

REVISED MEETING AGENDA

HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

Western Washington University, Old Main 340

516 High Street, Bellingham, WA 98225

May 25, 2000

*Approximate
Times*

Tab

8:15 a.m. Board Breakfast and Meeting Overview, Solarium, Old Main
(No official business will be conducted at this time.)

9:00 a.m. Welcome and Introductions
Dr. Selby, HECB Vice Chair
Pres. Karen Morse, welcome remarks

Adoption of March HECB Meeting Minutes 1

INFORMATION ITEMS

• **2000 Legislative Session Summary** 2
HECB staff briefing

• **Educational Opportunity Grant Study, Update** 3
HECB staff briefing

• **Competency-based Admissions Standards Project** 4
NCHEMS Program Review

MASTER PLAN UPDATE 5

HECB Staff Briefing

- Master Plan Resolution: capital and enrollment assumptions review
- Competency-based Degrees
- Rules Review

CONSENT AGENDA

• **Associate in Science Transfer Degree** 6
(Resolution 00-12)

• **MS Engineering Technology, CWU at Ellensburg,
Puyallup, and Auburn** 7
(Resolution 00-13)

- **BA Elementary Education, WSU Tri-Cities** **8**
(Resolution 00-14)

- **MS In Agriculture, WSU Extended** **9**
Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho
(Resolution 00-15)

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURN

12:30 **Board Lunch** (No official business will be conducted at this time.)

1:30 p.m. Campus Tour

If you are a person with disability and require an accommodation for attendance, or need this agenda in an alternative format, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7800 as soon as possible to allow sufficient time to make arrangements. We also can be reached through our Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 753-7809.

2000 HECB Meeting Calendar

<i>DAY/DATE</i>	<i>TYPE</i>	<i>TENTATIVE LOCATION</i>
June	No meeting	
July 25-26 (Tue./Wed.)	Board planning/ Regular meeting	CWU, Ellensburg Board Room, Barge 412
August	No meeting	
September 19 (Tues.)	Regular meeting	WSU, Pullman CUB 125 & 127
October 26 (Thurs.)	Regular meeting	Olympia JAC, SHR4
November	No meeting	
December 1 (Fri.)	Regular meeting	UPS, Tacoma Board Room

MINUTES OF MEETING March 30, 2000

May 2000

HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair
Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair
Mr. David Shaw, Secretary
Ms. Kristi Blake
Dr. Frank Brouillet
Mr. James Faulstich
Mr. Larry Hanson
Ms. Ann Ramsey-Jenkins
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn

HECB Staff

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director
Ms. Linda Schactler, Deputy Director
Mr. Bruce Botka, Dir, Governmental Relations
Ms. Becki Collins, Dir, Education Services
Mr. John Fricke, Associate Director
Mr. Doug Scrima, Policy Associate
Dr. Tom Weko, Associate Director
Ms. Elaine Jones, Associate Director

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Bob Craves, HECB Chairman, welcomed meeting participants and initiated Board introductions. Mr. Gary Oertli, Shoreline Community College president, welcomed the Board to the Shoreline campus. He said the college is unique because even though it is the smallest community and technical college district in the state of Washington, it is in the top five as far as the size of the college. Fifty-seven percent of the students who come to Shoreline Community College are from out-of-the district. Carolyn Edmonds, State Representative from District 32, welcomed the Board to Shoreline.

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director, reviewed the agenda for the day.

Minutes of January 27, 2000, Board Meeting

Mr. Larry Hanson moved for approval of the minutes as recorded. **Ms. Kristi Blake** seconded. The minutes were approved.

ACTION: **Dr. Gay Selby** moved that Resolution 00-11, dealing with admissions standards in science, and Resolution 00-08, dealing with the M.Ed. reimbursement program, be placed on the consent agenda subject to discussion. **Mr. Larry Hanson** seconded. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Craves updated the Board on endorsements for the Master Plan. He said the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges agreed to have a joint meeting in early June to discuss the needs of higher education and their endorsement of the Master Plan. Mr. Craves said he has written to the four-year public and independent colleges and universities who have not yet responded. He hopes to hear from them in the next few weeks.

K-12 Teacher Training Initiatives

Elaine Jones, HECB associate director, briefed the Board on two teacher training initiatives currently underway in Washington State:

- Partnership for Excellence in Teaching (PET)
- Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant (TQE)

Mr. Gaspard introduced Dr. Lin Douglas, Director of Professional Education and Certification for the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). Dr. Douglas discussed what roles the HECB and Colleges of Education could play in supporting teacher training.

Transfer and Articulation

Doug Scrima, HECB policy associate, presented to the Board a report on the partnership between the two- and four-year colleges of joint articulation and cooperation concerning transfer of students in academic programs to baccalaureate institutions. The Articulation and Transfer Report raised a number of issues that the Inter-College Relations Commission (ICRC) is currently studying:

- the use of competencies and skills standards in determining transfer placement;
- the need to expand articulation among professional technical programs on a statewide discipline-basis;
- the need to expand the use of institution-to-institution, individual program articulation;
- the use of the “upside-down” degrees, where feasible, with baccalaureate curricula;
- incentives for dual admissions of concurrent enrollment at a baccalaureate institution and community/technical college.

Mr. Gaspard told the Board there would be dialogue in June with the colleges and universities on these issues. So perhaps at the July Board meeting an update can be given and an effective timeline could be established.

2000 Legislative Session Update

Bruce Botka, HECB director of Governmental Relations, reported that the Washington Legislature adjourned its 60-day regular session on March 9, but Governor Locke immediately called a special session to enable lawmakers to complete their work on supplemental budgets for state operations, capital projects, and transportation. As of March 17, the Guaranteed Education Tuition, Accountability, and the Distance Education Study bills were awaiting signature by the Governor. The HECB supplemental budget request was still in the budget negotiation process.

Accountability Update

Bruce Botka and Dr. Tom Weko, HECB associate director, reviewed the 1999-2001 budget provision on accountability. It directs the HECB to make a report to the Legislature by November 1, 2000 on its progress toward statewide and institution-specific goals. It also asks for recommendations for the next biennium. A preliminary workplan was reviewed. A discussion followed on how to make this report more meaningful.

Master Plan Update

Linda Schactler, HECB deputy director, and John Fricke, HECB associate director, reported on the progress of the Strategic Planning subcommittee. The subcommittee’s purpose is to monitor the implementation of the plan, to regularly reassess the Board’s goals, and to recommend to the

full Board revisions as needed. The Legislature approved the 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education (ESSCR 8425) during the regular session.

The five goals identified by the Board for the state to address higher education needs in the next ten years are:

1. Making student learning the yardstick by which institutional accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency is measured;
2. Linking students' participation in higher education to their achievement in the K-12 grades;
3. Providing the information citizens need to make the best use of the learning pathways available to them;
4. Enhancing higher education opportunity through greater use of e-learning technologies and by increasingly efficient use of public facilities; and
5. Helping colleges and universities meet student needs and compete in an increasingly competitive and complex education marketplace.

Recognition of Frank "Buster" Brouillet

ACTION: **Mr. Larry Hanson** moved for consideration of Resolution 00-10 honoring Dr. Frank "Buster" Brouillet on his retirement from the Board. **Ms. Kristi Blake** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. Craves presented a plaque to Dr. Brouillet thanking him for his years in education and in particular, his service on the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Everyone was invited to join Dr. Brouillet after lunch for cake.

Biennial Report on Institutional Degree Programs: Two-year Plans, Recently Approved Programs, and Program Review

Elaine Jones gave a combined report that included recommendations on the following:

- 2000-2002 program plan: During 2000-2002, the public baccalaureate institutions propose to initiate 142 programs at approximately 30 locations. Based on the information provided, 117 are recommended for pre-approval status. The remaining 25 are recommended for return to the institutions for further development.
- 1999 enrollments in recently approved new degree programs - Fewer than half of new programs approved before 1994 have met full enrollment targets; several of them are slated for termination or suspension.
- 1998-1999 program reviews - During the 1998-1999 academic year, the four-year institutions reviewed a total of 56 degree programs.

