proprietary Schools Law requires that a change of ownership be treated no differently than an initial license application. The change of ownership at Cameron College has been seamless for the students in that the curricula and instructors remain the same. Current program offerings are Advanced Phlebotomy (37.0 semester credit hours/690.0 clock hours/35.0 weeks), Medical Assistant (70.0 semester credit hours/1,335.0 clock hours/60.0 weeks), Medical Billing Specialist & Health Care Administration (52.0 semester credit hours/945.0 clock hours/50.0 weeks), and the AOS Degree in Medical Assistant (86.0 semester credit hours/1,575.0 clock hours/80.0 weeks). Cameron College had met all the legal and administrative requirements to be approved for a change of ownership license.

Following further discussion regarding the seamless transition of ownership, current student enrollment, availability of financial aid to students who qualify, and future plans to offer additional programs,

On motion of Ms. Amrhein, seconded by Mr. Fontenot, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously recommended that the Board of Regents approve the change of ownership license application for Cameron College, Inc., located in New Orleans, Louisiana.

The next agenda item considered by the Commission was operating license renewals. Ms. Marabella informed the Commission members that there were twenty-six (26) schools

seeking renewal. These schools scheduled for renewal were in complete compliance, having met all the legal and administrative requirements to be re-licensed.

Following further discussion,

On motion of Mr. Fontenot, seconded by Mr. Lalonde, the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission unanimously recommends that the Board of Regents renew the licenses of the following proprietary schools (initial license date in parentheses).

**Advance Healthcare Institute, LLC (05/26/11)
BAR/BRI (Baton Rouge) (05/23/12)
BAR/BRI (New Orleans) (05/23/12)
Blue Cliff College--Alexandria (05/25/06)
Delta College of Arts & Technology (06/25/92)
Diesel Driving Academy (Baton Rouge) (06/25/87)
Eastern College of Health Vocations--Shreveport (05/27/04)
Global Trucking Academy (06/29/16)
Grace & Favor Training Academy, LLC (05/21/14)
Heritage Dental Assisting Academy (06/29/16)
Lincoln College (05/22/03)
Louisiana Institute of Massage Therapy (05/22/13)
Medical Technical Institute (05/27/15)
Oak Park School of Dental Assisting (05/28/0
Operation Spark (06/29/16)
Ouachita Truck Driving Academy, LLC (05/22/03)
Petra College, Inc. (05/27/15)
Remington College (Lafayette Campus) (05/26/11)
Remington College (Shreveport Campus) (05/26/11)
SIHAF Career Institute (05/21/14)
Southern Medical Corporation School of Ultrasound (06/26/97)
Virginia College (05/27/10)
Virginia College (Shreveport) (05/26/11)
WyoTech (Florida) (05/27/15)
WyoTech (Pennsylvania) (05/27/15)
WyoTech (Wyoming) (05/27/15)**

Ms. Marabella informed the Commission that there were no schools that chose to not renew their licenses this renewal cycle.

The next item on the agenda was an update on program approvals. Chair Jones reminded the Commission that staff approved these updates administratively and course approvals were being shared for informational purposes only.

Under Report from Staff, Dr. Tremblay informed the Commission members that staff is continuing to develop the scope of work for the projected digitalization project for student records from closed proprietary schools. He also informed them that staff is working to secure an appointment to the Commission for the vacant position appointed by the State Association of Better Business Bureaus.

The next meeting of the Proprietary Schools Advisory Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, September 12, 2017, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 1-190 of the Claiborne Building.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

APPENDIX A
GUESTS

Thomas Becker	Remington College
JoAnn Boudreaux	Remington College
Jack Capella	Cameron College
Renee Gaddis	Vista College
Shawanna Guillory	Premier Healthcare Training Solutions, LLC
Lisa Gunnells	Louisiana Medical Certifications, LLC, Avoyelles Campus
James Keen	Cameron College
Derrick Mayo	Opelousas Academy of Nondestructive Testing
Jessica Mayo	Opelousas Academy of Nondestructive Testing
Patricia Wilton	LA Department of Justice

Agenda Item IV.

Executive Summary

The State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) is a national initiative which seeks to establish comparable national standards for the interstate offering of postsecondary distance-education courses and programs. SARA makes it easier for students to take online courses offered by institutions based in another state by reducing the cost and administrative burden on institutions seeking authorization in various states. SARA is a voluntary agreement among regional compacts (SREB, NEBHE, MHEC, and WICHE) and member states. Each member state approves their in-state institutions on an annual basis for SARA participation. Once approved, SARA member institutions may offer distance education programs in other SARA member states without additional authorization.

Act 13 of the 2014 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature authorized the Louisiana Board of Regents to seek SARA membership on behalf of the State of Louisiana. In October 2014, Louisiana's application for SARA membership was approved by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA), effective December 1, 2014.

To date, the Board of Regents has approved applications for institutional participation in SARA from twenty-one institutions. In June 2017, the University of New Orleans submitted an application for Regents' consideration. Regents' staff have reviewed and determined it meets all requirements for initial membership in SARA.

Senior staff recommends that the Planning, Research & Performance Committee approve the Application for Institutional Participation in SARA for the University of New Orleans and authorize staff to submit the approved application to NC-SARA for final approval of SARA membership.

Agenda Item V.A.

American Institute of Integrative Medicine New Orleans, Louisiana

Background

Revised Statute 17:1808 requires the Board of Regents to register and license academic degree-granting, post-secondary institutions in Louisiana. Regents' rules and regulations overseeing the review process echo the revised statutes with particular emphasis placed on the attainment of appropriate accreditation. The proposed American Institute of Integrative Medicine (AIIM) has identified the Distance Education Accrediting Commission (DEAC) as its desired accreditation agency. DEAC accreditation aims to instill public confidence in DEAC institutions' missions, goals, performance, and resources through rigorous application and peer-developed accreditation standards.

Overview of American Institute of Integrative Medicine

The mission of the proposed Institute is:

To enhance and enrich the lives of healthcare practitioners and students by offering convenient and affordable quality distance learning educational programs in Integrative Medicine Nutrition and Natural Health Sciences.

Goals established by AIIM include:

- *To teach, promulgate, and advance the philosophy and art of holistic, natural and integrated healing and encourage others in the same endeavor.*
- *To create a realistic bridge between theory and real life experience.*
- *To combine teaching and information with experience to facilitate optimal learning and practical knowledge.*
- *To provide quality faculty and staff to assist the students in their learning experience to promote in-depth inquiry and life-long learning.*
- *To provide positive, strengthening experiences through quality, independent, sequential and developmental learning.*
- *To seek public, legal, and governmental recognition for Naturopathy, and Natural Healing as a valid, effective healing system.*

The interests of AIIM extend beyond the basic subjects to encourage students to pursue their individual goals and talents. Students have an opportunity to become proficient in selective fields of natural, integrative and holistic health. AIIM's goal is to attract students with a wide variety of talents and backgrounds that will contribute to the growth and progress of natural and integrative health. In addition to a record of academic excellence, life experience and personal attributes will be considered for admission to AIIM. AIIM's students must learn a "well rounded" science with maturity, integrity, sound judgement, empathy, and a desire to serve.

AIIM plans to offer a B.S. and M.S. in Natural Health and 5 Certificate Programs: Blood Chemistry and Urine Analysis, Botanical Medicine, Iridology, Natural Health for Animals, and Nutritional Health Coach Certification. AIIM intends to offer these degree and certificate

programs in a distance learning format. A board of directors is in place along with a senior management team and prospective faculty members have been identified. Regents' staff observes that individuals engaged in the development of this institution and the degree programs to be offered appear to possess requisite academic/experiential qualifications.

