



STATE OF WASHINGTON
HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

917 Lakeridge Way • PO Box 43430 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3430 • (360) 753-7800 • TDD (360) 753-7809

PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

*Cascadia Community College/University of Washington, Bothell
Cascadia Bldg, Room 360
18345 Campus Way NE, Bothell 98011
October 30, 2001*

*Approximate
Times*

Tab

9:30 a.m.	<u>CASCADIA/UWB CAMPUS TOUR</u> (Assembly point → UWB2 Commons)	
10:00 a.m.	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bob Craves, HECB Chair• Pres. Victoria Munoz Richart, Cascadia Community College• Chancellor Warren Buck, UW Bothell	
	<u>CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS</u>	
	Adoption of July 2001 HECB Meeting Minutes and Sept. 17, 2001 Teleconference	1
10:30 a.m.	<u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</u> (including Status Report: Notification of Intent - new public baccalaureate degree programs)	2
10:45 a.m.	Legislative Preview <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HECB staff briefing	3
11:15 a.m.	<u>FISCAL COMMITTEE REPORT</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2003-05 HECB Operating & Capital Budget Guidelines for Public Colleges and Universities <i>(Resolution 01-32)</i>	4
11:30 a.m.	<u>INFORMATION ITEMS</u> HECB staff briefing <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fall 2001 Enrollments• SAT and Fifteen Percent Waiver	5 6

- 12:00 noon** LUNCH BREAK (*UWB Rose Room*)
No official business will be conducted.
- 1:00 p.m.** **Accreditation and Quality Improvement: Challenges & Opportunities** **7**
- Dr. Sandra Elman, Executive Director, Commission on Colleges
(Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges)
 - Dr. Barbara Smith, former TESC provost
- 2:30 p.m.** **CWU Enrollments**
- Pres. Jerilyn McIntyre
- 2:45 p.m.** ACTION ITEMS
HECB staff briefing
- **Higher Education Accountability Plans** **8**
(*Resolution 01-33*)
 - **Child-care Grants Project** **9**
(*Resolution 01-34*)
- PUBLIC COMMENT
- ADJOURNMENT
- 3:15 p.m.** BREAK
- 3:30 p.m.** ROUNDTABLE
Community Colleges/Branch Campus Issues **10**
- Institutional representatives, legislators, HECB members and staff

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 us sufficient time to make arrangements. We also can be reached through our Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 753-7809.

Revised Date for December 2001 HECB Meeting

December 13 Thursday	Gonzaga University, Spokane Foley Library Teleconference Room
---------------------------------------	--

**Minutes of Meeting
July 25, 2001**

October 2001

HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair
Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair
Mr. Jim Faulstich
Mr. Larry Hanson
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins
Mr. Herb Simon
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn
Ms. Pat Stanford

Welcome and Introductions

HECB Chairman Bob Craves opened the meeting at 9:45 a.m. and started the round of Board introductions. Chancellor Vicky Carwein welcomed the Board to the University of Washington Tacoma campus. She spoke about the continuing growth of UWT, estimated to be about 15.5 percent per year, and the projected establishment of the technology institute.

Rep. Pat Lantz, who represents the district and attended the meeting, was invited to say a few words. She expressed pride in the teamwork and partnerships among business, community members, and the UWT that has successfully leveraged funding for the technology institute.

Minutes of May Board Meeting Approved

ACTION: Pat Stanford moved for consideration of the minutes of the Board's May meeting, and the notes from the joint work session with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. Larry Hanson seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

New Degree Program Approved

ACTION: Gay Selby moved for consideration of three resolutions under the consent agenda, recommending approval of new degree programs for the University of Washington: Res. 01-26, BS in Neurobiology; Res. 01-27, MS in Information Systems; and Res. 01-28, MS in Architecture. Jim Faulstich seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Director's Report

Executive Director Marc Gaspard summarized the agenda for the day, and offered update reports on ongoing programs and projects: reciprocity agreements, Washington Promise Scholarship, the GEAR UP summer institutes, the GET college savings plan.

In addition, Mr. Gaspard provided a status report on three programs approved under the Notification of Intent (NOI) process. Among changes in the HECB's guidelines for program approvals adopted in January 2001, is a new program review and approval process for existing degree programs proposed at branch campuses, new off-campus locations, via distance learning, or through a combination of delivery methods. The process requires institutions to submit a Notification of Intent at least 45 days prior to the proposed start date of the program. The NOI is published on the HECB Web site, and if the Board receives no objections, the executive director approves the programs. Three such programs have been approved since January 2001: M.Ed. Master Teacher, CWU; BA Education/Elementary, CWU; and MS Applied Math, UW.

Finally, Mr. Gaspard expressed appreciation to the Legislature for its confirmation of HECB members Herb Simon, Pat Stanford, Chang Mook Sohn, and Gay Selby.

Legislative Update

HECB Government Relations Director Bruce Botka provided highlights on major HECB priorities, including final enrollment and budget numbers. He said the budget allows 55 percent income cut-off for State Need Grant; and although legislation for the Promise Scholarship was not approved, the top 15 percent cut-off for students was preserved.

Comments and questions from board members indicated a need for the Policy Committee to identify — and make available — various data that would help the Board in its policy deliberations.

Related to HECB legislative priorities, Ruta Fanning, HECB deputy director, referred to the HECB projects summary. Projects are divided into four categories, describing whether a project is required under statute, legislative mandate, Board resolution, or administrative need. The projects are listed by due dates, not by priority. She clarified that the projects do not include the day-to-day operations requirements of the agency.

UWT Technology Institute

Board member Herb Simon provided introductory comments. He ascribed the rapid development of the project to the inspired work and dedication of UWT Chancellor Vicky Carwein and Bill Philip, UWT advisory board chair.

Chancellor Carwein traced the beginnings of the project to Gov. Gary Locke who envisioned the institute as a response to the shortage of high-tech workers in the area. She introduced the members of the panel, composed of individuals representing various groups involved with the technology institute.

- Rich Nafziger, former policy advisor to Gov. Locke, described the situation that gave rise to the Governor's idea of a technology center.
- Ken Myer, workforce chair of the Washington Software Alliance (WSA), shared the latest workforce survey results conducted by WSA, which clearly shows the rising and continuing need for baccalaureate-trained high-tech workers.
- Bill Philip described how the business community rallied to bring the UW to Tacoma and how business has come to the forefront in support of the technology center.
- David Notkin, Boeing professor and associate chair for Computer Science and Engineering at the UW Seattle, and Larry Crum, UWT director of Computing and Software Systems, talked about the need for the two campuses to work together and described technology academic plans.
- State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Director for Education Services Jan Yoshiwara talked about how community colleges provide students for the pipeline and about the collaborations underway to ease transfer and articulation from the two-year colleges to the baccalaureate institutions.
- Susan Hasse, UWT senior student of computer programming, shared some of her experiences and career goals.