ACTION: **Dr. Gay Selby** moved for consideration of Resolution 00-06 which approves the staff report and recommendations included in the March 30, 2000 document entitled: *Biennial Report on Institutional Program Plans, Recently Approved Programs, and Program Review*. **Mr. Jim Faulstich** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Bob Craves asked if there were any discussions on the following items:

- Washington Scholars – Final Rules Adoption (Resolution 00-07)
- Washington Promise Scholarship – Final Rules Adoption (Resolution 00-08)
- M.Ed. Reimbursement Program – Final Rules Adoption (Resolution 00-09)
- Minimum College Admissions Standards in Science: Proposed New Standards (Resolution 00-11)

ACTION: There being no discussion of consent agenda items, **Dr. Gay Selby** moved for approval of Resolution 00-07, Resolution 00-08, Resolution 00-09, and Resolution 00-11. **Mr. Larry Hanson** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Director's Report

- New G.E.T. director - Mr. Gaspard introduced Betty Lochner, G.E.T. director. She begins her duties at the HECB on April 10.
- HECB Sept. 21 meeting to be rescheduled - The House and Senate have scheduled their next meeting dates in the interim (Sept. 21-22, 2000). The September Board meeting had been scheduled for September 21. Mr. Gaspard asked the Board members to check their calendars and identify alternate dates for rescheduling the September Board meeting.
- May 11-12 conference on postsecondary access issues - Mr. Gaspard reminded the Board of the WICHE/SHEEO meeting in May that's being co-sponsored by the HECB.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-06

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted the Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval, and Review in September 1992; and

WHEREAS, The Guidelines requested the public four-year institutions to submit to the Board information on new degree programs presently being considered for development and/or existing programs considered for a new location; and

WHEREAS, The Guidelines requested information on enrollments in recently approved new degree programs and all branch campus programs; and

WHEREAS, The Guidelines requested information on the most recent institutional existing program reviews; and

WHEREAS, The Guidelines requested information on programs that institutions have reviewed for elimination; and

WHEREAS, All six of the public four-year institutions have submitted information on all of the above items; and

WHEREAS, The independent four-year institutions, other education agencies, and the public four-year institutions have had an opportunity to review these program plans and comment upon them;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board approves the staff report and recommendations included in the March 30, 2000 document entitled: *Biennial Report on Institutional Program Plans, Recently Approved Programs, and Program Review*.

Adopted:

March 30, 2000

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

RESOLUTION NO. 00-07

WHEREAS, The Washington State Legislature, through Second Substitute Bill 1661, Chapter 159, Laws of 1999, made certain changes to the Washington Scholars program; and

WHEREAS, The legislative changes impose new attendance requirements on scholars selected to the program beginning with the graduating class of 2000; and

WHEREAS, The legislative changes require the forfeiture of the award for scholars who do not fulfill the attendance requirements and the transfer of the scholarship to an alternate candidate; and

WHEREAS, The Board proposed certain technical changes for improved clarity; and

WHEREAS, The Board filed, through the Code Reviser, the Pre-proposal Notice of Inquiry on October 4, 1999, and the proposed rules on December 22, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Board held a public hearing on February 16, 2000, and accepted written comments through March 3, 2000; and,

WHEREAS, No testimony was received at the public hearing, nor have written comments been received by the Board; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature authorized the Board to adopt rules for the program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt, without change, amended rules for the Washington Scholars program, Washington Administrative Code 250-66-020 through 250-66-050.

Adopted:

March 30, 2000

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

RESOLUTION NO. 00-08

WHEREAS, In 1999, Washington State Legislature authorized the Washington Promise Scholarship Program in section 611 (6), Chapter 309, Laws of 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature authorized the Board to adopt rules for the program; and

WHEREAS, Emergency rules are currently in effect for this program; and

WHEREAS, The Board filed, through the Code Reviser, a Preproposal Statement of Inquiry on October 4, 1999, and filed the proposed permanent rules on December 22, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Board held a public hearing on the proposed rules on February 16, 2000, and accepted written comments through March 3, 2000; and

WHEREAS, No testimony was received at the public hearing, nor have written comments been received by the Board;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt without change the Washington Promise Scholarship rules, Washington Administrative Code 250-80-010 through 250-80-100.

Adopted:

March 30, 2000

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

RESOLUTION NO. 00-09

WHEREAS, The 1999 Washington State Legislature authorized the Master in Education reimbursement Program in section 611 (3), Chapter 309, Laws of 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature authorized the Board to adopt rules for the program; and

WHEREAS, Emergency rules are currently in effect for this program; and

WHEREAS, The Board published, through the Code Reviser, a Pre-proposal Statement of Inquiry on December 22, 1999, and filed the proposed permanent rules on February 5, 2000; and

WHEREAS, The Board received testimony at the public hearing held on March 21,2000, and received written comment through the close of business on March 21, 2000; and

WHEREAS, The public comments request clarification of what constitutes a Washington institution; and

WHEREAS, The public comments request that less than full-time teachers be considered for the reimbursement; and

WHEREAS, Other testimony and comments request changes to the program that are required by statute and not within the Board's discretion to modify;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt the Master in Education rules, Washington Administrative Code 250-81, with the following changes:

WAC 250-81-020 Definitions (6) "Institution of higher education" means an accredited public or private college or university offering graduate degree coursework in the state of Washington including the branch campuses of out-of-state institutions which have a physical classroom presence within the state of Washington

WAC 250-81-020 Definitions (4)(c) Is teaching in one of the state's public elementary, middle, or secondary schools or has a contract to teach in one of those schools for the next academic year, at a rate of half-time or greater.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board convey the complete text of public comments and testimony to the Legislature for use in the 2001 Legislative Session as it considers changes to the pilot program.

Adopted:

March 30, 2000

Attest:

BOB CRAVES, CHAIR

GAY SELBY, VICE CHAIR

RESOLUTION 00-11

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board recognizes its responsibilities in helping establish and maintain high standards in education for all students at all grade levels in Washington; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is concerned with the issue of student readiness for college-level work; and

WHEREAS, RCW 28A.630.883, The Education Reform Act of 1993, outlines an education structure that no longer relies on traditional Carnegie units (seat time) as the measure to determine completion of basic education; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is required by law to establish *minimum* requirements for admission to Washington's public baccalaureate institutions (RCW 28B.80.350);

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the Admissions Standards Action Committee's recommendations for competency-based minimum admissions standards for science; and

WHEREAS, The competency-based admissions standards are intended to be a translation of the current minimum standards; and

WHEREAS, The new Benchmark 3 standards exceed the current two years of science (including 1 year of laboratory science) minimum admissions standards for science; and

WHEREAS, Science and mathematics faculty agreed that the current minimum admissions standards are not adequately preparing students for college-level study in science because they do not include algebra-based science coursework as preparation for postsecondary work in introductory-level science courses for science;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the Admissions Standards Action Committee's recommendation to raise the current minimum admissions standards for science to two years of laboratory science, including one year of algebra-based biology, chemistry, or physics (or its equivalent) beginning with the high school graduating class of 2010.

Adopted:

March 30, 2000

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

2000 Legislative Session

May 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Washington Legislature concluded its 2000 business on April 28, after conducting two special sessions in addition to the 60-day regular session that began in January.

The Legislature's most important and difficult assignment proved to be adjusting the 1999-2001 biennial operating, transportation, and capital budgets for the final year of the two-year spending cycle. Lawmakers spent several weeks revising the budget in response to the voters' approval in November of Initiative 695. That measure reduced the state motor vehicle excise tax and forced the adjustment of both spending and revenue projections for transportation projects and local and state government operations.