Chronology of Activities Related to Board of Regents' Consideration of the Application for Licensure for American Institute for Integrated Medicine (AIIM)

October 2016 – The Board of Regents receives an application for licensure of AIIM.

November 2016 – Regents' staff conducts initial assessment of license application submitted by AIIM.

November 2016 – Regents' staff informs AIIM representatives that there is additional information required before full consideration can be given to the license application.

December 2016 – AIIM representatives respond to the November 2016 correspondence, providing additional documentation. The proposed Institute reiterates that it will seek institutional accreditation through the Distance Education Accrediting Commission (DEAC).

January 2017 – Staff concludes that further internal assessment would benefit from an in-depth review of this application using an external consultant thoroughly familiar with DEAC accreditation processes. Potential external reviewers were identified and contacted in order to determine interest and availability. AIIM representatives were updated on the status of the review.

February 2017 – Staff engages the services of Ms. Susan Chiaramonte*, President, EduCred Services, to assess AIIM's application for licensure and associated materials in light of the proposed institution's probability of successful DEAC accreditation.

March 2017 - May 2017 – Regents' staff participate in a phone conference with Ms. Chiaramonte (at her request) to discuss the documentation relevant to and the status of AIIM's application for licensure. Ms. Chiaramonte identified remaining areas of concern and indicated that she would include in her report, detailed steps that AIIM should follow before submitting a subsequent application for licensure.

May 2017 – Ms. Chiaramonte submits her formal report relevant to the Institution's application for licensure.

**Ms. Chiaramonte's 16 years of secondary and higher education experience, accreditation, and compliance knowledge was viewed as beneficial to the evaluation process. In addition, she regularly participates in evaluations of higher education institutions and continues to serve as Chair and Educational Standards Evaluator for onsite visits for DEAC and has served as a subject specialist for the Accrediting Commission of Career Colleges and Schools (ACCSC). Ms. Chiaramonte regularly attends various higher education accreditation conferences and has presented several times at DEAC Annual Conferences and Fall Workshops.*

June 2017 – The external consultant’s report is provided to AIIM representatives. It is requested that should the Institution wish to continue pursuit of licensure in the State of Louisiana that a formal response to the consultant’s report be provided per an addendum to the licensure application.

July 2017 – The Board of Regents receives a detailed response to the external consultant’s report from AIIM. Staff finds the report to be thorough, addressing all recommendations and suggestions raised by the external reviewer.

Staff Assessment

The staff acknowledges that DEAC accreditation (AIIM’s chosen recognized accrediting agency) has long been recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as an appropriate measure of requisite quality for post-secondary educational institutions in the United States. In particular, DEAC serves primarily those independent schools that aim to offer degree programs through distance learning technologies. Given its 80-plus years of history and its highly refined and federally recognized accreditation program, staff decided that the use of an external consultant with DEAC experience to conduct a mock review of AIIM’s application using DEAC accreditation standards would be a useful diagnostic tool both for the Regents and for the proposed Institute.

AIIM’s initial application materials were reviewed by staff and by the external consultant, Ms. Susan Chiamonte. Findings and opinions were provided by Ms. Chiamonte as well as the identification of areas in which AIIM would need to show documentary evidence of potential compliance with DEAC standards and policies. She pinpointed steps that should be implemented prior to enrolling students as well as identified specific requirements that AIIM will need to focus and lay a solid foundation in order to achieve accreditation through DEAC. Based on this assessment it was determined that much was lacking and, as a result, it was determined that the Institute should greatly reconceptualize its application.

In its revised application, the staff believes that AIIM has made considerable progress. Clearly, the consultant’s observations, suggestions and recommendations have had beneficial effect; the application materials were much more complete. In addition, concerted efforts were made by the AIIM management team to demonstrate familiarization with DEAC accreditation standards. AIIM representatives have discussed the accreditation process in their contact with DEAC officials and has committed to sending at least 2 representatives to attend DEAC’s Annual Conference and Fall Workshops. AIIM’s application more directly addresses the DEAC accreditation standards and is augmented by a series of supporting documents including a mission statement, catalog, and proposed timeline for fully developing their academic programs, implementing the appropriate administrative structure and student policies and seeking accreditation.

While the staff is unable to determine whether or not this proposed institution will satisfy DEAC candidacy expectations, it appears that the Institute is in a much better position to make its case. At the same time, the staff cautions that much of what has been developed and submitted by AIIM so far supports only a theoretical institution – what is outlined on paper may not translate

effectively or efficiently into practice. DEAC assesses ongoing operations of institutions, not proposals for state licensure.

The staff finds that the additional documentation provided by AIIM in July adequately responds to areas of concerns as identified by Ms. Chiaramonte. AIIM representatives now have a clear knowledge and understanding of DEAC standards and comprehend what is required by AIIM to comply with said standards. While the staff cannot determine whether documentation provided by AIIM will satisfy DEAC candidacy expectations, it appears that the Institute is in a good position to move forward with the accreditation process.

Staff Conclusion

Given the circumstances described above, American Institute for Integrative Medicine merits a limited period of state licensure to allow it sufficient time to seek DEAC candidacy and accreditation. This initial period of licensure, however, should be subject to the fulfillment of several stipulations, requiring step-by-step continuous evidence of progress toward accreditation. So as to avoid any doubts regarding the seriousness of the Regents' intent in this matter, these stipulations should be structured in such a way that failure to complete fully any one of these requirements may result in immediate revocation of licensure. The motion and stipulations below are designed to ensure that AIIM operates within Louisiana only as long as there is unquestioned evidence that reasonable accreditation progress is being made.

Staff Recommendation

1. The Board of Regents hereby grants initial licensure for American Institute for Integrative Medicine for a period of three years.
2. By September 1, 2018 and on that date every year thereafter during the term of initial licensure, the Institute shall report to the Deputy Commissioner for Planning, Research and Academic Affairs the status of its progress toward preparation and submittal of an application for accreditation candidacy through DEAC. This report shall at a minimum evidence attendance and participation of appropriate Institute officials at periodic DEAC workshops for pre-applicant institutions and general membership meetings.
3. At the end of this period of initial licensure, the Institute shall provide evidence of submittal of an application for DEAC candidacy. If accomplished, the Regents will consider another eighteen months of licensure. If not accomplished, the Regents will consider denial of further licensure.
4. Within one year of submittal of an application for DEAC candidacy, the Institute shall provide evidence of successful DEAC candidacy status. If granted, the Regents will consider extending licensure to allow for final accreditation review. If not accomplished, the Regents will consider denial of further licensure.
5. Upon termination of the allotted time for final accreditation review, the Institute shall report its DEAC membership status. If DEAC accreditation has been granted, the Regents shall consider issuing a regular 2-year operating license. If not granted, the Regents will consider denial of further licensure.

Agenda Item V.B.

Southwest Kingston University Shreveport, Louisiana

Background

The Board of Regents received the initial license application from Southwest Kingston University (SKU) in October, 2010. The next two years were spent assessing and strengthening the application. Following an evaluation from an outside consultant and further research by SKU, at its meeting of August, 2012, the Board of Regents approved a three-year operating license for Southwest Kingston University with a variety of stipulations.

Activities During Initial Licensure

Since being granted its operating license, SKU has been actively operating, recruiting for and offering two online degree programs, RN to BSN and an MBA in Healthcare Management. For its initial two years, the institution operated out of leased space in New Orleans, but relocated to larger space in Shreveport in 2014.

As required, SKU submitted annual reports to the Regents' staff outlining its progress in seeking accreditation with the Distance Education Accrediting Commission (DEAC). The institution experienced staff turnover in academic affairs since being granted its initial license delaying somewhat the pursuit of accreditation. Nevertheless, the institution made progress towards accreditation and experienced enrollment growth in each of its three years.