The recurring theme was the need for continuing collaborations and partnerships to create more opportunities and financial help for students and institutions. Bill Philip suggested it is time to look at changing the funding strategy for higher education. Herb Simon called for a more concerted effort statewide to get the private sector to invest in higher education.

The Evergreen State College Tacoma Campus

Evergreen State College Tacoma Campus Director Joye Hardiman described the student population, programs of study, and successes of the campus. She clarified that TESC Tacoma is an off-campus site, not a branch campus. The campus is nationally known for graduating people of color, with a graduation rate never lower than 89 percent. Student success is attributed to student (and parents) involvement in the community, strong focus on the application of learning, articulation agreements and co-location with two-year colleges, and intergenerational transfers.

Distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, Consortial Degree Program

Policy Committee Chair Gay Selby provided background information, and Associate Director Elaine Jones described the program and the committee's recommendations.

In July 1998, the HECB conditionally approved WSU's distance-delivered bachelor's degree in Business Administration with the understanding that the consortium of public four-year institutions would deliver a "consortial-awarded" BA in Business Administration by July 1, 2001. But because of problems with accreditation and limited funding, the consortium has requested that each institution be permanently approved by the HECB to deliver its own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration.

The Policy Committee recommended extending WSU's conditional approval for two more years, after which it would automatically be made permanent. Other universities in the consortium

(CWU, EWU, WWU) are to be granted conditional approval for their own individual programs as long as certain conditions are met in the next two years.

WSU Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Jane Sherman and EWU Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies Ron Dalla expressed support for the program.

***ACTION: Gay Selby** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-29**, approving the Policy Committee's recommendations on the Distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, Consortial Degree Program. **Larry Hanson** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.*

Transfer and Articulation Policies Review

HECB Associate Director Gary Benson summarized the report, which lays out the preliminary scope, process, and timeline for a study surrounding transfer and articulation. He emphasized that the preliminary study scope will be reviewed and refined through a collaborative process involving representatives of the public colleges and universities, the independent institutions, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and the Council of Presidents.

Jim Faulstich suggested that rather than a study group, an "action" group on transfer and articulation be established.

2003-05 Budget Guidelines

Marc Gaspard reminded the Board that statute requires the HECB to issue budget guidelines to the institutions by December of odd-numbered years, which means staff would need to start working with the institutions now.

Fiscal Committee Chair Larry Hanson remarked that the approach being considered for the 2003-05 budget guidelines is different than in previous years, particularly with regards to the operating budgets. In essence, the approach would first direct institutions to articulate the "basics" of what they need in any biennium to preserve the system. Then they would identify a limited number of system-wide initiatives that merit additional resources in the upcoming biennium. With respect to the capital budget, the Committee proposes continuing with the approach of system-wide integrated rankings of capital projects.

Ruta Fanning, HECB deputy director, and Associate Directors John Fricke and Jim Reed discussed the specifics of the budget guidelines. They also described the collaborative process to be used in putting the process forward.

Bob Craves inquired about what other states are doing to finance higher education. Jim Reed said that the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the Joint Legislative Accountability Review Committee (JLARC), in consultation with the HECB, had been directed by the Legislature to conduct a study of higher education capital and facility needs. In connection with

this study, the HECB is looking at how other states have addressed this issue, such as North Carolina's capital improvement bond referendum.

Ann Ramsay-Jenkins proposed that in preparation for the next Master Plan, staff should look into which of the current master plan initiatives have not been met, the reasons why, and the cost of delays or consequences of deferral. She suggested that if the reason for the delay is the budget, then different funding mechanisms should be considered.

UWT Student Panel

Chancellor Vicky Carwein introduced four students who shared some of their thoughts about working on their degrees at a branch campus and their reasons for picking the UWT. Two of the students mentioned that transfer from a community college to the UWT was greatly facilitated by staff from the colleges who are knowledgeable about transfer requirements and core programs they needed to successfully transition to the UWT. The students who participated in the panel are: Burke Anderson, Erica Escobar, Barry Nelson, and Shellie Jo White.

Latino/a Educational Achievement Project

Concerned that Latino students have scored very low on virtually all K-12 state assessments in the past 20 years, a group of Washington citizens initiated the Latino/a Educational Achievement Project (LEAP) to improve learning opportunities and academic achievement of Latino students.

LEAP Chair and Skagit Valley College President Lydia Ledesma-Reese stated that other groups have addressed these same concerns in the past, but Latino students continue to score low. LEAP believes that all children – not just Latinos – can meet high academic standards when they are provided appropriate and supportive learning environments. She described the current projects that LEAP is working on, including proposals to develop public policies that will open college doors to undocumented students, dual language educators, and parent literacy and school involvement training.

Ricardo Sanchez, LEAP director, discussed demographics. He said OFM predicts that the Latino population will be the fastest growing group by 2020; consequently, the student population will reflect the same demographics. LEAP recommends the state rethink some of its policies to help this sector.

One way LEAP brings its issues to a larger audience is through public dialogues. One such meeting is planned for September 29, and the HECB has been invited to participate. Chair Bob Craves asked Marc Gaspard to see if staff can get involved with the project.

Adjournment

After a short executive session, the Board adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

RESOLUTION NO. 01-26

WHEREAS, The University of Washington has requested approval to establish a Bachelor of Science in Neurobiology; and

WHEREAS, The program will enhance the university's undergraduate offerings in science and attract highly qualified students from diverse backgrounds; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the quality of the program and outstanding faculty; and

WHEREAS, The program will serve as a model collaborative program between the Medical School and the College of Arts and Sciences; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable for a program of this nature;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Neurobiology, effective July 25, 2001.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

RESOLUTION NO. 01-27

WHEREAS, The University of Washington has requested approval to establish a Master of Science in Information Systems; and

WHEREAS, The program will address the immediate and future need for information systems professionals; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the high quality of the curriculum and affiliated faculty; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are suitable for a program of this nature; and

WHEREAS, The program will be funded on a self-sustaining basis;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Master of Science in Information Systems, beginning fall 2001.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

RESOLUTION NO. 01-28

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to establish a Master of Science in Architecture, beginning in fall 2001; and

WHEREAS, The program will introduce advanced studies in architecture and serve the growing needs of the profession well; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the need and quality of the program and its faculty; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans will serve students and the program well; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington's proposal to establish a Master of Science in Architecture, beginning in fall 2001, effective July 25, 2001.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

RESOLUTION NO. 01-29

WHEREAS, The Consortium of Public Baccalaureate Institutions of the State of Washington for the Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration was established to develop and deliver a "consortium-awarded" BA in Business Administration; and

WHEREAS, The Consortium has concluded that because of insurmountable accreditation issues and costs associated with administrative overhead, the concept of a state-based consortium-awarded BA in Business Administration is an unworkable one for the foreseeable future; and

WHEREAS, All participating Consortium members continue to support the social efficiency issues that are inherent in the consortium concept, and propose that each member should award its own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration in keeping with the program guidelines and goals they have established; and

WHEREAS, The Board recognizes that WSU's conditionally approved distance delivered BA in Business Administration has contributed significantly to greater higher education access in all regions of Washington; and

WHEREAS, The Board recognizes that the consortium has made impressive progress in developing program guidelines and goals, and additional tasks remain;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby:

1. Extends WSU's conditional approval to offer its distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, in keeping with the Consortium's collaborative program guidelines and goals, through June 30, 2003. This conditional approval will automatically convert to permanent approval on July 1, 2003.