The supplemental budget (HB 2487) revised the funding of several programs administered by the HECB; adjusted college and university enrollment funding for the 2000-01 academic year; and made a number of enhancements at the public colleges and universities. This report includes a summary of the components of the supplemental budget for higher education.

The HECB approved a legislative agenda in December, and a summary of the Legislature's actions in those areas appears on the following pages.

HECB HIGH-DEMAND ENROLLMENT POOL

The supplemental budget increased the HECB's current authority to allocate funds to support new enrollments in high-demand fields and programs, such as information technology, teacher training, and health care. In the original budget, the HECB received the authority to allocate funds on a competitive basis to support 500 full-time student enrollments at the two- and four-year colleges and universities.

This session the Legislature authorized the Board to allocate an additional 50 FTE, because funds to support further enrollments remained available following the original allocation. The Legislature's action will enable the Board to fund up to two more of the proposals it received last year from the community and technical colleges and baccalaureate institutions.

The HECB will develop a process to reconsider a limited number of the highest-rated projects that were not approved in the first round last fall, and to make sure that the colleges that offered the proposals would still be able to deliver the needed enrollments in the 2000-01 academic year. An allocation process and timeline will be discussed with the Board at the May 25 meeting.

Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board

HECB LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES Final Report, 2000 Regular and Special Sessions

May 25, 2000

HECB Priority	Legislative Action	Outcome
2000 Master Plan for Higher Education	A compromise version of SCR 8425 , adopting the 2000 Master Plan, was approved on the final day of the regular session.	The HECB is directed to communicate regularly with the Legislature in response to specific directives in the resolution.
Promise Scholarship	<p>Legislation to place the scholarship in statute (SB 5598) was approved by the Senate but did not become law.</p> <p>The final supplemental budget includes a \$2.4 million enhancement for Washington Promise Scholarships to financially eligible members of the top 15% of high school graduating classes. Home-schooled students and those outside the top 15% will be academically eligible if they achieve a high SAT score.</p>	<p>Legislation consistent with SB 5598 is expected to be reintroduced in the 2001 session.</p> <p>The supplemental budget requires OSPI to provide lists of top students to the HECB by October 1, 2000, including the names of students who achieve a cumulative score of at least 1,200 on the SAT.</p>
Guaranteed Education Tuition	The House and Senate approved HB 2559 as requested by the HECB, the Treasurer, and the Committee on Advanced Tuition Payment.	The Governor signed HB 2559 into law on March 17 and has appointed two additional members to the GET oversight committee as prescribed in the legislation.
Supplemental budget proposals	A final supplemental operating budget was approved during the second special session and signed May 2 by the Governor.	A summary of major higher education provisions of the supplemental budget is attached to this document.

Other issues	Legislative Action	Current Status
Accountability	The Legislature and Governor enacted HB 2375 , which directs a multi-institution group, with HECB participation, to develop technology literacy standards for students.	The institutions and the HECB have begun collaborative work under the terms of the legislation. Progress on this initiative will be outlined in the HECB's accountability report and recommendations to the Legislature in November 2000.
Future Teachers Conditional Scholarship	<p>Legislation to revise the existing scholarship program (SB 6645) was approved by the Senate, but did not become law.</p> <p>The final supplemental budget includes \$1 million for a demonstration project to provide Future Teachers Conditional Loans to K-12 classified employees who pursue teaching degrees during the 2000-01 academic year.</p>	The HECB has begun to communicate to K-12 classified employee organizations about the new demonstration project. Emergency rules for the program are scheduled to be considered by the HECB at its July meeting.
Distance Education Study	The Legislature and Governor enacted HB 2952 , directing the HECB to lead a multi-institutional study of distance education.	The staff has begun to develop a project outline in collaboration with the other institutions designated in the legislation.
Study of WSU semester system	The final supplemental budget directs the HECB to use existing resources to study the feasibility of WSU converting from the semester system to the quarter system.	A report is due from the HECB to the legislative policy and fiscal committees by December 1, 2000.

Supplemental Budget Highlights For Higher Education

May 25, 2000

Higher Education Coordinating Board

- \$2.4 million is added for the Washington Promise scholarship program, to serve financially eligible public and private school seniors who graduate in the top 15 percent of their high school classes. Also, the budget expands academic eligibility to include home-schooled high school graduates, and to students not in the top 15 percent, who achieve a cumulative score of 1,200 on the SAT. Financial eligibility is preserved for students whose family income does not exceed 135 percent of the state median.
- \$1 million is added for a Future Teachers conditional loan demonstration program limited to K-12 classified employees who want to receive bachelor's degrees and teacher certification.
- The HECB is directed to study the feasibility of WSU changing from a semester operating system to a quarter system.
- The HECB, along with the rest of higher education, is excluded from the administrative efficiency reduction effort managed by OFM, which requires savings from certain state agencies that did not otherwise receive targeted budget reductions.
- Funding for community scholarships is reduced by \$131,000 in the first year of the biennium and increased by an equal amount in the second year, to reflect the extended time needed for local organizations to raise funds to qualify for state matching money. For the first time, local organizations may receive more than one matching grant of \$2,000 in the same biennium.

Enrollment:

The budget incorporates the following enrollment changes for 2000-2001:

- EWU increased by 100 FTEs;
- WSU — Pullman campus reduced by 100 FTEs, Spokane reduced by 50 FTEs, Tri-Cities reduced by 138 FTEs, and Vancouver reduced by 50 FTEs;
- 30 FTE students are moved to Olympic College in Bremerton from UW Tacoma;
- The HECB is authorized to increase by 50 FTEs the number of high demand enrollment slots available for distribution; funded from unused earlier appropriation for this purpose. The Board is directed to choose from among proposals received last fall; and
- OFM is directed to hold and release funds for enrollment increases only to the extent that enrollments at individual institutions exceed actual first-year FTE totals. “Unearned” enrollment funding will lapse.

Other Higher Education Issues:Community and Technical Colleges:

- \$1 million is added to replace a failing roof at Columbia Basin College in Pasco;
- \$500,000 is added to help community college students with disabilities;
- \$750,000 is added to develop system-wide, on-line catalogs for distance learning, and admissions in the community colleges; and
- \$658,000 is added to operate a completed building at Cascadia Community College in Bothell.

University of Washington:

- \$450,000 is provided for graduate student employee health insurance; and
- \$375,000 is added for Internet connectivity.

Washington State University:

- \$3.6 million is included to begin repairs of WSU’s central steam plant; and
- \$450,000 is provided for a health science initiative in Spokane.

The Evergreen State College:

- \$563,000 is included for various studies by the Institute for Public Policy.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

Program Review and Policy Study

May 2000

BACKGROUND

The Higher Education Coordinating Board periodically reviews policies and administrative procedures for the state-funded financial aid programs for which it has statutory responsibility. Such a study is currently underway for the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) program, which last underwent comprehensive review in 1994.

The EOG study will evaluate the program's effectiveness in responding to the goals established by the 1990 enabling legislation, and determine whether current EOG program criteria are relevant in today's higher education environment.

PROGRAM PURPOSE

The Legislature established the EOG program in 1990 in response to a recommendation of the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) as one part of an overall strategy to increase upper-division enrollment. Other strategies included the establishment of branch campuses and lifting enrollment lids at public institutions. The program was based on the premise that the size, and therefore the construction and operating costs of the proposed branch campuses could be reduced if place-bound students could be encouraged to enroll in existing colleges and universities and utilize what would be otherwise unused capacity.

The Board's 1994 review¹ notes that the EOG is designed to test the premise that a supplemental grant of some significance will affect student choice of institution. And the review points out that unlike most state-funded student aid programs, the EOG is driven from construction and enrollment policy rather than 'equity' or 'access' policy: "...it represents a state policy attempt to influence institutional choice and thereby reduce the size and associated construction and operating costs of branch campus."