The process to apply for DEAC accreditation involves the following steps:

1. Obtain the DEAC Accreditation Handbook
2. Complete DEAC Course
3. Review Application
4. Begin Writing the Self-Evaluation Report (SER)
5. Submit Application and Other Required Information
6. Undergo Readiness Assessment
7. Undergo On-site Evaluation Visit
8. Commission Review and Action

During the initial three-year license, SKU completed steps 1-4. SKU anticipated submission of the completed application by December, 2015. Per the DEAC Director of Accreditation's feedback, the DEAC review and approval process is expected to take between 12-18 months from the point of submission. Therefore, at its meeting in August 2015, the Board of Regents approved an extension of the operating license for Southwest Kingston University (SKU) with stipulations until August 31, 2017. The Board action stipulated that if the university did not submit its completed application to DEAC by January 31, 2016, the Board of Regents may revoke the institution's operating license. Assuming this schedule, the action also stipulated that based on the formal accreditation action of DEAC anticipated at its meeting of June 2017, the Board of Regents would determine whether to renew the institution's operating license in August 2017.

Recent activities at SKU

While initiating step 4 of the accreditation process (Writing the Self-Evaluation Report), it became apparent to the executive leadership of SKU that transitioning the institution from a for-profit corporation to a non-profit entity would be in the best interest to the institution and its constituents. Undergoing this process delayed the completion and submission of the Self-Evaluation Report since DEAC does not allow an institution to change its status during the formal stages of the accreditation process.

SKU underwent its conversion in 2016 and received its authorization as a non-profit entity from the Louisiana Secretary of State in December 2016. Since that time, the institution rewrote its Self-Evaluation Report and submitted the revised documents and application to DEAC reflecting its non-profit status in July 2017. However, DEAC's standards require that an institution seeking initial accreditation must be operating under the present ownership for a minimum of two years. Therefore, following conversations between Regents' staff and staff at DEAC, it appears that SKU's application will be denied since the current governance status has not been in effect for two years. The application can be resubmitted in December 2018 (two years after transition from for-profit to non-profit).

Senior Staff Recommendation

Based on information provided by Southwest Kingston University and conversations with DEAC staff, the senior staff recommends that the Planning, Research and Performance Committee approve an operating license for Southwest Kingston University for two years. By the expiration date of the license (August 2019), Southwest Kingston University will (1) have submitted its complete application to the Distance Education Accrediting Commission and (2) have a scheduled Readiness Visit by DEAC. If either of these stipulations is not met, the Board of Regents may deny further licensure.

AGENDA ITEM VI.

LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS



August 2017

**Louisiana Campus Climate Survey Report
For Academic Year 2016-2017**

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	3
II. Introduction and Background.....	5
III. Limitations	7
IV. Results	8
A. Demographics and Academic Characteristics	8
<i>Observations on Survey Demographics</i>	8
B. General Climate Questions	8
<i>Observations on General Campus Climate</i>	8
C. Perceptions of Institutional Policies, Procedures and Leadership	8
<i>Observations on Perception of Institutional Policies, Procedures and Leadership</i>	9
D. Alcohol and Drug Use	9
<i>Observations on Alcohol and Drug Abuse</i>	9
E. Sexual Violence.....	9
<i>Observations on Sexual Violence</i>	9
F. Stalking and Relationship Violence	10
<i>Observations on Stalking and Relationship Violence</i>	10
G. Readiness to Help	10
<i>Observations on Readiness to Help</i>	10
H. Bystander Confidence, Norms, and Behaviors.....	11
<i>Observations on Bystander Confidence, Norms, and Behaviors</i>	11
V. Conclusions and Implications.....	12

I. Executive Summary

Act 172 of the 2015 Regular Session sought to improve safety at Louisiana's public higher education campuses and to provide specific protections against and penalties for sexual assaults and other acts of sexual violence. One of the requirements of Act 172 was a campus climate survey to be developed by the Board of Regents (BOR) in consultation with the four management boards and to be administered at every public higher education institution. BOR is required to submit, by September 1, the survey results of each such institution for the previous academic year to the Governor and the Senate and House Committees on Education.

AY 2016-2017 represents the second year the survey was administered and this is the second report to be submitted since the enactment of Act 172. The Board of Regents continued its partnership with EverFi for the administration of the survey instrument for AY 2016-2017. During March/April of 2017, the online web-based surveys were made available to students via the respective systems' offices and were completed on a voluntary basis in accordance with Act 172.

The resulting 2016-2017 survey administration yielded a response rate of 3.5% with a total of 7,541 valid responses. The data yielded information about the experiences, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors related to campus climate and sexual violence consistent with the 2015-2016 response. The response rate of 3.5% is not an adequate response rate statistically and therefore not representative of the entire student population at an institution nor the student population of the state as a whole. Board of Regents has analyzed the data and prepared this report with as accurate an interpretation of the data as possible, in accordance with Act 172.

However, caution must be exercised in interpreting the data to avoid overgeneralization. A response rate of this size is inadequate and restricts the ability to make generalizations to a larger population.

As explained in later sections, national trends and the literature on the subject show that low participation rates in sexual assault surveys is common, due to the sensitive nature of the subject matter, the stigma that victims perceive, and the limitations of even carefully designed surveys to elicit clear responses on a nuanced subject. Thus, Louisiana's response rates are not inconsistent with the national trends.

A change to Act 172 that would both help increase participation rates and make the surveys more meaningful would be to change the requirement of an annual survey to one that is administered every three years. At a four-year institution, a freshman who takes the survey in Year 1 is less likely to take it in Years 2-4. Similarly, a sophomore who takes it in Year 1 is less likely to take it in Years 2-3. This pattern nearly guarantees a low participation rate if the survey is administered every year. The second, and the more important, reason to change the annual cycle to a 3- or 4-year cycle is to allow campuses to analyze the results of the survey, learn from the results and implement changes before administering the next survey. The annual cycle does not allow time or resources for such reflective changes that could positively impact campus safety.

BOR made several attempts to have Act 172 amended to change the annual cycle to a 2-, 3- or 4- year cycle. All efforts failed. Without such a change, BOR anticipates future years' participation rates to be equally low, with statistically insignificant survey results that do not yield any meaningful analysis, conclusions or recommendations.

Although the survey has had its challenges, there are other components prescribed by Act 172 that have been fully implemented by the campuses including: 1) a central website hosted by the Board of Regents (LA SAFE) with links to confidential advisor training modules, state and national resources and the yearly Campus Climate Survey results report, 2) the establishment of confidential advisors on each campus, 3) programming initiatives on each campus and 4) cooperative agreements between the campuses and local law enforcement.

The major survey findings and observations of the Regents' report for AY 2016-17 are as follows, limited to merely the survey participants, as the data are statistically insignificant:

Overall, student responses to the survey questions did not deviate from that of the 2015-2016 administration. Act 172 requires yearly administration of the survey to the enrolled postsecondary student population. Given that scenario, there is a high probability that the survey pool consisted of students who participated in the 2015-2016 administration, leading to the lower response rate for the 2016-2017 administration.

The majority of survey respondents indicated that they had not experienced sexual contact without their consent. However, of those respondents who reported having experienced such contact, a larger percentage confided about the incident to a close friend other than their roommate rather than college administration, advocates or any of the other established resources on campuses. The answers of the survey respondents who experienced sexual contact without their consent reflected the difficulties inherent in surveying this sensitive topic. These respondents expressed that the two main reasons they were reluctant to share what happened were that they wanted to 'forget it happened' followed closely by 'they didn't think it was serious enough to talk about.' Given the varying narrative on sexual assault, campus leaders must continue to deliver the message to students regarding their commitment to informing students regarding the definitions of unwanted sexual contact, what it means and whom to go to for help. If changes are not made, response rates will remain low and insignificant.

