



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1411  
312-263-0456 | 800-621-7440 | Fax: 312-263-7462 | [ncahlc.org](http://ncahlc.org)

October 23, 2013

Dr. Carl Heilman  
President  
Barton County Community College  
245 NE 30th Rd  
Great Bend, KS 67530-9283

Dear President Heilman:

The Change Panel has reviewed Barton County Community College's change application for the Associate of Applied Science in Technical Studies program. In addition, Commission staff have reviewed both the Panel's work and recommendation. The Change Panel has recommended to the Institutional Actions Council your request to be denied. This recommendation is not final until the IAC acts on it and until you receive the dated action letter. The Panel's report is attached.

The Institutional Actions Council (IAC), a Commission decision-making body, will act on the Panel's recommendation on December 3, 2013. As allowed for by policy, the institution can submit a written institutional response. The IAC will consider the institutional response and may agree with or revise the Panel's recommendations.

Please complete and return the enclosed form to Stephanie Kramer [skramer@hlcommission.org](mailto:skramer@hlcommission.org) no later than two weeks from the date of this letter. The institution's response becomes part of the official record of the evaluation and is included in the materials sent to the decision process and to the next team that reviews the institution.

If the Commission does not receive a response within two weeks, it will conclude that the institution accepts the accreditation recommendation and will forward the appropriate materials to the IAC for review and action. More information on the Commission's decision process is provided on the attached form and available on the Commission's website ([www.ncahlc.org](http://www.ncahlc.org)).

Should the IAC concur with the Panel's recommendation, the institution may choose to resubmit the change application, addressing issues raised by the Panel, no sooner than six months after the IAC decision. The previous Panel's report, any institutional response, and the IAC's action letter will be part of a new Panel's review.

We encourage you to review the Panel's comments and to contact [Stephanie Kramer](mailto:Stephanie.Kramer@hlcommission.org) at [312-263-0456](tel:3122630456) or [800-621-7440](tel:8006217440).

Higher Learning Commission of NCA

Enclosures

cc: Change Panel Members  
Robert Appleson, VP for Accreditation Relations

**Substantive Change Recommendation Form:  
Change Panel**

After the panel achieves consensus, the Primary Reader completes this form to summarize and document the panel's view. Notes and evidence should be essential and concise — a bullet or two, 50 words maximum.

Institution: Barton County Community College City, State: Great Bend, KS

Change requested: Adding new Associate of Applied Studies degree in Technical Studies

**Part A: Analysis** (See Part 1, General Questions in change application)

Item	Accurate, clear, complete	Inaccurate, vague, incomplete	Notes
Requested Change	<b>x</b>		New degree program in Technical Studies within the existing Associate in Applied Studies degree
Classification of Change(s)	<b>x</b>		
Institutional Context	<b>x</b>		
Special Conditions	<b>x</b>		
Required Approvals	<b>x</b>		Completed through Kansas Board of Regents (5/20/2013) and BCCC Board of Trustees (10/20/2011)

<b>Essential Elements</b> The categories below relate to the evidence expected across subsections of Part 2 of the change application.	Acceptable	Acceptable if Modified	Not acceptable	<b>Evidence</b>
<b>Commitment to, preparation for, and fit</b> of the proposed change to the institution (characteristics, history, planning, design) (See <i>Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 of change application.</i> )	<b>X</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BBCC currently offers an equivalent program as three separate certificates. This proposal will integrate these certificate tracks into a single degree program in Technical Studies for a military target student population.</li> <li>- The institution currently serves this cohort group through sites at Fort Riley and Fort Leavenworth.</li> </ul>
<b>Capacity</b> (people, structures, and resources) for implementing and sustaining the change(s) (See <i>Parts 1, 3, 5, 6 of change application</i> )		<b>X</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Board policy mandates that new programs be supported with current facilities, equipment, budget. It's unclear whether these are adequate.</li> <li>- Faculty qualifications are a concern:</li> </ul>

			of 8 FT faculty 2 have masters, 3 have an associates, 1 has no degree; of 10 PT faculty, 2 have masters, 3 have no degree.
<b>Strategies for systematically monitoring and evaluating</b> the effects, performance, and/or quality of the change(s) <i>(See Parts 1, 7 of change application.)</i>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employer surveys will generate graduate satisfaction data.</li> <li>- Technical advisory committees will offer input on technical components.</li> <li>- Only one assessment instrument (student evaluations) would assess the program. It's unclear what direct measures will be used to measure student learning.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategies for addressing strengths, challenges, or strategic issues</b> (especially those previously identified by the Commission) related to the change(s) <i>(See Parts 3, 7 of change application.)</i>	<b>X</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional student advising will be done by FT staff member.</li> </ul>
<b>Potential positive or negative effects</b> of the change(s) on other institutional operations <i>(See Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 of change application)</i>	<b>X</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed program shows no potential negative effects, but also the positive potential to generate greater retention of those students currently enrolled in individual certificate programs.</li> <li>- Since this program is offered primarily for military personnel, it contains appropriate flexibility to meet student needs.</li> </ul>
<b>Quality standards</b> incorporated that would make successful implementation likely <i>(See Parts 1, 7 of change application.)</i>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advisory committees evaluate student satisfaction, workplace success.</li> <li>- National consortia inform about industry trends, hold instructor training.</li> <li>- Some courses are all day for one week. It's unclear how students process/apply learning so quickly. Which courses are one week? Do they carry 1 or 3 hours of credit? Will pedagogies used produce learning equivalent to other courses?</li> </ul>

**Part B: Recommendation and Rationale**

**Recommendation:**     Approve Request     Approve Modified Request     Deny Request

**Note:** In the rare circumstance that you concur that a decision requires information only available through an on-site visit, check here \_\_\_\_\_, explain the determination in the rationale section below, and submit the form without completing the other sections. Commission staff will review the recommendation for an on-site visit for appropriateness and for consistency with Commission practice and may contact the panel.

**Rationale for the panel's recommendation (100 words maximum).** *If the recommendation is a modification of the institution's request, make clear how the Panel modified the original request.*

The panel recommends that the request be denied since the institution has not articulated a systematic strategy to monitor and evaluate the effects, performance and quality of this program, particularly as it relates to student learning. Best practices indicate that multiple, integrated measures employed over a full cycle will provide comprehensive and meaningful program assessment of student learning and pedagogical practice. This issue

also relates to the institution's articulation of quality standards, which requires further specification as indicated in the item discussion above. The panel recommends that the institution specify and resubmit this request.

**Clarification of Information.** *If applicable, identify the date and topics of any requests for clarification or communication with the institution and the results.*

**Organizational Profile.** *If the request indicates an addition to the Organizational Profile, identify it here.*

**Stipulations or limitations on future accreditation relationships.** *If recommending a change in an institution's level for review of future changes (locations, programs, delivery, etc.), state both the old and new level, and provide a brief rationale for the recommended change. Check the Statement of Affiliation Status for the current wording.*

**Monitoring:** *The Panel may recommend that the Commission monitor the institution's implementation of the change through a variety of methods. Check the method(s) recommended.*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Progress report     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cover in detail in next PEAQ Comprehensive Self-Study Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring report   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Focused visit       | <input type="checkbox"/> Cover in detail in next AQIP Systems Portfolio               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> AQIP Action Project | <input type="checkbox"/> Report achievements via Assessment Academy                   |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain below)  |

*Specify any schedule or deadlines for the monitoring and briefly describe the concerns and the goals and expectations of the monitoring in relation to these concerns.*

**Additional feedback:** *If recommending denial of the request, explain what was inadequate.*