THE EOG PROGRAM

The program targets students who are unable to attend local baccalaureate institutions because of various obstacles, e.g., family or employment commitments, health concerns, financial need. To assist students, the EOG provides special grant funds to attend institutions with existing capacity anywhere in the state. The program is relatively small, serving about 1000 students per year with \$2500 grants.

¹ Chance, William (May 1994), *Educational Opportunity Grant Program Evaluation, for the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board*.

EOG eligibility criteria include the following:

- Have completed at least two years of college;
- Intend to complete a baccalaureate degree;
- Meet the statutory definition of “place-bound²”;
- Reside within a county served by a branch campus;
- Be willing to attend a Washington public or private four-year college or university that has the capacity to accommodate such students within existing education programs and facilities;
- Adhere to the EOG program’s religious-study exclusion³.

Statute prohibits recipients from using the grant to attend any of the five branch campuses.

THE EOG STUDY

The EOG study will focus on two aspects of the program. First, it will evaluate the program’s effectiveness in achieving the goals of existing legislation. This part of the study will include an analysis of EOG recipients, eligible non-recipients, and a comparison group to determine whether the program positively influenced urban, place-bound students to pursue upper-division coursework and persist to baccalaureate degree completion. Staff are currently collecting and analyzing enrollment and student financial aid data.

In addition, the study will include a policy analysis to consider whether statutory modifications should be proposed, given changes that have occurred in higher education delivery since 1990, when the program was established. The policy review will consider, for example:

- **County eligibility:** Whether the EOG program should continue to focus on serving urban, place-bound students who reside in specified counties, or if eligibility should be extended to place-bound students residing in any county;
- **Student eligibility criteria:** If other student eligibility criteria should be modified;
- **Institutional eligibility criteria:** Whether changes should be made in institutional eligibility;
- **Grant amount:** If the current grant amount should be adjusted.

This part of the study will include review of current literature on the affect of grant assistance on student persistence. And it will include an analysis of changes in higher education needs and availability in Washington since 1990, when the EOG program was established.

Data review and policy analyses are underway. Staff will consult with advisory groups and the HECB’s fiscal subcommittee as the study progresses. A report and recommendations will be submitted to the Board for consideration and action at its July meeting.

² Because of family or employment commitments, health concerns, financial considerations, or other similar factors, the student is unlikely to complete the junior or senior year of a baccalaureate degree without enhanced financial assistance.

³ RCW 28B.101.040 “...The participant shall not be eligible for a grant if it will be used for any programs that include religious worship, exercise, or instruction or to pursue a degree in theology....”

COMPETENCY-BASED ADMISSIONS STANDARDS PROJECT

Project Evaluation

May 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) is required by law to establish *minimum* requirements for admission to Washington's public baccalaureate institutions (RCW 28B.80.350). The HECB adopted the current admissions policy in 1987; this policy was fully implemented for students entering fall term 1992. The policy describes minimum high school core requirements in terms of years of study. Minimum admission criteria currently include grade point average, pre-college test scores (SAT/ACT), and a distribution of high school core-course requirements.

The current standards, however, do not align with education reform as described in the Education Reform Act of 1993 (RCW 28A.630.883). The Education Reform Act outlined an education structure that no longer would rely on traditional Carnegie units (seat time) as the measure to determine completion of basic education. The Legislature directed the HECB to develop a competency-based admissions system for public baccalaureate institutions.

In 1995, the HECB convened an Admissions Standards Action Committee (ASAC) to begin a process of translating current admissions standards into competency-based admissions standards. This work was funded through a state appropriation and through two grants (\$197,156) from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE).

In 1997 the HECB approved competency-based admissions standards for English, world languages, and mathematics; the HECB approved science standards in April 2000. These standards have been created by using and, as necessary, adding to the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs, i.e. post-Certificate of Mastery curriculum). To date the EALRs have been approved by the Commission on Student Learning (reading, writing, communication, mathematics, and science). Now that the CSL has sunsetted, the responsibility has been turned over to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (RCW 28A.655.070).

CURRENT PROJECT STATUS

A student follow-up system has been created and the phase for testing a competency-based system has been initiated at three high schools; a fourth was added in 1998 and a fifth in 1999. English, mathematics, world language, and science high school teachers are creating student assignments that will reveal evidence of their proficiency relative to the competency-based admissions standards. In order to refine the definitions and expectations of competency, pilot-school teachers meet with college faculty to review and evaluate the student work twice a year. As the project proceeds, collections of student work and examples of scoring criteria will be

created as a resource that eventually will be shared with college and high school faculty throughout the state.

Embedded within the competency-based admissions standards project are three types of evaluation:

Level 1: Student Assessment will answer the question, “How do we assess students’ competencies for purposes of college/university admission?”

Level 2: Performance Measures will answer the question, “How well do students admitted under competency-based standards perform?”

Level 3: Project Success, will answer the question, “How successful has the Admissions Standards Project been?” The response will address a number of process and outcome variables and represents the final condition of the FIPSE grant.

LEVEL 3 FIPSE GRANT EVALUATION

One condition of the receipt of the FIPSE grant was a program evaluation at the end of the grant cycle. The HECB contracted with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) to perform a project review of the competency-based admissions work.

The NCHEMS report (Appendix 1) presents the Board with Level 3 evaluation, and the final evaluation of the FIPSE grant. The evaluation model in this report examines how the project improves higher education, and it systemically examines the project as a viable approach to education reform. It is intended to assist the Board in determining if the outcomes being collected are accurate and reliable indicators of project success.

The report also furnishes the Board with information regarding its role in providing leadership on issues that promote high-school-to-college transitions. It emphasizes how the link between high school preparation and student success in the college classroom is more important than ever. And the report will assist the Board in addressing the following three key questions:

1. Why do we need the competency-based admissions standards project?
2. What are its benefits?
3. What happens if we don’t continue the competency-based admissions standards project?

Enrollment and Capital Re-Examination In Response to Legislative Master Plan Resolution

May 2000

Background

In its approval of the Master Plan resolution (SCR 8425), the Legislature instructed the HECB to re-examine its assumptions with regard to:

- Projected upper-division and graduate enrollments;
- The role of the community and technical colleges; and
- Meeting the capital needs of the two- and four-year higher education institutions.

The Master Plan also directed the HECB to consult with the Office of Financial Management and collaborate with the public and independent colleges and universities, private vocational schools and appropriate legislative committees “to prepare an enrollment accommodation plan, contemplate various growth scenarios, identify related operational and capital needs, and examine alternatives to address the identified budget needs.” The HECB staff has been actively working with representatives of a large number of institutions and organizations to implement these instructions.

The Board is also directed to “communicate regularly with the appropriate legislative committees and the governor regarding the assigned tasks and report back with its results and findings before proceeding with the development of its biennial budget recommendations” for 2001-03.