II. Introduction and Background

Disclosing sexual violence is extremely difficult given the personal and sensitive nature of the topic. Trying to more accurately gauge the prevalence of sexual violence in college via survey is problematic given the definitional inconsistencies, methodological hurdles, and the very specific and personal nature of the questions which can subsequently lead to underestimating the breadth of the problem. Thus, the types of questions asked and method used by schools in survey research of this matter are critical to the outcome.

Furthermore, even if the survey is carefully designed to avoid the pitfalls noted above, surveys concerning sexual assault on campuses typically have low participation rates, as the literature on the subject demonstrates.

In the two years since the passage of Act 172, data from a variety of major studies indicate that nationally, sexual assault on campus is a very real problem, (Cantor, Fisher, Chibnall, Townsend, Lee, Bruce and Thomas, 2015). Determining the actual instances of sexual assault remains difficult due to the stigma that victims face in disclosing, (Yoffe, 2017) as well as limitations of the instrument and methodology of survey administration as found here in Louisiana. A 2016 Congressional Research study found that although sexual violence on campus is a widely acknowledged concern, establishing the incidence of cases can be challenging. Published estimates of the scope and scale vary considerably across studies and data sources, and efforts to improve the collection of this information is an ongoing focus of federal policy (Gonzalez and Feder, 2016).

In the same year of passage of Act 172 (2015), three other state legislatures enacted laws requiring colleges to conduct a campus climate survey: Maryland: at least every two years; New York: no less than every other year and Texas: annually, (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2016). In late spring of 2015, the American Association of Universities (AAU) Campus Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct was administered to students from 27 institutions that selected to participate in the study. Originally offered to 780,000 students, 150,072 students responded resulting in a response rate of 19% which was considered non-representative of the populations of these institutions (Skinner & Gross, 2017). It is not uncommon for surveys on socially sensitive issues such as sexual assault to lack robust survey participation. Given the complex context of national sexual assault reporting, the findings of the administrations of Louisiana's Campus Climate Survey can be considered consistent with national trends

Act 172 specified a quick turn-around for the development and administration of the survey instrument with no allocated funding, thus straining already strained higher education resources. In order to meet the requirements of Act 172, BOR partnered with a third-party vendor, EverFi, a leading educational technology company headquartered in Washington D.C., willing to administer an approved Campus Climate Survey at no cost to the state for two years, i.e. AY 2015-16 and AY 2016-17. It should be noted that there is no cost-free option for subsequent years and BOR, in consultation with the four higher education systems, is assessing all available options.

Based on the response rate generated by the AY 2015-2016 administration (5%), BOR staff worked with System representatives and EverFi consultants in an effort to identify strategies to increase student response rate prior to dissemination of the instrument. Given the benefit of previous experience with the administration and subsequent low response rate of the 2015-2016 survey (5% of the total college going population in Louisiana), the BOR and the system representatives shared concerns with EverFi regarding several factors impacting the non-representative response rate of the initial administration including: the length of the survey, lack of customization option, yearly administration of the survey, use of a uniform instrument for all institutions regardless of type, size or population and voluntary completion of the instrument.

In order to address the 2015-2016 low participation rates, the Board of Regents and system representatives met to discuss the implementation of measures in an effort to increase student response rate including offering substantive incentives to entice more students to complete the survey.

Additionally, given the previous years' experience and concern with the low response rate, BOR made repeated efforts to introduce the following amendments to Act 172 which could potentially lead to a more robust and representative response rate: 1) change from a yearly administration to a biennial or triennial schedule, and 2) adjust from the use of a uniform instrument to one that would reflect the diversity of the institutions within the various systems. BOR's efforts were unsuccessful and thus BOR moved forward in the same manner as the previous year.

III. Limitations of Campus Climate Survey

As previously noted, Act 172 mandates every institution to administer the survey, but allows students to voluntarily participate in the survey. Thus students with strong opinions or substantial knowledge regarding climate issues on campus may have been more apt to participate in the study.

A total of 7,541 students responded to the survey. This response rate represents approximately 3.5 percent of the student population currently enrolled in Louisiana's public postsecondary institutions and is a lower response rate than the previous administration.

The purpose of administering a uniform campus climate survey amongst the student populations of the systems was to capture self-reported data regarding the students' own experiences with sexual assault and the prevailing perceptions of the climate related to sexual misconduct on the various campuses. These self-reported data on rape and sexual assault are crucial to understanding the extent and nature of crimes as they often go unreported to police and consequently are underreported in crime statistics. There are many factors that contribute to the low reporting of rape and sexual assault including: 1) the sensitive and personal nature of these crimes; 2) the definitional ambiguity of rape and sexual assaults may result in victims not thinking about what happened to them as a crime, and 3) the victims' own lack of faith that reporting of these crimes will result in satisfactory outcomes.

The four systems reported to the Board of Regents that the timing initially selected for the survey, late spring, was not an optimal time for student and campus calendars, with students studying for final exams, and would need to be reconsidered. An additional concern expressed by both the Board of Regents and the system representatives centered around the length of the EverFi survey – with over 103 overarching questions, many with sub questions.

These concerns are not unique to Louisiana, indeed even the administrators of the largest sexual assault climate survey to date, the American Association of Universities' (AAU) 2015 study reported a low response rate which was not representative of the population. AAU's study consisted of twenty-seven institutions and a pool of over 700,000 students. Efforts to adequately capture the scope of sexual assault not only in this state but also nationally via surveys remain a challenging venture.

Given the aforementioned study limitations, the results presented in this report should only be interpreted as representative of the survey respondents, and cannot be generalized to the population of all students at an institution or Louisiana students as a whole.

IV. Results

The survey included questions about the following: (A) survey demographics and academic characteristics, (B) general climate questions, (C) perceptions of policies, procedures and leadership, (D) alcohol and drug abuse, (E) sexual violence, (F) stalking and relationship violence, (G) readiness to help, and (H) bystander confidence, norms, and behaviors. **As mentioned previously, the results obtained from the survey cannot be generalized to the population of all students at an institution or Louisiana students as a whole.** Therefore, the results presented below are limited to the perceptions and opinions of 7541 participants who responded to the survey.

A. Demographics and Academic Characteristics

Table 1 provides a summary of selected demographic and academic characteristics of survey participants from both administrations of the survey.

There were no discernable differences in the two cohorts except for a slight change in students' living arrangements which saw the percentage of respondents living at home with family increase from 27% in 2016 to 31% in 2017, while the overall number of respondents living in residence halls, on and off-campus apartments and Greek halls decreased.

B. General Climate Questions

Numerous studies have concluded that how students experience their campus environment influences both learning and developmental outcomes. For the purposes of this study, a general campus climate measure was constructed using a 15-item measure. Rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree), participants were asked to rate the following areas:

On a scale of 1 (unsafe environment) to 5 (safe environment), the mean score of the survey was 3.46, only a slight difference from the mean reported in the 2015-2016 administration of 3.41, indicating that overall students in Louisiana public higher education institutions perceive their campus to be moderately safe. While this mean score does not necessarily index a negative campus climate, it is an area in which campus leaders could work for improvement. Although this finding is not representative of the student population as whole, campus leaders should continue to strive to identify and address deficiencies in their campus environment (infrastructure, policies, procedures, and training) that could negatively impact campus safety or the students' perceptions of campus safety (if the perceptions are not a true reflection of campus safety).