2. Grants conditional approval to the other institutional members of the Consortium (CWU, EWU, WWU) to offer their own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, in keeping with the Consortium's collaborative program guidelines and goals, pending the July 1, 2002 completion and HECB approval of each institution's program delivery plan for initiating their own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration by June 30, 2003. The program delivery plan shall include:

- a) name of institution
- b) degree title
- c) program implementation date
- d) source and amount of funding
- e) year 1 and full enrollment targets
- f) timetable for developing and delivering on-line courses and options;
- g) inventory of on-line courses and options to be offered;
- h) identification of resources and funds dedicated to support the program;
- i) timetable for continued development of a joint transfer guide, on-line catalog, and marketing plan.

Those institutions gaining conditional approval and implementing their program by June 30, 2001 will automatically be granted permanent approval on July 1, 2003.

3. Stipulates that in the event an institutional member of the Consortium fails to complete and/or gain HECB approval for its program delivery plan by July 1, 2002 for initiating its own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration by June 30, 2003, conditional approval lapses. At a later date, if the institution wants to offer a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, it shall submit a Notification of Intent to the HECB for consideration.

4. Stipulates that in the event other public baccalaureate institutions want to offer a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, they shall submit a Notification of Intent to the HECB for consideration.

Adopted:

July 25, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

Minutes of Teleconference Sept. 17, 2001

October 2001

HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair
Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair
Ms. Kristi Blake, Secretary
Mr. Jim Faulstich
Mr. Herb Simon

Background

The HECB held a teleconference on Sept. 17, to take action on two items that had been on the Board's agenda for the meeting on Sept. 12, which had been cancelled because of the events in New York and Washington D.C.

HECB senior staff and institutional representatives: Jane Sherman, WSU; Robert Corbett, UW and Neville Hosking, EWU were also present at this teleconference.

Guidelines for Higher Education Accountability Plans (*Res. 01-30*)

In November 2000, the HECB recommended continuation of the four statewide accountability performance measures identified by the Legislature, as well as continuation and refinement of institution-specific measures. The proposed 2001 guidelines reflect the same recommendations and make to substantive changes in the Board's directions to institutions.

The most significant difference between these guidelines and those approved in 1999 is in the handling of the statewide goals for graduation efficiency, retention, graduation rates, and faculty productivity. Specifically, the guidelines ask institutions to identify student-learning outcomes in all undergraduate academic programs, develop assessment projects in the areas of writing, quantitative skills, and technological literacy, and to report annually on their progress in those areas.

ACTION: **Jim Faulstich** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-30**, approving the 2001 Guidelines for Higher Education Accountability Plans. **Herb Simon** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Teacher Training Pilot Program Grants (*Res. 01-31*)

The Teacher Training Pilot project began in 1999 as a legislative initiative to stimulate innovation in the recruitment and training of K-12 teachers. The initial pilot projects were undertaken by Western Washington University and the UW Bothell in partnership with Cascadia Community College.

For the 2001-03 biennium, the Legislature granted 350,000 appropriations to support at least two new pilot projects. Several four-year universities and one community college submitted grant proposals for new programs to train teachers. The advisory group that reviewed the proposals recommended that the funds be awarded to the following institutions:

- University of Washington Bothell (\$20,000)
- Green River Community College ((\$141, 481)
- Western Washington University (\$138, 519).

Each project involves extensive collaboration among K-12 school districts, community and technical colleges, and four-year universities.

ACTION: **Jim Faulstich** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-31**, approving the recommendations of the advisory group. **Gay Selby** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 01-30

WHEREAS, The Washington Legislature required institutions to prepare accountability plans at the direction of the Higher Education Coordinating Board and submit them to the Board by August 15, 2001; and

WHEREAS, The institutions have been granted an extension of this deadline to October 10; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has prepared guidelines to help the institutions prepare accountability plans that will describe each institution's strategies for making meaningful and substantial progress toward the achievement of the Legislature's long-term performance goals;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts these guidelines for the 2001-2003 Accountability Plans; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board encourages institutions to identify student learning outcomes in all undergraduate academic programs, develop assessment projects in the areas of writing, quantitative skills, and technological literacy, and to report annually on their progress in those areas.

Adopted:

September 12, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Kristianne Blake, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 01-31

WHEREAS, The Governor and the Legislature have appropriated \$300,000 for the 2001-2003 Biennium to the Higher Education Coordinating Board for competitive grants to develop coordinated, innovative programs of teacher training; and

WHEREAS, The Board, via *Resolution 99-27*, adopted a process for review and approval of the teacher-education pilot program grant proposals; and

WHEREAS, The Board staff and external experts in the field have evaluated the 2001-2003 grant proposals in accordance with the adopted process, and recommend funding the following teacher-education pilot programs:

1. University of Washington, Bothell Teacher-Training Pilot Program extension: The Teaching Link in Collaboration with Cascadia Community College District;
2. Green River Community College Teacher-Training Pilot Program: Project Link – Linking the EALRs to Their Related Content Course in Teacher Preparation – in Collaboration with Project Teach Partner Schools and Colleges; and
3. Western Washington University Teacher-Training Pilot Program: Pathways to Careers in Teaching Phase II in Collaboration with Everett, Whatcom, and Skagit Valley Community Colleges.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington, Bothell teacher-training pilot program extension in the amount of \$20,000 for FY 2002; the Green River Community College teacher-training pilot program in the amount of \$141,481 for the 2001-2003 Biennium; and the Western Washington University teacher-training pilot program in the amount of \$138,519 for the 2001-2003 Biennium.

Adopted:

September 12, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Kristianne Blake, Secretary

Status Report Notification of Intent

October 2001

INTRODUCTION

In January 2001, the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted revised *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval and Review* in order to expedite and improve the process for the institutions and HECB alike. One of the major changes in the *Guidelines* includes a new program review and approval process for existing degree programs proposed to be offered at a branch campus, a new off-campus location, via distance learning technologies, or a combination of delivery methods.

The process requires an institution to submit a Notification of Intent (NOI) in electronic format to the HECB at least 45 days prior to the proposed start date of the program. The NOI includes the following information:

- Name of institution
- Degree title
- Delivery mechanism
- Location
- Implementation date
- Substantive statement of need
- Source of funding
- Year 1 and full enrollment targets (FTE and headcount)

HECB staff posts the institution's NOI on the HECB Web site within 5 business days of receipt, and via email notifies the provosts of the other public four-year institutions, the Washington Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Inter-institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning, and the Council of Presidents. The other public four-year institutions and HECB staff have 30 days to review and comment on the NOI via an email link on the HECB Web site.