Activities to date

A total of seven major meetings and a number of smaller meetings and conversations have occurred in recent weeks. Working groups to review and discuss enrollment and capital budget issues have been formed, with the following representatives included in meetings and discussions:

COP:	Terry Teale, Carolyn Sundby	TESC:	Ruta Fanning, Steve Hunter, Barbara Smith, Steve Trotter
CWU:	Greg Chan, David Dauwalder, Martha Lindley, Mark Lundgren, Mike Reilly	UW:	Marilyn Cox, Debra Friedman, Harlan Patterson
EWU:	Peter Dual, George Durrie, Mary Voves	WAICU:	Vi Boyer, Tom Parker
LEG:	Karen Barrett and Mike Groesch, Senate Ways & Means Comm.; Jack Daray, House Appropriations Comm.; Erika Prager, House Higher Education Comm.; Bill Robinson, House Capital Comm.; Jean Six, Senate Higher Education Comm.	WSU:	Karl Boehmke, Larry Ganders, Rom Markin, Jim Rimpau
OFM:	Tom Boyer, Jim Hurst, Irv Lefberg, Wolfgang Opitz, Mike Roberts, Pat Tasanasanta, Theo Yu	WTECB:	John Bauer, Bryan Wilson
SBCTC:	Tom Henderson, Scott Morgan, Loretta Seppanen, Sandy Wall	WWU:	Andrew Bodman, Jack Cooley, Judy McNickle, George Pierce
		HECB:	Bruce Botka, Whitney DalBalcon, John Fricke, Marty Harding, Dan Keller, Parker Lindner, Patty Mosqueda, Kathy Raudenbush, Jim Reed, Linda Schactler, Tom Weko

PART I: ENROLLMENT

A New Framework for Presenting Enrollment Needs

The initial discussions have yielded a draft enrollment framework for the Board's consideration that refines the assumptions of the Master Plan and is designed to lend policy-makers greater flexibility in planning for future enrollment needs and assessing the potential impact of various policy decisions. This framework has the initial support of the working group and, with the approval of the Board, will be shared with legislators to ensure this framework meets the intent of the resolution.

The Basic Assumption—Maintaining the Current Level of Opportunity

Throughout the Board's development of the Master Plan and the Legislature's discussion of the concurrent resolution, the preservation of the current level of opportunity has been a top priority shared by the public, students, business, college and university leaders and state decision-makers. No one participating in the enrollment discussions over the past 18 months has suggested that reducing the opportunity for students to attend college is an acceptable option.

Within the new enrollment framework, preservation of the current level of opportunity will be addressed by enrollment forecasts that:

- Hold constant the proportion of the state population receiving instruction at in-state institutions of post-secondary education;
- Calculate ongoing increases in enrollment to educate the same proportion of a growing population; and
- Inform the Legislature of the additional enrollments needed biennially and in future years to reflect this assumption. As it did during the Master Plan development, the HECB will continue to rely on the Office of Financial Management for these projections.

Changing Conditions, Changing Policies

A population-based enrollment projection for current levels of opportunity assumes that the future will look just like the present — except for the size and age distribution of the state's population. However, it is clear that many other factors that affect enrollment *will* change between now and 2010, including citizens' educational aspirations, demands of the economy, and state policies.

The new framework therefore should consider other major factors that will influence enrollments. These factors will be considered individually to evaluate their clearly

identifiable impact on enrollment needs. This analysis also will permit projections of the academic or vocational program implications of various enrollment options.

1. A Building-Block Approach

The purpose of a building block approach is clarity, so that the effect of each factor can be identified and discussed separately. This approach would allow the presentation of enrollment options to cover a broad range of alternative scenarios while still being understandable. It would allow decision-makers to consider a variety of conditions and choices, and to project the combined effect on enrollments. It is a commonly used analytical tool to identify separately the individual effects on a calculation of a number of factors occurring simultaneously.

The table below illustrates how the building block approach could be used to assess future enrollment need.

2010 ENROLLMENT GOAL FOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS (numbers represent <u>changes</u> to current FTE levels)	
<i>Policy Choice/Variable</i>	<i>FTE Impact</i>
Maintain current opportunity for a larger population (current levels of enrollment for more residents with a different age profile)	+???
<u>Economic effects:</u>	
Economic variable (to be defined)	-? to +?
Economic variable (to be defined)	-? to +?
Policy choice (to be defined)	-? to +?
Policy choice (to be defined)	-? to +?
<u>Education reform:</u>	
Policy choice (to be defined)	-? to +?
<u>Demographic/behavioral effects:</u>	
Demographic variable (to be defined)	-? to +?
Policy choice (to be defined)	-? to -?
Other variables & policy choices to be inserted in the categories above	-? to +?
Total Range (Depends on choices made above)	??? to ???

Different Sectors, Different Impacts

The policy options and external factors examined in this model would not equally affect all higher education sectors or types of students. Understanding the effects of different policy choices and factors would require a more detailed look at the types of students enrolled now and in the future. OFM, HECB staff and institutions are discussing possible methods to distinguish enrollments among types of students (e.g. academic, vocational, basic skills). This would be particularly useful when considering factors that would alter current enrollment patterns in the future, such as decisions to expand job training programs at two-year colleges or advanced computer science instruction at the baccalaureate institutions.

Analysis of the 1999-2000 Enrollment Situation

As of May 2000, OFM projects enrollment in the six public baccalaureate institutions to be more than 600 annual full-time equivalent students less than budgeted levels for the 1999-2000 academic year. Meanwhile, OFM forecasts indicate that the enrollment at the community and technical colleges will be over budgeted levels. The potential enrollment shortfall at the upper division and graduate levels appears to be at odds with beliefs that upper-division enrollment could be higher now and in the future. And it calls into question the level of demand among students to enroll in upper-division and graduate programs. This apparent shortfall needs to be understood, and its implications for the future analyzed. To complement the analytical framework proposed above, the HECB will work with all interested groups to answer/address the following questions and issues:

1. Understanding the 1999-2000 enrollment situation

- Demographic factors influencing fall 1999 freshman enrollments, the size of the 18 year-old age group and possible effects on enrollment.
- Effect of the economy on enrollment decisions of high-school graduates and community college transfer students.
- Headcount versus FTE enrollment -- Why did the average course load drop for students at some four-year institutions?
- The impact of changing high school graduate enrollment behavior as students chose between college or work.
- Enrollment behavior of minorities and under-served populations.
- Behavior of students who entered college with college credits earned through Running Start or advanced placement classes. Are they reducing average time to degree or taking a lighter class load upon reaching traditional college age?

2. Predicting the future implications of current enrollment behavior

- Demographic factors that are expected to change in the next few years, and how they may affect enrollments.
- Institutions' plans for outreach and recruitment of traditional, minority and under-served students.
- Institutions' plans for administrative actions to change students' course registration patterns.
- Institutions' plans for administrative actions to improve student progress and retention.

PART II: SPACE PLANNING AND CAPITAL BUDGETING

Re-examining Capital Space and Budget Needs

As stated above, the HECB has established a work group to review the space planning assumptions and associated capital cost estimates included in the Master Plan. This group has met twice and future meetings are being planned. So far, the discussions concerning the Master Plan capital planning assumptions have not produced recommendations for change to the utilization standards. Additionally, most work group participants appear to support the inclusion of the "e-learning" assumption (that electronic learning will be used to provide an average of 1.5 weekly lecture contact hours by 2010) in planning for future space needs. However, the group recognizes that the full effect of e-learning opportunities will need to be monitored over time.

The work group also has discussed recent correspondence from the House Capital Budget Committee Co-chairs, Reps. Gary Alexander and Ed Murray, and the Senate Ways & Means Committee Chair, Sen. Valoria Loveland, seeking changes in the HECB capital budget recommendation process for 2001-03.

The budget leaders' letter makes two requests of the HECB:

- "When you look at projects to increase enrollment capacity, we would appreciate a list of capital projects in priority order, irrespective of whether the project is for a branch campus, a main campus, multi-institutional or for an educational center.... Should resources not stretch as far as desired, where would the board invest and why?"
- "We would also ask you to provide a similar priority list of capital projects that preserve or modernize existing facilities in high demand and that no longer meet educational program requirements."

In considering possible responses to this request, the work group has discussed the concept of preparing two priority lists that rank all four-year and community and technical college capital projects. These discussions have indicated the importance and

need for a standardized facility condition assessment survey to be the basis of ranking preservation/modernization type projects. Additionally, the group has discussed the policy bases for ranking program driven projects between institutions with differing roles and mission.