C. Perceptions of Institutional Policies, Procedures and Leadership

Institutional policies, procedures and leadership are vital to effectively preventing and responding to sexual assault. In conducting an environmental scan to determine how Louisiana's campuses addressed these issues, the Board of Regents in 2014 concluded that the majority of Louisiana's campuses did not have institutional policies that were specifically designed to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual assault. Most institutions' sexual assault policies were

subsumed under sexual harassment policies and procedures. To ensure that each institution had policies and procedures that adequately prevented and responded to incidents of sexual misconduct, the Board of Regents Uniform Policy on Sexual Misconduct required each institution to develop and implement institutional policies and procedures that are clear, readable, and accurate. All of Louisiana's public postsecondary institutions have developed and implemented policies and procedures which can be found on the Board of Regents website (<http://www.regents.la.gov/page/LASAFEINFO>) and on each institution's website.

Observations on Perception of Institutional Policies, Procedures and Leadership

Overall, findings indicate that less than half of the respondents felt that campus leadership and resources would be supportive in the event of a report of sexual assault

Across the board, less than 30% of those students who responded found the training offered at their campus useful or knew how to report a complaint of sexual assault.

D. Alcohol and Drug Use

To evaluate students' experiences with alcohol and drug abuse, students were asked to report the frequency and amount of drug and alcohol use since the start of the academic year.

Observations on Alcohol and Drug Abuse

54% of students who responded reported that they drink twice a month or less, since the start of the academic year

34% of students reported that, on a typical drinking occasion, they will have up to 4 alcohol drinks (one drink = 1.5 oz. liquor, or 5 oz. wine, or 12 oz. beer)

11% of the respondents reported using marijuana

Less than 5% of respondents reported using medications not prescribed to them

Less than 3% of respondents reported using cocaine, methamphetamine or amphetamines

E. Sexual Violence

To understand the full extent of nonconsensual sexual contact on Louisiana's public postsecondary institutions, survey participants were asked a broad range of questions regarding unwanted sexual contact. This section summarizes the prevalence of victimization that was a result of unwanted sexual contact, as well as the characteristics of the victims, and whether the incident was reported to an agency or another individual.

Observations on Sexual Violence

473 of 7,541 survey participants (6.3%) indicated that they experienced sexual contact without consent since they enrolled in school.

50% of survey participants who reported that they experienced sexual contact without consent live off-campus.

1.5% of respondents indicated that they pressured or forced someone into sexual contact without that person's explicit consent.

Of the 473 survey participants who indicated that they experienced sexual contact without consent, most told a friend about the incident.

F. Stalking and Relationship Violence

Much of the research that focuses on sexual violence largely ignores relationship violence and stalking. In fact, it was not until recent legislation (2013) that the Federal Clery Act was expanded to include rights to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. According to a National Intimate Partner Violence and Sexual Violence survey (2011), the highest rates of stalking occur for victims between the ages of 18 to 24 years old. These statistics make awareness and reporting of stalking even more important for colleges and universities.

Observations on Stalking and Relationship Violence

Findings indicate that a large majority (over 82%) of survey respondents reported that they never experienced the following: (1) someone spying on them; (2) unsolicited letters or written correspondence, (3) unsolicited phone calls, (4) unsolicited emails/text messages; (5) someone who showed up at the place where the participant was (without any reason to be there); (6) someone leaving an unwanted item; (7) someone who tried to communicate in other ways against the participant's will; (8) and/or vandalized/destroyed participant's property.

While the majority of the survey respondents reported that they never experienced intimate partner abuse (emotional and physical abuse), of those who did report relationship violence, a higher number reported emotional abuse compared to physical abuse.

G. Readiness to Help

Students can be effective leaders on campus by modeling what respect looks like and educating their communities about sexual assault, consent, and bystander intervention.

Several measures were used to assess survey participants' readiness to help.

Observations on Readiness to Help

Findings suggest that students are willing to help their peers; however, few indicated that they have taken part in activities or volunteered their time on projects focused on ending sexual violence.

38% of survey respondents strongly disagreed/disagreed that "doing something about sexual violence is solely the job of campus administrators."

8.4% of survey respondents reported that they have recently attended a program about sexual violence

H. Bystander Confidence, Norms, and Behaviors

Research on the causes of sexual violence and evaluation of prevention efforts indicate that bystander prevention is a critical piece of the work. Legislative initiatives and institutional policies and programs can shift social norms so there is social pressure for the campus community to take action. Research also suggests that although many students are willing to help, bystanders are often unsure of themselves, and campus norms often impact whether and how a bystander will intervene.

Observations on Bystander Confidence, Norms, and Behaviors

45% of survey respondents reported that they would feel confident/completely confident in confronting a friend who tells them they had sex with someone who had passed out or didn't give consent.

47% of respondents reported that they would feel confident/completely confident in doing something to help a very drunk person who is being brought to a bedroom by a group of people.

50% of respondents would share information that might help in a sexual assault case to a campus authority even if pressured to stay silent by peers.

34% of survey respondents would check in with a friend who looks drunk when they go to a room with someone at a party.

20% of survey respondents would choose not to report sexual assault out of concern they or others will be punished

V. Conclusions and Implications

In AY2016-2017, Louisiana's public postsecondary institutions reported some expansion of meaningful changes in their policies, programs, and resources to more effectively address sexual violence on their campuses. Campuses continued to build on initiatives begun in 2015-2016 as part of meeting the requirements of Act 172. Refer to Appendices B-E for summary information regarding each of the four systems' updated programming initiatives and list of campus confidential advisors, pursuant to Act 172.

It is crucial that the Board of Regents and system representatives further investigate options moving forward, including engaging with other institutions or entities that have successfully promulgated campus climate surveys and policies to learn about best practices and national trends. Regents' staff will reach out to colleagues in those states (Maryland, New York and Texas) with recently implemented statewide campus climate survey requirements in order to exchange ideas and best practices regarding the survey instrument and administration.

Regents' staff and system representatives have begun to assess options for the AY 2017-2018 administration of the campus climate survey including reaching out to peer institutions and research associations as recommendations and decisions are made for the future. Additionally, Regents' staff plans to work with the system representatives and their respective institutions in efforts to increase response rates moving forward.

Additionally, Regents' staff is actively conducting research and pursuing information on state of the art methodology to increase the percentage of survey respondents which would ultimately increase the statistical relevance of the results. Toward that end, Board of Regents' staff have reached out to peer institutions who have developed survey instruments that could perhaps be adapted or customized for Louisiana's Campus Climate Survey. For example, Rutgers and the University of Kentucky developed institutional instruments that have been nationally recognized as standard bearers in this area. The Board of Regents' staff is working with representatives from those institutions to discuss the possibility of a joint effort with these entities in the development and administration of future Campus Climate Surveys that would meet the requirements of Act 172.

Although postsecondary higher education has implemented many of the requirements of Act 172 (training/programming modules, confidential advisors, partnerships with local law enforcement and web resources such as LA SAFE - the active link to the BoR LA SAFE website is <http://www.regents.la.gov/page/LASAFEINFO> and can be found on the BoR home page), the low response rate on the Campus Climate Survey remains troublesome. The results of this second year of administration of the campus climate survey provides little insight into the evaluation of those efforts given the lower survey response rate. Unless and until changes are made within the scope of Act 172 or Act 172 is amended, the Board of Regents is concerned that meaningful information will not be forthcoming from the Campus Climate Survey.

As of this writing, Regents' staff are finalizing plans to enter into a collaboration with the University of Kentucky's Center for Research on Violence Against Women for assistance with the survey for AY 2017-2018.