If there are no objections, the HECB Executive Director approves the existing degree program proposed to be offered at a branch campus, a new off-campus location, via distance learning technologies, or a combination of delivery methods. If there is controversy, the HECB will employ its dispute resolution process.

STATUS REPORT

From September 1, 2001, through October 25, 2001, the HECB Executive Director has approved the following existing degree programs in accordance with the NOI process.

Institution	Degree Title	Location	Approval Date
WSU-Spokane	BA Business Administration-Real Estate Option	Spokane	September 28, 2001
UW	M Library & Information Science	Distance Delivery	October 12, 2001
WWU	BA Education-Child Development	Peninsula College	October 25, 2001
WWU	M Ed Elementary Education	Marysville	October 25, 2001

2002 HECB Legislative Session Overview

October 2001

BACKGROUND

The Washington Legislature will convene the 2002 session on Monday, January 14. The regular session is scheduled for a maximum of 60 days.

This report presents a brief summary of issues that are expected to receive legislative consideration in 2002. It is a preliminary document for the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) members to use in considering their legislative priorities for the 2002 session. The HECB is scheduled to adopt its formal legislative agenda for the 2002 session on December 13, when it meets at Gonzaga University in Spokane.

STATEWIDE HIGHER EDUCATION ISSUES

Significant Uncertainty Due to Changing Economic and Revenue Environment

Normal preparations for the 2002 legislative session were significantly altered by the economic and revenue impacts of the terrorist attacks of September 11, which compounded the downward trends that had been identified earlier in the year. As of late October, most state agencies and higher education institutions reported that they were continuing to analyze the new environment and that their efforts to prepare for the 2002 session were delayed. However, several specific proposals are expected to be presented to the Governor and Legislature.

Operating and Capital Budget Issues

The Legislature is expected to substantially revise the 2001-2003 operating and capital budgets that were enacted earlier in the year. The November 20 state revenue forecast is expected to show a continued drop in state revenue due to the effects of the events of September 11 and the general slowing of the state economy. The Governor is scheduled to release his supplemental operating and capital budget proposals in mid-December. The Office of Financial Management (OFM) has taken two significant actions in anticipation of a substantial revenue decline:

- On October 16, OFM directed all state agencies, elected officials, and colleges and universities to find expenditures that could be reduced or eliminated. OFM directed the largest general-fund agencies to prepare plans to reduce their budgets by an amount equivalent to at least 15 percent of their FY 2003 appropriations.

- On September 21, OFM placed a moratorium on the authorization to proceed with 2001-2003 capital projects that are funded in whole or in part by general obligation bonds. The agency, in collaboration with the higher education institutions and the HECB staff, is analyzing the effect of the current economic situation on the state's bonding capacity for capital projects. Until that analysis is complete, OFM is not permitting capital projects to proceed.

Given the uncertainty that surrounds the status of the operating and capital budgets, all of the higher education institutions are reviewing their plans for the 2002 supplemental budgets. Supplemental budget increases are being requested by a number of institutions to cover new expenses and some costs that were not recognized in the biennial budget approved earlier this year. For example, three of the public universities are requesting supplemental funds for facility maintenance and/or utility costs, and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) is scheduled to consider a similar recommendation on October 31 for the two-year college system. Central Washington University is seeking \$1 million to continue the enrollment recovery initiatives that were begun during the 2000-2001 academic year in response to an enrollment downturn. The University of Washington and The Evergreen State College indicate they do not plan to submit supplemental budget requests.

Supplemental Requests to Respond to Over-Enrollment

Two requests for supplemental funding to respond to over-enrollment are expected to be submitted to the Governor and Legislature:

- The SBCTC will consider on October 31 a system recommendation that it request \$21 million to support an additional 2,500 full-time enrollment slots in the two-year colleges' dislocated worker retraining program. As of fall quarter, the colleges' retraining programs are over-enrolled by 1,800 FTEs. The current over-enrollment does not reflect the additional enrollment pressure associated with upcoming layoffs at The Boeing Company and other companies related to the events of September 11. Currently, the retraining program funding level supports 6,200 FTE. The two-year college system's legislative committee recommends adding 1,000 enrollment slots in the current academic year and another 1,500 during 2002-2003.
- Eastern Washington University (EWU) seeks funding for an additional 450 FTEs to respond to over-enrollment that is expected to continue through the current biennium. EWU is funded for an enrollment base of 7,933 FTEs during the current academic year. EWU is over-enrolled by 475 FTE during fall quarter 2001, but the total is expected to decrease slightly by the spring term in 2002.

Tuition and Financial Aid

The likelihood of budget reductions throughout state government is expected to spark a review of the tuition increase authority granted to the colleges and universities in the biennial operating budget. As of late October, the prospect of further tuition increases had been discussed, but no

specific proposals had been made public. The Senate and House Higher Education committees are scheduled to conduct public hearings on tuition and financial aid in Seattle and Bothell on November 1 and 2, in Vancouver on November 28, and in Eastern Washington on December 10 and 11. Among other issues, the committees' agenda asks the question, "Where do we go from here in the current fiscal environment?"

Washington Promise Scholarship

The Promise Scholarship program, which is in its third year of operation, was created through a proviso in the 1999-2001 state budget and extended for two more years through a similar proviso in the 2001-2003 budget. Each year since 1999, Governor Locke has proposed legislation that would enact the program in statute and make it a permanent part of the state's complement of student financial aid programs. Currently, because the program exists only in the state's operating budget, it is scheduled to expire at the end of the biennium. The HECB has endorsed the Governor's policy legislation in each of the last three years.

OTHER PROSPECTIVE LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Branch Campuses: The House and Senate Higher Education committees are scheduled to conduct work sessions on November 1 and 2 at the University of Washington's branch campuses in Tacoma and Bothell to discuss a variety of issues regarding the operation of the University of Washington and Washington State University branches and the collaboration of the universities with the community and technical colleges. Discussions are expected to include the branches' operating and capital budgets, enrollment trends, degree-granting authority and articulation of programs with the two-year college system. Similar meetings are scheduled November 28 in Vancouver and December 10 and 11 in the Tri-Cities and Spokane.

Loan Repayment for Public Interest Attorneys: Legislation has been offered in each of the past three sessions to establish a loan repayment program to assist attorneys who practice as prosecuting attorneys, public defenders and in other public interest fields. This legislation is expected to be introduced again in 2002.

LEGISLATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION MEETING DATES

Thursday, November 1

- House and Senate Higher Education committees work session, UW Tacoma – branch campus issues
- Senate and House Higher Education committees public hearing, Seattle Central Community College – tuition and financial aid

Friday, November 2

- House and Senate Higher Education committees work session, UW Bothell – branch campus issues
- Senate and House Higher Education committees public hearing, Cascadia Community College – tuition and financial aid

Wednesday, November 28

- Senate and House Higher Education committees public hearing, Clark College, Vancouver – tuition and financial aid
- House and Senate Higher Education committees work session, WSU Vancouver – branch campus issues

Friday, November 30

- Senate Higher Education Committee meeting, Olympia – discussions of impact of September 11 terrorist attacks on institutional climate and operations
- House Higher Education Committee meeting, Olympia – articulation issues

Monday, December 10

- Senate and House Higher Education committees public hearing, Columbia Basin College, Pasco – tuition and financial aid issues
- House and Senate Higher Education committees work session, WSU Tri-Cities – branch campus issues

Tuesday, December 11

- Senate and House Higher Education committees public hearing, Eastern Washington University, Cheney – tuition and financial aid
- House and Senate Higher Education committees work session, WSU Spokane – branch campus issues

Monday, January 14

- 2002 legislative session convenes in Olympia

2003-2005 HECB Operating and Capital Budget Guidelines For Public Colleges and Universities

October 2001

PURPOSE OF THE OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGET GUIDELINES

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) is required by statute (RCW 28B.80.330(4)) to “review, evaluate and make recommendations” on the operating and capital budget requests of the public colleges and universities. To prepare for these recommendations, the HECB must adopt and distribute budget guidelines in December of each odd-numbered year. The Board’s budget recommendations are to be based on the following:

- The role and mission statements of the public institutions;
- The state’s higher education goals, objectives, and priorities as identified in the comprehensive master plan; and
- Guidelines that describe the Board’s fiscal priorities.

The intent of these directions is for the Board, together with the institutions, to identify and recommend budget proposals to help achieve the state’s higher education goals. As in the past, these operating budget guidelines are designed to help integrate the Master Plan priorities into the 2003-2005 institution budget requests and, ultimately, into the HECB operating budget recommendations for higher education.

THE 2003-2005 OPERATING BUDGET PRIORITIES AND GUIDELINES

The 2003-2005 Operating Budget Process

The HECB plans to discuss its 2003-2005 operating budget recommendations in two parts:

1. to clarify and re-affirm its long-standing budget and policy commitments; and
2. to clearly focus on a limited number of specific priorities for enhancements.

The Board’s continuing commitments and values will be described as “**budget principles.**” The specific enhancement goals will be described as “**2003-2005 budget priorities.**” The principles are not expected to change greatly over time, but the fiscal priorities for each biennial budget will change as they are successfully addressed or as the state’s higher education environment evolves.

The HECB's budget principles reflect the long-standing values of the Board as reflected in the Master Plan, and form the basis to discuss the state's biennial higher education budget. The Board has identified four principles, each of which represents a separate area of investment. These budget principles are inter-related and of equal importance and priority:

- ***Carry-Forward or "Maintenance" Level Budget***

The Legislature should fully fund the carry-forward budgets of the colleges and universities to provide a foundation of educational quality. The colleges and universities should be able to rely on consistent and predictable levels of state financial support. In return for this predictability, colleges and universities should be prepared to demonstrate the reallocations and efficiencies they have achieved in their ongoing operations. This "core" funding is critical to the ability of the public colleges and universities to meet the state's need for a well-educated citizenry whose members actively contribute to the state's quality of life.

- ***Enrollment Increases***

Increases in enrollment should reflect an incremental approach to the 2010 enrollment goal of the 2000 Higher Education Master Plan that the Board re-examined at the Legislature's request. Enrollment increases should include lower-division slots at the community and technical colleges and baccalaureate institutions, and upper-division and graduate/professional enrollments at the baccalaureate schools. Enrollment levels should respond to three forces: projected population growth, the need for more education and training, and recent enrollment experience. Enrollment increases should provide for more traditional core programs and more student capacity in specific programs.

- ***Adequate Funding of Financial Aid Programs Consistent with State Tuition Policy***

Linking financial aid and tuition is important to make college costs as affordable and predictable as possible. The state should keep tuition rates affordable and, at least, preserve the current level of aid to needy students. The state should increase financial aid funding to keep pace with tuition and enrollment increases. As enrollment grows and tuition and other costs rise, state financial aid makes college a reality for many students who would not otherwise attend college.

- ***Faculty and Staff Compensation Levels***

Competitive salaries should be provided at a level necessary to recruit and retain employees with the skills, knowledge, and experience to meet the needs of students and to fulfill the role and mission of each institution. The quality of higher education institutions is inextricably related to the quality of the faculty and staff who teach, conduct research, and perform public service and other activities.

The 2003-2005 biennium fiscal priorities are proposals that address specific system-wide issues for the next biennium to implement the policies and goals of the higher education Master Plan. The Board's preliminary priorities are to:

1. Improve student preparation, participation, retention, and completion based on the issues identified in the Master Plan and in the Board's May 2001 report, "*Postsecondary Opportunity and Achievement in Washington.*"
2. Improve student transfer and articulation among the public two- and four-year sectors of higher education to help more students reach their educational goals.
3. Support new and expanded academic and vocational programs that help strengthen the state's economy. High-demand fields such as nursing, engineering, computer engineering, technology, teacher training, and research need more graduates. The Board will work with the colleges and universities and labor market specialists to identify fields where there is both strong enrollment pressure from students and a reasonable expectation that jobs will be available for skilled graduates. Well-educated citizens trained in fields related to the state's "new economy" contribute to their communities socially and culturally as well as economically.
4. Improve the transition of students and strengthen the connections between K-12 schools and higher education. The Board will support programs that build on K-12 education reform and provide students the opportunity to enter higher education and receive degrees based on their knowledge and skills.

The Board's 2003-2005 operating budget recommendations also will recognize the differences in the role and mission of each public college and university. The Board expects to review budget requests that reflect the unique educational and fiscal circumstances of specific institutions. These proposals may not be directly related to the Board's statewide policies and goals, but they may be very important to particular institutions and their students. The budget guidelines assume that the Governor and Legislature will evaluate these unique proposals outside the framework of the Board's statewide priorities.

Linking Master Plan Goals with Fiscal Priorities

The Board's budget recommendations will reflect the goals established in the 2000 Master Plan, and the Board will work with the colleges and universities to identify links between the Master Plan goals and the institutions' specific budget proposals.

One of the goals in the 2000 Master Plan is to enhance student opportunity through greater use of e-learning technologies. Educational technology is an increasingly powerful tool that can reach students who might otherwise not be able to participate in higher education, and it can improve the programs of all students. In reviewing budget proposals for the 2003-2005 biennium, the

HECB will support innovative and well-documented proposals to use e-learning technology to accomplish the budget priorities.

Similarly, the overview presented in the recent HECB report, *“Postsecondary Opportunity and Achievement in Washington,”* outlines a number of challenges in improving the preparation, participation, and completion of all students. The HECB will support budget proposals that offer a high likelihood of success in addressing these challenges.

Forms and Formats

The HECB will continue to use the basic forms and formats for budget requests the Office of Financial Management (OFM) has prescribed. These forms historically require that operating budget requests be grouped into two separate sections:

1. the maintenance and carry-forward budget request to carry on the current activities, and
2. proposals for enhancements.