The HECB staff is developing a draft prioritization/categorization framework for the capital budget recommendations that will be responsive to the legislative requests and recognize the suggestions and concerns of the institutions.

Further progress in both areas – re-examination of the Master Plan capital assumptions, and a draft framework for responding to the legislative request for capital budget recommendations, will be reported to the Board at its July meeting.

MASTER PLAN COMPETENCY-BASED DEGREES Project Status Report

May 2000

BACKGROUND

The recently adopted 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education, *The 21st Century Learner: Strategies to Meet the Challenge*, adopted five goals reflecting the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) policy that the interests and needs of learners must be the fundamental priority of the state's higher education system. To support this policy, the Master Plan introduced an initiative to identify the skills and knowledge associated with statewide associate transfer degrees and with baccalaureate degrees.

PROJECT STATUS

The HECB staff project team (Elaine Jones, Doug Scrima, Evelyn Hawkins, Tom Weko) prepared a conceptual proposal for this project in March. It was shared with and endorsed by the HECB Master Plan Subcommittee in early May. To date, informal conversations have taken place among HECB staff and several institutional representatives about the project. In addition, a review of literature and best practices has been initiated. The project work plan and selection of institutional partners will be completed in June.

HIGHLIGHTS OF CONCEPTUAL PROPOSAL

The conceptual proposal is to pilot a model for establishing and assessing fundamental student learning outcomes in general education (e.g., math, communications, science) and specific majors/degree programs that are competency-based. The pilot would engage three existing campuses where a partnership now exists between a two- and four-year institution: UW Bothell/Cascadia, CWU Lynwood Center/Edmonds, EWU/Spokane Falls.

Master Plan Direction

Goal 1 of the 2000 Master Plan is to "Make student learning the yardstick by which we measure accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness." One strategy for accomplishing this goal is to "Identify the skills and knowledge associated with statewide associate transfer degrees and with baccalaureate degrees."

Consistent with the direction of the Master Plan, following are the goals of the pilot project:

- Permit students to organize their education where and when it suits their needs.
- Provide students with a variety of pathways to demonstrate their learning, to earn credit, and to pursue additional studies.
- In particular, serve the needs of adults and other nontraditional students by creating competency-based degrees.

Major Project Tasks

- Identify fundamental student learning outcomes in general education, develop competency-based standards, and determine assessments.
- Identify student learning outcomes in specific majors/degree programs, competency-based standards, and assessments.
- Pilot and evaluate standard assessment programs and practices currently underway, e.g., the American College Testing (ACT) test of academic proficiency for reading, writing, math, and science reasoning.

Project Organization and Key Tasks: Following are the steps staff propose to set up a model for establishing and assessing fundamental student learning outcomes in general education and specific majors/degree programs that leads to competency-based degrees:

1. **Establish partnerships.** HECB partners with interested institutions. The UW Bothell/Cascadia, CWU Lynwood Center/Edmonds, EWU/Spokane Falls have indicated interest in participating in this project.
2. **Identify general education outcomes.** Institutions, in collaboration with the HECB, would identify fundamental student learning outcomes in general education, competency-based standards, and assessments.
3. **Identify major-specific outcomes.** Institutions, in collaboration with the HECB, would identify fundamental student learning outcomes in specific majors/degree programs, competency-based standards, and assessments.
4. **Implement the pilot.** Institutions will pilot and evaluate assessment, programs, and practices, including “co-admissions.” This allows a student to take courses at a community college and four-year institution at the same time, yet students have to go through one admissions process. One option for assessing general education competencies is to use tests for reading, writing, math, and science reasoning developed already by ACT (America College Testing) and CAPP (Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency).

Project Outcomes: This pilot model has the following intended outcomes:

- SBCTC and HECB adopt competency-based degree programs for statewide associate transfer degrees and baccalaureate degrees.
- Create assessments to determine whether or not students achieve fundamental learning outcomes in general education prior to moving into the major.
- Guarantee degree validity: assure families, employers, and communities that college graduates possess breadth and depth of knowledge together with skills and competencies that provide sufficient preparation for living, working, and lifelong learning.
- Answer the question, “What should Washington college graduates know and be able to do?”

MASTER PLAN RULES REVIEW

Project Status Report

May 2000

BACKGROUND

The recently adopted 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education, *The 21st Century Learner: Strategies to Meet the Challenge*, adopted five goals reflecting the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) policy that the interests and needs of learners must be the fundamental priority of the state's higher education system. To this end, the Master Plan has called for, among other initiatives, a comprehensive review of how existing regulations or practices at the state and institutional levels could be changed to better meet the needs of learners.

To carry out this review, the Master Plan identified the following actions and timelines as part of the implementation strategy for **Goal 5: *To help colleges and universities meet student needs and compete in an increasingly complex marketplace.***

1. **By June 2000**, public colleges and universities, in collaboration with **faculty and students**, will identify institutional and other obstacles to meeting students' program demand and barriers to students' academic progress.
2. **By October 2000, the HECB** will analyze (the above) institutional reports and, if warranted, work across sectors and institutions to develop solutions that can be piloted within "opportunity zones." These pilot projects and high-demand programs to which the state should target FTE enrollments will be included in the budget recommendations to the Legislature and Governor.

The HECB has initiated the "rules review" process discussed below. This review process is focused on *student needs* and — based upon the observations and ideas of institutions, faculty, and students — how existing regulations or practices at the state and institutional levels could be changed to better meet those needs.

PROJECT STATUS

The HECB staff project team prepared a work plan for this project in February 2000. The work plan identified the following milestones.

1. **By March 2000: *invite the participation of all public universities and colleges, and faculty and student representatives, in the review project.*** A letter to the institutions and student and faculty representatives was sent on March 6, 2000. This letter described the

purpose of the project and identified the types of information needed to conduct the review. Additionally, the letter provided the schedule of key project dates.

2. **By May 2000: hold a series of informational meetings throughout the state with project participants to review the purpose of the project and to encourage a collaborative approach in the review process.** HECB staff conducted meetings in April and May 2000 in Spokane, Yakima, Vancouver, Seattle, and Longview. Approximately 30 individuals attended these meetings. In addition to reviewing the purpose and scope of the project, many meeting participants came prepared to discuss a variety of obstacles and constraints to meeting student needs.

3. **By May 15, 2000: receive the rules review findings from the institutions, and faculty and student organizations.** As stated above, the March letter to project participants described the types of information needed for the review. Specifically, participants were asked to provide the following:

- The name or title of the specific policy or practice identified as an obstacle to student progress or meeting student program demand.
- The legal or administrative origin and reference (e.g., RCW, WAC) of the identified policy or practice.
- A description of the identified policy or practice.
- A discussion of how the identified policy or practice represents an impediment to student learning needs.
- Recommendations on how the identified policy or practice could be modified to facilitate student learning needs. Where appropriate, these recommendations should include ideas on pilot or demonstration sites to test the proposed solutions.
- The identified obstacles to student progress or meeting student program demand should be ranked in priority order, with the most serious impediment being the first priority.

4. **By June 15, 2000**, the HECB project team will *complete its analysis of the review findings and will disseminate draft recommendations of solutions and pilot projects to the institutions, and faculty and student organizations.*

5. **By July 17, 2000**, the HECB project team will *complete, through consultation with the institutions, and faculty and student organizations, final recommendations on solutions and pilot projects.*

6. **On July 26, 2000**, HECB staff and institutional, faculty, and student representatives will *brief the Board on the project findings and recommended solutions and pilot projects*.

7. **By August 18, 2000**, the HECB project team will *complete the cost and legislative analysis of the Board adopted solutions and pilot projects for incorporation into the HECB's 2001-2003 budget recommendations and legislative proposals*.