Appendix A

Table 1. Louisiana's Public Postsecondary Institutions Survey Demographic and Academic Characteristics

		Spring 2016		Spring 2017	
Demographics	Subgroup	*n	% of Sample	*n	% of Sample
**Ethnicity/Race	Female	7,355	72%	5,367	71.2
	Male	2,799	28%	2,146	28.4
	Intersex	32	0.3	28	0.4
	Hispanic or Latino/a (yes)	603	6%	389	5.2
	Non-Hispanic or Latino/a	9,529	94%	7,115	94.8
	American Indian/Alaska Native	251	3%	209	2.8
	Asian	553	5%	356	4.7
	Black	2,247	22%	1,935	25.6
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	65	0.6	37	0.5
	White	7,212	71%	5,118	67.9
Sexuality	Other	321	3%	239	3.2
	Asexual	716	7%	525	7.0
	Heterosexual	8,014	80%	5,838	77.4
	Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual	924	9%	738	9.8
	Questioning	119	1%	65	0.9
	Pansexual	184	2%	138	1.8
	Other	126	1%	156	2.1
Age	18	1,204	12%	740	9.8
	19	1,712	17%	1,358	18.1
	20	1,545	15%	1,116	14.8
	21	1,375	14%	867	11.5
	22	965	10%	637	8.4
	23 or older	3,360	33%	2,804	37.2
Academic Characteristics					
	Enrollment Status				
Living Arrangements	Full-time	9,089	90%	6,513	87.1
	Part-time	970	10%	962	12.8
	Residence Hall	1,622	16%	1,111	14.8
	Fraternity or Sorority Hall	131	1%	69	0.9
	On-Campus Apartment	695	7%	432	5.7
	Off-Campus Apartment	4,826	48%	3,415	45.4
	At Home with Family	2,722	27%	2,347	31.2
	Other	150	1%	141	1.9
Grade Point Average(GPA)					
	4.0 – 3.5 (A average)	4,002	42.00%	2,953	41.1
	3.4 – 2.5 (B average)	4,436	46.00%	3,320	46.2
	2.4 – 1.5 (C average)	952	10%	700	9.7
	1.4 below (D average or below)	54	2%	40	0.6
	Don't know or not applicable	202	2%	173	2.4

* It is important to note that the percentages shown in Table 1 are based on the numbers of participants in the sample (n) for the specific demographic characteristics. The total n for each measure will differ due to missing data.

**Participants were able to select one or more race category; therefore, the n and the percentage for this measure are larger than the study sample.

Appendix B

System Overview

Systems	Survey Dissemination & Population	Confidential Advisor Training	Status of MOU's with Local Law Enforcement
LCTCS	In 2017, the survey was sent out to all enrolled students except dual-enrolled high school students and incarcerated students by each individual LCTCS college, with the exception of 2. LCTC System Office sent out the survey for the 2.	Annual Training by Confidential Advisors must be completed by 7/31 each year.	Currently under revision.
LSU System	Sent to entire enrolled population on all campuses through each campus	Annual Training August/September	Currently under revision with a completion date of 12/2017
SU System	Distributed the climate survey in a decentralized manner. Each campus distributed the survey to its students.	Annual Training to be completed by Fall 2017	Currently under revision.
UL System	Sent to entire enrolled population on all campuses through each campus	Annual Training	UNO drafted & awaiting signatures All other campuses current.

Appendix C

LCTCS System Confidential Advisors and System Initiatives

I. Confidential Advisors

BPCC

Abby Benzinger	Recruiting, Transition, and Retention Coordinator, Innovative Learning (Career Compass) abenzinger@bpcc.edu
Deana Elliott	Student Success Coordinator, Science, Nursing, and Allied Health delliott@bpcc.edu
Marjoree Harper	Director of Student Life mharper@bpcc.edu
Yolanda Cooper	Assistant Professor/Academic Advisor/Assistant Women's Basketball Coach ycooper@bpcc.edu
Peggy Fuller	Dean of Student Success pfuller@bpcc.edu
Qi Angie Cao	Student Support Specialist acao@bpcc.edu
Gina Rider	Instructor of English grider@bpcc.edu
Sharonda Mickle	smickle@bpcc.edu

BRCC

Theresa Charles	Default Manager charlest@mybrcc.edu
Anthonis Davenport	Enrollment Services Specialist davenporta@mybrcc.edu
Lisa Hibner	Director of Career Services hibnerl@mybrcc.edu
Timothy Johnson	Assistant Director of Recruitment

johnsont2@mybrcc.edu

Tyquencia Johnson Student Services Specialist
johnsont3@mybrcc.edu

Patricia McClanahan Assistant Director of Student Programs and Resources
mcclanahanp@mybrcc.edu

Reginald Johnson JAG Specialist
johnsonr2@mybrcc.edu

Michelle Samuels Enrollment Services Specialist
samuelsm@mybrcc.edu

Crystal Williams Student Services Specialist
williamscl@mybrcc.edu

Ann Zanders Director of Grant Resource Center
zandersa@mybrcc.edu

CLTCC

Sendy Johnson Student Success Advisor/Counselor
SendyJohnson@cltcc.edu

Lacey Hardy-Brown Carl D. Perkins Administrator & College & Career Transitions
Coordinator
laceyhardy@cltcc.edu

DCC

Brandy Barbarin Instructor in Nursing
bbarba@dcc.edu

Scott Borne Assistant Director of Student Life
sborne@dcc.edu

Barry Brantley Instructor/Director of Hospitality
bbrant@dcc.edu

Peter L. Cho Professor of Music & Interim Executive Dean
plcho@dcc.edu

Monique Cola	Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and City Park Campus, Executive Dean mcola@dcc.edu
Lesha Coulon	Assistant Dean/ Site Manager–Jefferson Site lcoulo@dcc.edu
Theresa Degruy	Director, Student Support Services tdegru@dcc.edu
Steven Edwards	Director, Honors Program. Professor sedwar@dcc.edu
Larisia Jones	Lead Instructor & Department Chair Ljones3@dcc.edu
Erin Landry	Director of Adult Education elandr@dcc.edu
Carla Major	Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources and Professional Development cmajor@dcc.edu
Tammy Marullo-Scott	Academic Advisor, Science & Mathematics tscott@dcc.edu
Rachelle Matherne	Assistant Director, Continuing Education rmathe@dcc.edu
Regina Radosta	Site Facilitator for Maritime, Fire, Radar and Industrial rrados@dcc.edu
Miguel Romar	Assistant Professor mrmanu@dcc.edu
Stacey Thompson	Assistant to the Executive Dean sthomp@dcc.edu

DELTA

Lamar Anderson	Financial Aid Advisor harryanderson@ladelta.edu
----------------	--

Richard Bates	Campus Coordinator richardbates@ladelta.edu
Maurice Bowie	Assistant Campus Director mauricebowie@ladelta.edu
Stephanie Ceasar	Adult Education Counselor stephaniecaesar@ladelta.edu
Traci Clark	Director of Student Counseling and Disability Services traciclark@ladelta.edu
Dorothy Davis	Financial Aid Advisor dorothydavis@ladelta.edu
Patricia Dunn	Assistant Campus Director patriciadunn@ladelta.edu
Gwenn Hall	Assistant Director for Admissions gwennhall@ladelta.edu
DeAnne Kiper	Director of Campus Services and Workforce/Economic Development deannekipper@ladelta.edu
Lisa Lewis	Academic Outreach Counselor Lisalewis2@ladelta.edu
Joseph Mansour	Director of Campus Services and Workforce/Economic Development josephmansour@ladelta.edu
Julie Salter	Career and Job Specialist Jsalter@ladelta.edu
DeWanna Temple	Administrator Coordinator 4 dewannatemple@ladelta.edu
Julia Toliver	Campus Coordinator juliatoliver@ladelta.edu