As in the past, the HECB will recognize the carry-forward or maintenance budgets the institutions have developed in cooperation with OFM. This allows the HECB to focus on those items that are most relevant to achieve the fiscal priorities identified in these guidelines. It is clear that adequate maintenance budgets are essential to the ongoing vitality and quality of Washington’s colleges and universities. Because an elaborate process exists to refine the carry-forward budgets, the HECB’s review and analysis will focus mainly on the enhancement requests that relate to fiscal priorities identified for the upcoming biennium.

HECB recommendations are designed to complement the information and requests from the institutions by providing an additional system-wide perspective on the needs of public higher education. As such, HECB review and recommendations should provide additional information that is useful to the Governor and Legislature in budget deliberations.

Timing of Budget Development Activities

HECB’s review of institutional budget requests is based on submissions formally presented by the institutions in September of each even-numbered year. However, it takes many months to develop and discuss institutional budget requests before final recommendations are submitted. As before, the HECB staff will meet regularly and discuss budget information with institution staff to better understand the proposals that will be included in the formal budget requests. Review of enrollment proposals along with recent enrollment experience will be an early focus.

HECB Operating Budget Guidelines Options

Current Approach <i>2001-2003 Biennium</i>		Proposed Approach <i>2003-2005 Biennium</i>
1. Fully funded carry-forward budget 2a. Enrollment (linked) 2b. Financial Aid 3. Outreach, Diversity 4. Competency-based Admissions 5. E-learning Technology 6. Competency-based Degrees 7. Other Investments	SALARY INCREASES NOT PRIORITIZED	Budget Principles Fully funded carry-forward budget, ample enrollment, financial aid, and compensation
<p style="text-align: center;">TOTAL: Equals ALL Institution Requests</p>		Biennial Priorities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student Preparation, Participation, Retention, Completion 2. Transfer/Articulation within higher education 3. Strengthening the state economy, high-demand programs (not FTEs) 4. Re-design K-12 connections, competency-based admissions/degrees
		<p style="text-align: center;">TOTAL: Does NOT Equal All Institution Requests</p> Other enhancement proposals, related to an institution's unique role and mission, will be evaluated outside this framework.

Differences:

- Salary increases will be included as a budget principle, rather than presented as a separate item.
- HECB recommendations will be focused on the ongoing budget principles and the 2003-2005 biennium priorities.
- Other enhancement proposals, related to an institution's unique role and mission, will be evaluated outside this framework.

2003-2005 CAPITAL BUDGET PRIORITIES AND GUIDELINES

Priorities and Evaluation Model

The HECB will continue to use the integrated project ranking method developed by the Board for preparing its 2001-2003 capital budget recommendations. The development of this approach was requested by the Chair of the Senate Ways and Means Committee and the Co-Chairs of the House Capital Budget Committee in April 2000.

Attachment A (HECB Capital Project Evaluation Model) provides the priorities and scores to be used in establishing the integrated ranking of requested projects. These priorities are derived from the 2000 Master Plan and reflect the Board's capital budget fiscal priorities for 2003-2005. It is important to emphasize that these priorities are **not considered to be a substitute** or alternative to the institutions' own budget priorities. Rather, these priorities are intended to assist the Legislature and Governor in capital funding decisions by providing an **additional statewide perspective to capital budget needs**.

The policy framework for deriving the integrated prioritized list of the capital projects places the highest priority (Categories 1-4) on protecting and preserving the physical and academic quality of the existing capital assets of the universities and colleges. Following these projects, priority is placed on alleviating existing space shortages and adding capacity for future enrollment demand (Category 5), meeting capital needs for areas of high program demand (Category 6) and supporting investments to promote institutional competitiveness (Category 7). Finally, projects which could be deferred one biennium without jeopardizing safety or program quality are placed in Category 8.

The methodology used to establish the integrated priority list of capital project requests involves assigning a numeric score value to requested projects and then ranking the projects on the basis of the score value. The scores assigned to projects constitute a scale that is associated with the relative priority of the type of project as associated with initiatives contained in the Master Plan.

To arrive at the prioritized list, projects will first be ranked on the score value assigned them through the HECB Capital Project Evaluation Model (Attachment A). Projects with the same score value will then be listed by institution in alphabetical order. When a university or college has more than one project with the same score value, the projects will be ranked in the order of institutional priority.

Capital Budget Review Process

The Board recognizes that the capital budget requests submitted by the public four-year institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) represent and reflect complex management and planning processes and choices, requiring considerable effort to develop and prioritize at the institutional level.

To ensure that sufficient time is planned and spent to fully understand institutional capital needs and project requests, a formal process and schedule for the preparation of the Board's capital recommendations will be established for the 2003-2005 budget preparation process.

This process and schedule, summarized below, will require a collaborative and responsive approach in the sharing of preliminary institutional budget request information and HECB budget recommendations.

- ***Capital Needs: Field/Site Review – April and May 2002***

HECB staff will undertake field/site reviews of capital needs in **April and May 2002**. These reviews will be conducted at the institutions' respective campuses or other locations as appropriate. The focus of the review will be on both immediate capital/facility needs and the institutions longer-term capital program plan.

- ***Pre-Submittal: Governor's Capital Plan Update – mid-June 2002***

Institutions and the SBCTC should submit to the HECB, by **mid-June 2002**, a draft update of the prioritized capital projects contained in the Governor's Ten-Year Capital Plan for the 2003-2005 biennium. This information will be requested as a pre-submittal to the official submission of the budget request. The Board will ask baccalaureate institutions and the SBCTC to identify possible requests for deletion of projects currently in the plan, changes in estimated project costs, changes in the priority array, and new projects.

- ***Pre-Submittal Conferences – early July 2002***

Based on the information provided in the update to the Governor's Capital Plan, HECB staff will schedule pre-submittal conferences with the institutions and the SBCTC. The purpose of these conferences, to be held in **early July 2002**, will be to review the underlying policy and planning basis of the institutions and the SBCTC's approach to establishing the priority array of 2003-2005 projects.

- ***Preliminary Project Priorities – mid-July 2002***

The HECB will request baccalaureate institutions and the SBCTC to submit a *preliminary* listing of prioritized capital project requests to the HECB by **mid-July 2002**. HECB staff will recognize that the submitted information is in draft form and does not constitute a public document nor represent an official budget submittal. HECB staff will use the information to understand the magnitude of the 2003-2005 capital request for all of higher education, and to begin the classification of projects within the HECB Investment Categories.

- ***Review of Preliminary HECB Capital Revenue Assumptions and Project Rankings – late July 2002***

HECB staff will invite institutional and SBCTC representatives to attend briefings on the preliminary capital budget revenue assumptions being developed as part of the Board's budget recommendations. Additionally, HECB staff will review the preliminary rankings of projects derived from the integrated project ranking model. These briefings will be scheduled in **late July 2002**.

- ***Capital Budget Submittal – September 2002***

Pursuant to the budget instructions issued by the Office of Financial Management, the institutions and the SBCTC will submit copies of their capital budget requests to the HECB by **September 2002** (tentative date).