EMERGING THEMES

A number of common themes and issues emerged in the informational meetings held in April and May. As anticipated, administrators, students, and faculty identified a variety of state regulations and rules as obstacles to meeting student needs: e.g., the “6 Credit Rule” for obtaining financial aid, or the “2 Credit Tuition Rule” for baccalaureate students. Project participants also identified several other state and institutional practices that clearly represent impediments to both students and institutions:

- Effective articulation and collaborative program agreements. A clear message was the desire for the HECB to empower as well as challenge institutions to “partner.”
- The disincentives to responding to student needs caused by the emphasis on student FTE as a budgeting and institutional performance indicator.
- The lack of consistently understood financial aid rules at the institutional level can significantly limit the financial support opportunities made available to students.
- The “disconnect” between the needs of the non-traditional student and state-funded instructional terms and schedules.
- The inability or difficulty of institutions to plan and deliver new high demand programs without program planning and development funds.

It is anticipated that additional themes and specific rules and obstacles will be identified as the review process continues through July. Additionally, the final report of findings and recommendations to be presented to the Board on July 26, 2000 will propose solutions to identified obstacles and demonstration projects to test those solutions.

ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE DEGREE Transfer Policy

May 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

State law [RCW 28B.80.350 and RCW 28B.80.280], approved in 1988, requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish transfer policies and, in cooperation with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, to establish and maintain a statewide transfer of credit policy.

In 1991, the Board approved the “Cooperative Student Transfer Process” and established the Associate Degree – Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA). The purpose of the DTA associate degree is to establish admissions priority. The DTA is also intended to satisfy lower-division general education requirements. Although the DTA has been very successful in helping community college students transfer more effectively to a baccalaureate institution, it has not served students in science-related disciplines well. The DTA does not provide enough lower-division science coursework, and students in these courses have experienced difficulty entering their major upon transfer.

As a result, community college and baccalaureate staff and science faculty met in 1999 to craft a new statewide transfer agreement with emphasis in the sciences. The faculty formed two workgroups and crafted two degree proposals for the associate in science:

- 1) **Track 1:** biological sciences, environmental/resource sciences, chemistry, geology, earth and atmospheric sciences;
- 2) **Track 2:** engineering, physics, and computer science.

Their recommendations give priority for admissions at the public baccalaureate institutions to Washington transfer students and increase the likelihood of students’ entry into their major by emphasizing the completion of required lower-division science and mathematics courses. The agreement was approved by the Community College Instruction Commission¹ (CCIC) and the Inter-institutional Committee of Academic Officers² (ICAO) in January. The Board received a briefing on these recommendations at the March 2000 meeting.

BOARD ACTION

The Board is requested to adopt as Board policy the Associate in Science Transfer Agreement negotiated by the community colleges, the public baccalaureate institutions, and the staff of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Higher Education Coordinating Board, and Council of Presidents.

¹ CCIC is a commission of chief academic officers established by the community and technical college presidents.

² ICAO is a committee of chief academic officers established by the Council of Presidents.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-12

WHEREAS, RCW 28B.80.350 and RCW 28B.80.280 require the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish transfer policies and, in cooperation with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, to establish and maintain a statewide transfer of credit policy and agreement; and,

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board supports the efforts of public higher education institutions to collectively meet the needs of students; and

WHEREAS, This agreement will allow students to transfer credits more easily from community college to baccalaureate institutions in science-related disciplines; and

WHEREAS, An associate in science transfer agreement has been negotiated by the community colleges, the public baccalaureate institutions, and the staff of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Higher Education Coordinating Board, and Council of Presidents Office; and

WHEREAS, The associate in science degree was approved by the baccalaureate institutions' provosts and the Community College Instruction Commission;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts as Board policy the Associate in Science Transfer Agreement among the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and baccalaureate institutions.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY
Central Washington University at
Ellensburg, Pierce College in Puyallup, and Boeing in Auburn

May 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Central Washington University proposes to offer a Master of Science in Engineering Technology (MSET) at CWU Ellensburg, Pierce College in Puyallup, and Boeing in Auburn. The program would be the only one of its kind in Washington State.

PROGRAM NEED

The MSET was granted “pre-approval” status by the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) in April 1998. It would support the mission of Central’s Industrial and Engineering Technology Department “...to provide an educational service with customers at both ends of the system: students wanting an education leading toward employment and industry desiring employees to lead them into the future.”

Engineering technology focuses on the applied aspects of science and engineering, and prepares graduates for work in product design, experimentation, development, industrial practices, and field services. The US Labor Department indicates that the job market for engineering technologists is strong at present and is expected to continue growing in the future. Four groups in particular are expected to benefit from the proposed program: graduates from CWU’s undergraduate program in engineering technology, faculty members at two- and four-year institutions, and K-12 technology education teachers.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The MSET includes completion of a minimum of 45 quarter-credits: 30 credits in required courses, including a capstone experience and 15 credits in technical elective credits. Initial course delivery at Ellensburg and Puyallup would be via live instruction. As the program matures, some courses would also be offered at these two locations via the Internet and videotape as well. Boeing requires live instruction at its Auburn facility.

The program initially would accommodate a total of 28 FTE students and grow to a steady position of 64 FTE students. It is expected that full-time students would be able to complete the program in two years; part-time students would be able to complete the program in three years.

The program would be supported primarily by existing resources. A few adjunct faculty and contracted yearly faculty would be added to support the west-side programs. Additional library resources would also be acquired to support the MSET.

ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

The proposal outlines the expected student learning outcomes and the variety of methodologies that would be employed to evaluate program effectiveness, student learning, and faculty teaching. For example, each course syllabus lists the learner outcomes and corresponding assessment strategies. All of the assessment data would be considered in making improvements to the program.

With respect to diversity, Central's Industrial and Engineering Technology Department is committed to initiating a quality program in which students represent the gender and ethnic diversity of the region. This is especially important in the engineering field where women and people of color have not been well represented. The Department would work aggressively to recruit and retain a diverse group of majors in engineering technology at all three locations.

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

In reviewing this proposal, HECB staff worked extensively with Dr. Walter R. Kaminski, a professor in the Industrial and Engineering Department at Central Washington University:

In accordance with the HECB Guidelines, the MSET was reviewed by the other public baccalaureate institutions, an Associate Dean from Purdue University, a Program Coordinator from the University of Houston (both universities offer the MSET), and several Washington companies, including Boeing, Fluke, Atlas Foundry, and Tree Top. Eastern Washington University and Washington State University shared their support for the program. The other external reviewers gave the proposal high marks.

PROGRAM COSTS

The MSET would be offered on a self-support basis funded by tuition. The program costs at full enrollment would be about \$179,000 per year, or \$2,800 per FTE student.

STAFF ANALYSIS

CWU's proposed Master of Science in Engineering Technology would introduce a new degree program in Washington State that should be attractive to residents and employers. Student interest and local occupational demand have been demonstrated. The program would add sufficient resources to ensure quality teaching and learning for students and faculty participating in the program. It would be offered on a self-support basis with minimal costs to the state.

RECOMMENDATION

The Central Washington University proposal to establish a Master of Science in Engineering Technology at CWU Ellensburg, Pierce College in Puyallup, and Boeing in Auburn is recommended for approval, effective June 2000.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-13

WHEREAS, Central Washington University has requested approval to establish a Master of Science in Engineering Technology at CWU Ellensburg, Pierce College in Puyallup, and Boeing in Auburn; and

WHEREAS, The program appears popular among students and employers; and

WHEREAS, The program of study and resources are sufficient to accommodate student needs; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews endorsed establishing the program in multiple locations;

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable for offering the program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University proposal to establish a Master of Science in Engineering Technology at CWU Ellensburg, Pierce College in Puyallup, and Boeing in Auburn.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Washington State University Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education at WSU Tri-Cities

May 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Washington State University is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval for its existing Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education at WSU Tri-Cities. WSU initiated the program several years ago with grant funding provided through the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Through an apparent misunderstanding, HECB approval was not sought at that time. The HECB is responsible for approving the BA degree program, while the State Board of Education is responsible for approving the preparation components for the teaching credential. Earlier this year, the teacher preparation program gained re-approval status under the State Board of Education's new teacher preparation program approval standards.