Doug Postel Director of Campus Services and Workforce/Economic
Development
dougpostel@ladelta.edu

FTCC

Ashley Douglas, Academic Advisor
Ashley.douglas@fletcher.edu

Jodi Duet Director of Counseling and Advising
Jodi.duet@fletcher.edu

NSHORE

Elizabeth Froeba Assistant Director of Student Affairs
bethfroeba@northshorecollege.edu

Gail Haydel Financial Aid VA/ Program Specialist
gailhaydel@northshorecollege.edu

Wilburn Jones Assistant Director of Student Affairs
burkejones@northshorecollege.edu

April Lavergne Assistant Director of Student Affairs
aprillavergne@northshorecollege.edu

Remy Williams Assistant Director of Student Affairs
remywilliams@northshorecollege.edu

NUNEZ

Richard Greene Director of Human Resources
rgreene@nunez.edu

Becky T. Maillet Dean of Student Affairs
bmaillet@nunez.edu

NWLTC

Alena Harris Director of Student Services
alenaharris@nwltc.edu

Pam Hubier Financial Aid Officer
pamelahubier@nwltc.edu

Tammy Morgan	Administrative Assistant 4 tammymorgan@nwltc.edu
Sheri McLemore	Nursing Department Head shasherimclemore@nwltc.edu
Cynthia Ridley	Administrative Coordinator 3 cynthiaridley@nwltc.edu
Lawrence Richardson	Barber Styling Instructor lawrencerichardson@nwltc.edu
Paula Wiley	Financial Aid Officer paulawiley1@nwltc.edu

RPCC

Angela Colar Brumfield	Restricted Funds Accountant acolar@rpcc.edu
Angie Bell	College and Career Transitions Coordinator abell@rpcc.edu
Constance Chemay	Head of Public Services cchemay@rpcc.edu
Ruebin Gourley	Director of Industrial Workforce Solutions rgourley@rpcc.edu

SCLTC

Stephanie Leonard	Coordinator of Academic Services & Dual Enrollment stephanieleonard@scl.edu
Denise Pellegrin	Faculty denisepellegrin@scl.edu
Kaylla Hebert	kayllahebert@scl.edu
Dr. Annette Thornton	Faculty annettethornton@scl.edu

SOWELA

Wayne Bebee	College & Transitions Coordinator wayne.beebe@sowela.edu
Angela Schenider	Director of Enrollment and Student Engagement angela.schexnider@sowela.edu
Kylie Schmaltz	Instructional Site Coordinator kylie.shmaltz@sowela.edu
Cicely Williams	Student Success Counselor cicely.williams@sowela.edu
Dr. Martha Schexneider	Chief Information Resources & Technology Officer jo.schexneider@sowela.edu

SLCC

Kimberly Lachney	ADA Counselor Kimberly.Lachney@solacc.edu
Renee' Fruge'	Associate Director of Financial Aid renee.fruge@solacc.edu

II. Examples of Campus Programs

- Sexual Harassment Prevention Training for faculty, staff, and students
- Sexual Harassment Prevention Training: built into the Student Orientation module

Appendix D

LSU System Confidential Advisors and System Initiatives

I. Confidential Advisors by campus

a. A&M

- i. Eddie St-Vil
- ii. Teresia Greer
- iii. Juan Barthelemy
- iv. Murphy Rutherford
- v. Summer Steib
- vi. LaKeitha Poole
- vii. Rebecca Hubbard
- viii. All Lighthouse Advocates (86) and Accountability Advisors (17)

b. Alexandria

- i. Janice Miller
- ii. Jennifer Innerarity
- iii. Rafael Romero
- iv. Cynthia Thomas

c. Eunice

- i. Althea Jackson
- ii. Timothy Trant
- iii. Kathleen Warner

d. HSC NO

- i. Scott Embley
- ii. Margaret Bishop-Baier
- iii. Lauren Garnier

e. HSC S

- i. Michael McGill
- ii. Elizabeth Guice
- iii. Christi Rinaudo
- iv. Laura Mackowiak
- v. Jessica Cote
- vi. Christopher Schmoutz
- vii. Roosevelt Seaberry

f. Shreveport

- i. A'lissa Fowler
- ii. James Ingold
- iii. Angie Pellerin
- iv. Linda Webster
- v. Linda Wimbley
- vi. Timothy Winter
- vii. Kelly Wynn

II. Examples of campus programs

a. A&M

- i. Tiger BITES – student bystander intervention training
- ii. Responsible Employee training for Law Center Tutors
- iii. Safer Spring Break messages through Student Health Center
- iv. Online Responsible Employee training for all employees
- v. MyStudent Body training for all new undergraduate students
- vi. Presentation to international students in Sexual Misconduct
- vii. Multiple presentations targeted to students hosted by Greek Life, Student Health Center, Athletics, Cox Center for Student Athletes and Campus Life
- viii. Training for Title IX investigators on working with students
- ix. New brochure with overview of processes and resources
- x. Various events included within Safety Month initiatives

b. Alexandria

- i. In person training on Responsible Employee obligations for all new faculty
- ii. In person training for confidential advisors

c. Eunice

- i. Online training to students
- ii. Online training to employees
- iii. In person training to faculty and staff at fall employee orientation
- iv. Training at welcome night for residential students

d. HSC NO

- i. Online training for responsible employees
- ii. Sexual harassment presentation by HRM
- iii. Training for all students at New Student Orientation
- iv. Presentations by Campus Assistance Program to students and employees on services for survivors, EAP, healthy relationships
- v. Peer Advocate Liaison Program – covers myriad issues including interpersonal, dating and domestic violence

e. HSC S

- i. Presentation from Project Celebration to students
- ii. Responsible employee training

f. Shreveport

- i. Title IX training for student tutors
- ii. Title IX training for Resident Assistants
- iii. Title IX training for new faculty
- iv. Title IX training at new student orientation
- v. Speaker from Project Celebration in student organization council meeting
- vi. Dating violence awareness month outreach table
- vii. Bystander awareness bingo

viii. Healthy relationship poetry slam

Appendix D

University of Louisiana System Confidential Advisors and System Initiatives

I. Confidential Advisors by campus

Grambling: Carolyn Hester
Coleen Speed
Dewayne Hollins
Patrice Outley
Tundra Turner

LA Tech Jacob Hilton
Karen Colvin
Lauren Tressler
Lindsey O'Neal
Robert Burt
Ron Cathey

McNeese Dena Matzenbacher
Twila Sterling-Guillory

Nicholls Cabria Bouzigard
Michael Matherne
Rachel Boguille
Sabrina Laurent

Northwestern Desiree Wyrosdick
Jermaine Thomas
Kristi Simms
Lori LeBlanc
Maggie Welch
Rebecca Boone
Stephanie Campbell
Yvonne Grant

Southeastern Annette Baldwin-Newton
Emily Moise
Paige LeBleu Moody
Thomas Caffery

UL-Lafayette Bruce Buggs
Karlie Butterworth

UL-Monroe Karen Foster
Melanie Clark
Traci Clark

II. Examples of Campus Programs

- Sexual Misconduct Awareness & Prevention campaigns
- Sexual Assault Prevention Education through Everfi
- Sexual misconduct campus-wide PSA
- Campus safety weeks
- Taskforce meetings
- Title IX Taskforce Workshop
- Title IX Sexual Misconduct and Harassment Training
- Residential Life Title IX Training and Sexual Misconduct Presentation
- Domestic Violence Seminars
- Interpersonal Violence Awareness and Prevention
- Online individual training to students and staff (Haven, Green Dot Active Bystander Awareness Training Seminars)
- Local victims' advocacy groups such as Heart of Hope sponsor campus events to raise awareness about sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking.
- Poster Campaigns promoting consent and sexual assault stats.
- Relationship violence memorial/prevention event
- Rape aggression defense training