- ***Review of Preliminary HECB Staff Recommendations***

Meetings to review the preliminary HECB capital project recommendations will be held with the institutions and SBCTC staff **throughout September** *provided that the institutions and the SBCTC have submitted their official budget requests to OFM and the HECB by the established due date.*

- ***Review of (proposed) HECB Capital Budget Recommendations***

Each institution and the SBCTC will be provided with the HECB (proposed) 2003-2005 capital budget recommendations at the time that the recommendations are transmitted to the Board and available to the public.

**ATTACHMENT A
HECB CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION MODEL**

MASTER PLAN INITIATIVE	PROJECT TYPE	SCORE		
<p><i>Promote the Efficient and Effective Use of Public Resources in Providing a Quality Learning Environment</i></p>	<p>1 Unanticipated Repairs and Non-Deferrable Regulatory Compliance (A) Funding proposals within an omnibus appropriation request to respond to emergent repair and replacement needs potentially arising within the 2001-2003 biennium. (B) Line-item project requests or projects within an omnibus appropriation request whose funding is proposed in response to emergency conditions and/or a law or code that <u>requires</u> compliance within the 2001-2003 biennium to avoid (a) the closure of facilities essential for the delivery of programs and operations, or (b) the assessment of fines or other punitive actions.</p>	<p>100</p>		
	<p>2 Critical Repairs Omnibus appropriation requests whose deferral would jeopardize: (A) The ability to operate or occupy campus systems and space (B) Compliance with building occupancy codes</p>		<p>98</p>	
	<p>3 Minor Improvements and Equipment Acquisitions Line-item projects less than \$7.5 million or those projects within an omnibus appropriation request which are needed to sustain an acceptable level of program quality or facility operation.</p>		<p>96</p>	
	<p>4 Major Replacements, Renovations, and Infrastructure Improvements Renovation, replacement, or upgrade of existing space or infrastructure needed to sustain an acceptable level of program quality for current or projected enrollment.</p>		<p>94</p>	
<p><i>Reaffirm the State's Commitment to Opportunity in Higher Education</i></p>	<p>5 Expanded Capacity Projects Projects which support the enrollment goals of the 2000 Master Plan by creating additional capacity at locations: (A) Where existing enrollment is in excess of instructional space capacity</p>	<p>84 – 92</p>		
	<p>Construction Phase Projects</p>		<p>92</p>	
	<p>Design Phase Projects</p>		<p>91</p>	
	<p>Pre-design Phase Projects</p>		<p>90</p>	
	<p>(B) Serving regions/programs of near-term projected enrollment demand in excess of existing capacity</p>		<p>Construction Phase Projects</p>	<p>89</p>
	<p>Design Phase Projects</p>		<p>88</p>	
<p>Pre-design Phase Projects</p>	<p>87</p>			
<p>(C) Where additional capacity will accommodate longer-term regional/program growth/demand needs</p>	<p>Construction Phase Projects</p>	<p>86</p>		
<p>Design Phase Projects</p>	<p>85</p>			
<p>Pre-design Phase Projects</p>	<p>84</p>			

**ATTACHMENT A
HECB CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION MODEL**

MASTER PLAN INITIATIVE	PROJECT TYPE	SCORE
<i>Support the Delivery of High-Demand Programs</i>	6 Program Specific Improvements	80-82
	Improvements (renovation or new construction) needed to house high demand vocational/degree programs	
	Construction Phase Projects	82
	Design Phase Projects	81
	Predesign Phase Projects	80
<i>Support Institutional Competitiveness</i>	7 General Improvements	76-78
	Improvements (renovation or new construction) or acquisitions needed to support "mission critical" space and infrastructure needs	
	Construction Phase Projects	78
	Design Phase Projects	77
	Predesign Phase Projects	76
<i>Prioritize Expenditures Within Recognized Fiscal Constraints</i>	8 Other Improvements	74
	Line-item projects which could be deferred one biennium without jeopardizing:	
	(A) The ability to operate or occupy campus systems and space	
	(B) Compliance with building accessibility and occupancy codes	
	(C) Program accreditation	
	(D) An acceptable level of program quality or facility operations	
(E) Near- or longer-term enrollment demand		

RESOLUTION NO. 01-33

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Board (HECB) is required by statute (RCW 28B.80.330(4)) to review, evaluate, and make recommendations on the operating and capital budget requests from four-year institutions and the community and technical college system; and

WHEREAS, These recommendations are to be based upon role and mission statements of the institutions; the state's higher education goals, objectives, and priorities; and a comprehensive master plan; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is also required by statute to distribute budget guidelines which outline the Board's fiscal priorities to the institutions by December of each odd-numbered year; and

WHEREAS, The Washington State Legislature has adopted (Senate Concurrent Resolution 8425) the Comprehensive Master Plan for Higher Education which, as submitted by the Board in January 2000, outlines goals, objectives, and priorities for higher education; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board reviewed the *Draft HECB Operating and Capital Budget Guidelines* for the 2003-2005 biennium at its meeting on July 25, 2001, and these draft guidelines have been distributed to the institutions for review and comment, similar to the process employed in the development of budget guidelines for the 2001-2003 biennium; and

WHEREAS, HECB staff has met with the four-year institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) staff to discuss the preliminary guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Revisions suggested by the institutions and the SBCTC staff have been incorporated into the final versions of the *2003-2005 HECB Operating and Capital Budget Guidelines for Public Colleges and Universities*;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the *2003-2005 Operating and Capital Budget Guidelines for Public Colleges and Universities*, attached hereto.

Adopted:

October 30, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Kristianne Blake, Secretary

Discussion of Fall 2001 Enrollments

October 2001

Enrollment numbers for fall 2001 have just been received from the Office of Financial Management (OFM).

The process of reporting these enrollment numbers for the baccalaureate institutions is as follows:

1. Institutions report tenth-day enrollment statistics to OFM approximately one week after that day. The University of Washington began classes on October 1 this year.
2. OFM converts the fall 2001 enrollment levels to projections of average annual enrollments based on historical rates of continuation through the year.
3. OFM reports average annual enrollments compared to the budgeted level in a document called the “Budget Driver Report”.

Enrollment at the community and technical colleges is reported later in the year and will not be included in OFM’s fall 2001 enrollment report. This is consistent with past practice.

It is important to distinguish between the various forms of enrollment data that are currently being discussed and presented in newspaper articles. In some cases, the numbers represent student headcount, while in some cases the numbers are student FTEs. However, the official reporting will be done by OFM in terms of projected average annual FTEs—which can then be compared to the enrollment targets contained in the appropriation bills and institution operating budgets.

Institutions have indicated to Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) staff and in various newspaper reports that fall 2001 enrollment is very strong at all levels. Freshman enrollments are up and are above target levels. Enrollment of transfer students is strong, and retention of continuing students is also strong.

The baccalaureate institutions exceed budgeted enrollment targets at every campus.