PROGRAM NEED

Last year, WSU Tri-Cities conducted a needs assessment in the region to determine the areas in which teachers are needed. The assessment revealed that a number of school districts are having difficulty recruiting teachers in several endorsement areas. The assessment also determined that there is an acute shortage of teacher applicants who possess an English as a Second Language (ESL) or Bilingual Education endorsement. In addition, the three large school districts in the Tri-Cities recently announced that they will be hiring over 150 new teachers for the next school year.

The focus of the teacher education program at WSU Tri-Cities is on training K-8 teachers who will qualify for either an ESL or Bilingual Education endorsement. Thus, the program is responsive to local school needs.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The curriculum for the BA in Elementary Education at WSU Tri-Cities is the same as that delivered on the WSU Pullman campus. Students are required to complete 66 semester credits, including 50 semester credits in pedagogy courses and 16 in student teaching. Courses are delivered by on-site faculty and various distance learning technologies.

The program is designed as a 2+2 program where students complete the first two years of the program at Columbia Basin Community College and the last two years at WSU Tri-Cities. Students are admitted as a cohort and take all of their classes together.

The program can accommodate up to 50 FTE students: one cohort comprised of public school paraprofessionals who maintain employment by day and enroll part-time in evening and summer

classes; and another cohort comprised of place-bound students engaged in full-time study. The paraprofessional cohort is expected to complete the program in three calendar years while the full-time cohort is expected to finish in two years plus a summer term.

ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

The proposal outlines the expected student learning outcomes and evaluation techniques. The outcomes are aligned with the teacher preparation program standards established by the State Board of Education.

In supporting diversity, the WSU Future Teachers of Color Program has extended its recruitment efforts to the Tri-Cities. Additionally, WSU Tri-Cities personnel work closely with local school districts to recruit talented minority paraprofessionals into the program.

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

In reviewing this proposal, HECB staff worked with Dr. Jerry L. Milligan, Professor of Literacy Education at WSU. In addition, WSU sent the proposal to the provosts at the other public baccalaureate institutions for their review. Eastern Washington University and Central Washington University shared their support for the program. The Evergreen State College requested additional documentation of demonstrated need for the program; this data was provided by WSU.

PROGRAM COSTS

The BA in Elementary Education is supported through internal reallocation. The cost per FTE student is about \$6,190.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The existing program offers the following advantages:

- There is an ongoing need for the BA in Elementary Education in the Tri-Cities;
- The program provides a pool of competitive teacher candidates for the region, including candidates of color;
- Alternative undergraduate programs in education are not available in the region;
- The program is delivered in partnership with Columbia Basin Community College;
- The assessment and diversity plans are comprehensive; and
- The cost per FTE student is reasonable.

RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University proposal to offer the Bachelor of Arts in Education at WSU Tri-Cities is recommended for approval, effective June 2000.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-14

WHEREAS, Washington State University is seeking approval for its existing Bachelor of Arts in Education at WSU Tri-Cities; and

WHEREAS, There is continuing need for this program to meet the demand for elementary teachers in the region; and

WHEREAS, The program has a well-developed curriculum, assessment and diversity plans, and student learning outcomes established by the state; and

WHEREAS, The program is delivered in partnership with Columbia Basin Community College; and

WHEREAS, The program is supported through reallocation at a reasonable cost;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education at WSU Tri-Cities, effective June 2000.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURE
Washington State University Extended Degree Program in
Washington, Oregon, and Idaho

May 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

With support from the Tri-State Agriculture Distance Degree Alliance (TADDA), Washington State University (WSU) is partnering with Oregon State University and the University of Idaho to offer the Master of Science in Agriculture. The program would be based at WSU Pullman and transmitted cooperatively, using a variety of instructional technologies at various off-campus locations. It would complement the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program, which the Higher Education Coordinating (HECB) approved in July 1999. WSU is the only institution in Washington that offers degree programs in agriculture. HECB granted the MS in Agriculture an exemption from the pre-approval process in October 1999, because WSU needed to work within the requirements and timelines of TADDA.

PROGRAM NEED

The MS in Agriculture would support the Biological Systems Engineering Department's mission ... *"to be a knowledge resource in technology, education, and engineering for agriculture and other biological systems."* The graduate program in agriculture focuses on the latest agricultural science and technologies in the industry and prepares individuals for work in the applications, management, and communications of several fields: agriculture education, agriculture technology, and management.

According to the proposal, *"The nature of opportunity in agriculture has changed over the years from production to science, marketing, and service. National predictions of labor shortages in agriculture range between 15 and 20 percent in marketing, merchandising, sales, food processing engineers, food scientists, and other closely related fields."* It is expected that the program would be attractive to professionals, practitioners, and educators already working in the field.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The MS in Agriculture requires completion of 30 semester credits: 12 credits in core courses, 12 credits in approved electives, and 6 credits in practicum or thesis. Each of the participating universities (Washington State University, Oregon State University, and the University of Idaho) would contribute courses to the degree program based on each institution's faculty expertise. Instructional techniques would include distance delivery and traditional delivery presentations. Initially, existing resources would support the program. New personnel would be added to the program as student enrollments and demand for courses increase.

The program would serve 12 FTE students (30 headcount). It is expected that most students would enroll on a part-time basis and complete the program in 3-6 years. They would have access to an array of library resources, including university on-line catalogs and local libraries.

ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

The proposal presents an assessment plan for evaluating program effectiveness and student learning outcomes. Baseline data, intermediate and end-of-program assessments, and employer and alumni surveys would be used to evaluate program vitality and student performance. The proposal also presents a diversity plan for attracting and promoting under-represented groups into agriculture studies and careers. Part of that plan includes working with WSU's Council of Multicultural Recruitment to initiate a successful extended degree program approach to multicultural student recruiting.

REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

In reviewing this proposal, HECB staff consulted with Dr. Karen P. DePauw, Dean of the Graduate School at Washington State University.

In keeping with the HECB Guidelines, the MS in Agriculture was reviewed by the other public baccalaureates and two external reviewers from Oregon State University's Department of Agriculture Education and General Agriculture: Dr. Lee Cole and Dr. Greg Thompson. Central Washington University shared their support for the program; no comments were received from the other institutions. Both external reviewers pointed out the strength, need, and appropriateness of the MS in Agriculture.

PROGRAM COSTS

The MS in Agriculture would be funded through internal reallocation and TADDA funds. The program costs at full enrollment would be about \$167,000 per year, or \$13, 891 per FTE student.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed MS in Agriculture Extended Degree Program has the potential to contribute significantly to the agriculture industry in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, and to the evolution of best practices in multi-media instructional delivery. Resources are adequate to support a quality program and instructional costs are reasonable. The assessment plan is well-suited to the extended degree program and should ensure student success and program enhancements.

RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University proposal to establish a Master of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho is recommended for approval, effective June 2000. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WSU will submit actual costs for the distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, at the end of the second year of the program, WSU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

RESOLUTION NO. 00-15

WHEREAS, Washington State University proposes to establish a Master of Science Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho; and

WHEREAS, The program has the potential to contribute to the agriculture industry and multi-media instructional delivery; and

WHEREAS, The program would be offered collaboratively with Oregon State University and the University of Idaho; and

WHEREAS, The resources are adequate to support a quality program and instructional costs are reasonable; and

WHEREAS, The assessment plan should facilitate advanced teaching and learning;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves Washington State Universities request to establish a Master of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, effective June 2000. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WSU will submit actual costs for the distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, at the end of the second year of the program, WSU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

David Shaw, Secretary