Appendix E

SU System Confidential Advisors and System Initiatives

I. Confidential Advisors by Campus

Southern University Baton Rouge (SUBR)

SUBR Title IX Coordinator Marcus Coleman marcus_coleman@subr.edu

SUBR Title IX Deputy Coordinator - Human Resource Andrea Benjamin
andrea_benjamin@sus.edu

SUBR Title IX Deputy Coordinator - Athletics Pamela Smith
pamela_smith@subr.edu

SUBR Confidential Advisor Greta Wilkes greta_wilkes@subr.edu

SUBR Confidential Advisor Valaray Irvin valaray_irvin@subr.edu

SUBR Confidential Advisor Patricia Hebert patricia_hebert@subr.edu

Southern University- Shreveport (SUSLA)

SUSLA Title IX Coordinator Tilisha Bryant tbryant@susla.edu

SUSLA Confidential Advisor Marquis Hall mhall@susla.edu

SUSLA Confidential Advisor Rebecca Gilliam rgilliam@susla.edu

SUSLA Confidential Advisor Jerushka Johnson jellis@susla.edu

SUSLA Confidential Advisor Kaye Washington klwashington@susla.edu

Southern University Law Center (SULC)

SULC Title IX Coordinator Tavares Walker, JD twalker@sulc.edu

SULC Title IX Deputy Coordinator Ursula Ransberg, JD uransburg@sulc.edu

SULC Confidential Advisor Felicia Forman fforman@sulc.edu

SULC Confidential Advisor Lena Johnson lmjohnson@sulc.edu

Southern University New Orleans (SUNO)

SUNO Title IX Coordinator Yolanda Mims ymims@suno.edu

SUNO Confidential Advisor Tammy Barney tbarney@suno.edu

SUNO Confidential Advisor Sheryl Crosby scrisby@suno.edu

SUNO Confidential Advisor Pamela Benthley pbentley@suno.edu

II. Examples of Campus Programs

- Title IX ads in the student newspaper regarding reporting methods.
- Title IX awareness social media postings.
- Title IX information communicated during Freshman Seminar.
- Title IX information communicated during New Student Orientation.

Agenda Item VII.

Admission Exceptions Update

Background

Prior to the adoption of a constitutional amendment in 1997 creating the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, most of Louisiana's public universities practiced open admissions, serving the roles of both two- and four-year institutions. Following the creation of the two-year college system, the 2001 Master Plan instituted minimum admission criteria at public universities, shifting enrollment patterns to provide for a better student-to-institution match. The hope was that matching student preparation with institutional expectations would lead to higher student success rates, ultimately increasing retention and graduation rates. The admission criteria included exception limits for the Flagship, Statewide and Regional* institutions which allowed some flexibility for institutions to admit special talent or ability students who were not meeting regular criteria.

Since the adoption of the 2001 Plan, there have been several versions of the minimum standards and adjustments to the exception limits to reflect lessons learned through implementation. The current exception allowances are a percentage based on the previous years' entering class: Flagship-4%, Statewide-6%, and Regional-8%.**

During the past decade, universities have requested that the Regents consider increasing the allowable exceptions to allow for a more holistic admission process. At its May 2015 meeting, the Regents instructed the staff to review exception allowances to ascertain how effective the policy was and if there should be adjustments to the percentages of allowed exceptions. Staff would report its findings and recommendations, if any, to the Board in approximately two years. The review would concentrate on a comparison of 1st-year performance (retention, semester GPA) of students admitted by exception to those admitted under minimum standards.

Findings

Board of Regents' staff analyzed student outcomes data for 1st time Freshmen (FTF) cohorts admitted as exceptions in AY 2015 and AY 2016 to determine how students admitted under the exceptions category compared in performance to the general population of admitted students. Specifically, staff compared 1st-year performance, defined as fall 2015 to fall 2016 retention and 1st-semester fall GPA. Institutions began to report these measures in AY 2015-2016; therefore, the study cohort contains only two academic years of data. (Additional years of data should be included to draw definitive conclusions that would inform changes in policy.)

1st Semester Fall GPA: Freshmen.

In both Fall 2015 and 2016, 95% of first-time, full-time university freshmen were reported by institutions as having met minimum admission criteria, with 5% being admitted by exception. At the end of the first Fall, there was an overall difference of 0.74 in semester GPAs of those admitted

*Flagship: LSU. Statewide: LA Tech, ULL, UNO. Regional: Grambling, LSU-A, LSU-S, McNeese, Nicholls, NSU, SLU, SU, SUNO, ULM

**It is important to note that the BoR sets the maximum allowable percentage of exceptions per tier and does not give direction on how to manage this population, leaving that to the institution's discretion. Each institution handles the admission of these students and is required to report individual exceptions through the Regents' Statewide Student Profile System data.

by exception versus those who met minimum criteria, as shown in Table 1 below. In all institutions except SUNO, students admitted by exception did not perform as well as those who met the minimum admission standards. The GPA gap ranged from a low of 0.35 at ULM, to a high of 0.94 at LSUA. (It should be noted that SUNO over the two fall semesters reported only 12 students being admitted by exception. Therefore, the size of the cohort at SUNO should be deemed insufficient to draw any conclusions.)

Table 1
Average FTF Fall Term GPA: F2015 + F2016, Combined

		Admitted by Exception		Total
		No	Yes	
Flagship	LSU	2.86	2.01	2.82
Statewide	LA Tech	2.98	2.25	2.96
	UNO	2.66	2.08	2.61
	ULL	2.89	2.45	2.88
Statewide Total		2.89	2.28	2.86
Regional	LSUA	2.31	1.37	2.24
	LSUS	2.53	2.07	2.52
	SUBR	2.03	1.62	2.01
	SUNO	1.84	2.00	1.85
	GSU	2.31	1.68	2.28
	McNeese	2.47	1.88	2.39
	Nicholls	2.49	1.70	2.45
	NSU	2.72	1.86	2.68
	SLU	2.52	1.80	2.47
	ULM	2.83	2.48	2.83
Regional Total		2.49	1.80	2.45
University Total: Average Fall GPA		2.70	1.96	2.66
Total University FTF, Fall 2015+2016		40,869 (95%)	2,188 (5%)	43,057

Fall 2015 to Fall 2016 Retention

As with the first semester GPA, university first-time freshmen who met admission criteria in fall 2015 had a higher average retention rate than those admitted by exception: 81% retention among regular admits, versus 67% for the exceptions (Table 2). A review of institutional retention rates by tier or grouping indicates that retention rates are generally lower for institutions with lower minimum admission standards.

Table 2
Retention: Fall 2015 FTF Who Enrolled in Fall 2016

	F2015 FTF	Retained (Enrolled) F2016					
		Regular Adm		Adm by Exception		Total Retained	
Flagship	5,634	4,857	89%	158	77%	5,015	89%
Statewide	6,024	4,841	84%	189	72%	5,030	83%
Regional	10,286	7,620	74%	413	63%	7,620	74%
Total	21,944	16,905	81%	760	67%	17,665	81%

Senior Staff Recommendation

Although a limited data set was available for analysis (Fall 2015-Fall 2016), there were differences in 1st Fall semester GPA and Fall-to-Fall retention rates of students admitted as exceptions compared to students who met the minimum admission standards. Exceptions in statewide and flagship institutions had stronger performance measures than those in regional universities. The Senior Staff recommends that exception allowances (Flagship-4%, Statewide-6%, and Regional-8%) remain at their present levels -- unless there are indications that the exceptions are performing at near comparable levels of those students who meet the minimum admissions standards.