Comparison of FTE Enrollment For FY 2002
OFM Estimates of Average Annual FTEs versus Budget Level
Based on Fall 2001 Actual Enrollments

	<u>Budget Level FY 2001</u>		<u>Budget Level FY 2002</u>	<u>Increase 2001/2002</u>		<u>OFM Estimate FY 2002</u>	<u>Increase 2001/2002</u>		<u>FY 2002 Over-enroll (Under-enroll)</u>
UW	34,688		34,820	132		36,688	2,000		1,868
Seattle	32,266		32,321	55		33,862	1,596		1,541
Bothell	1,136		1,169	33		1,269	133		100
Tacoma	1,286		1,330	44		1,557	271		227
WSU	19,847		19,570	(277)		19,828	(19)		258
Pullman	17,609		17,332	(277)		17,471	(138)		139
Spokane	551		551	-		587	36		36
Tri-Cities	616		616	-		624	8		8
Vancouver	1,071		1,071	-		1,146	75		75
CWU	7,867		7,470	(397)		7,626	(241)		156
EWU	7,864		7,933	69		8,404	540		471
TESC	3,713		3,754	41		3,933	220		179
WWU	10,826		10,976	150		11,239	413		263
SBCTC	123,762		125,082	1,320		NA	NA		NA
HECB	50		-	(50)		-	(50)		-
Total	208,617		209,605	988		87,718	2,863		3,195
Subtotal, 4-year	84,855		84,523	(332)					

Minimum Admissions Standards: Update on HECB Admissions Policy for Alternative Admissions

October 2001

INTRODUCTION

State law requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to establish minimum requirements for admission to Washington's public baccalaureate institutions (RCW 28B.80.350). 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 college preparatory high school core-course requirements. The HECB adopted the current admissions policy in 1987; this policy was fully implemented for students entering fall term 1992.

Each of the six public baccalaureate institutions may use an alternative standard to admit up to 15 percent of freshmen students and up to 10 percent of graduate and professional students. In 1994, the HECB established separate alternative standards for freshmen applicants who are 25 years of age or older and meet standards appropriate for their age and personal experiences. Similar provisions exist for regular admission of first-time graduate students seeking initial entry with significant professional experience. Those provisions were adopted in March 1998.

In addition, there has been much written about the value of standardized tests as a criterion for making admissions decisions, and even University of Washington President McCormick has publicly questioned their value. Acknowledging these stated concerns, the Board amended the current standards in April 2001, to permit public baccalaureate institutions to waive the SAT or ACT examinations from entering freshman students on a case-by-case basis.

PURPOSE OF ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS

The 15 percent alternative admissions process was designed to help students who demonstrate an ability to succeed despite falling below current minimum standards.

Although students still have the best chance to enter a state college or university through the regular admissions process, the alternative admissions policy can help a small proportion of students (15 percent maximum) who may not have been able to access a public baccalaureate institution but who demonstrate an ability to succeed and a match with the institution.

FINDINGS FOR FALL 2001 ON 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS

- Each institution admitted some students through the 15 percent alternative admissions standards.
- Because the number of qualified applicants exceeded the number of spaces available, the institutions did not make full use of the candidate pool (**only 1,052 students of approximately 18,000 enrolled freshmen were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions**).

- Qualified students who met the HECB minimum admissions standards may not have met the higher standards established by the institution to which they had applied. These students may have been asked to submit additional information.
- At every institution, additional review decisions for all students went beyond test scores and grade point average and were based on other factors, such as type and level of courses selected, senior year performance, self-identified hardships, special circumstances, etc.
- Since the Board just approved the SAT or ACT examination waivers this past April, the number of students being admitted through waiver of SAT or ACT was small.
- Most SAT or ACT waivers went to entry-level adults or Running Start students who had earned an AA degree.
- Students generally learned about the SAT/ACT waivers primarily from admissions counselors at high schools, community colleges, and institutions or the college Web site.

CURRENT STATUS OF ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS

Undergraduate students who are currently admitted under the 15 percent alternative standards must satisfy the following requirements:

1. Submit a score on the SAT or ACT unless the receiving baccalaureate institution has granted a waiver;
2. Submit a transcript showing they achieved a 2.00 high school grade point average or a passing score on the General Educational Development (GED) Certificate test;
3. Complete high school course requirements as prescribed, with no more than three subject years waived; and
4. Present evidence of success outside the classroom and strong motivation to succeed in college.

FOLLOW-UP REPORT

The Board requested that HECB staff prepare a profile of the 15 percent alternative admissions process. Staff sent a questionnaire to the directors of admissions at each of the six public baccalaureate institutions (Attachments 1-6). The report is due to the Board at the end of each spring term, and the following information comes from the institutional questionnaire responses and interviews with the directors of admissions:

PROFILE OF 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS FOR 2001

- As **Table 1** shows, each institution admits some students through the 15 percent alternative admissions standards. However, institutions generally do not make full use of the 15 percent alternative admissions pool. Washington public baccalaureate institutions generally have far more qualified students who meet the minimum admissions standards than they can accommodate, making alternative admissions quite competitive.
- The more selective institutions make fewer offers through the alternative admissions process, as was the case with the University of Washington and Western Washington University.

Table 1: Alternative Admissions by Institution

Institution	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Percent of Entering Class</u>	<u>Percent Admitted Under AI Who Enroll</u>
CWU	151	12.0%	80%
EWU	248	9.6%	60-70%
TESC	160	12.0%	48%
UW	53	1.0%	68%
WSU	283	10.8%	66%
WWU	157	3.0%	N/A

- During the regular admissions review process, each institution identifies candidates for the 15 percent alternative admissions review. However, each institution uses different criteria to contact and select these students. For example, 15 percent candidates may go automatically into review status, may get an opportunity to petition, or may be asked to submit more information. With the exception of an automatic review, not all students choose to continue with the process, or (as indicated in **Table 1**) select to attend if offered.
- **All students who are below the HECB minimum standards with a 2.00 GPA or higher and not deficient in more than three core course units, will be given further institutional review** as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions.
- Upon entry, students admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions pool may be asked to satisfy certain conditions, such as enrolling in a remedial course or making up all high school deficiencies during the first year of college.

HECB vs. INSTITUTIONAL MINIMUM ADMISSIONS INDEX

- **Table 2** reflects that five institutions use an Admissions Index¹ (AI) that exceeds the HECB minimum standard. However, even with the higher AI, some qualified applicants still are denied so the school can manage enrollment levels. Whereas five of the institutions have standards that exceed the HECB minimum AI, Washington State University continues to use the HECB minimum standards in making offers on a first-come, first-served basis.

Table 2: HECB and Institutional Admissions Indexes

<u>Institution</u>	<u>HECB Admissions Index</u>	<u>Institutions' Admissions Index</u>
CWU	13	28
EWU	13	25
TESC	13	28
UW	28	70
WSU	28	28
WWU	13	65

¹ The Admissions Index is a mathematical formula used to predict student success (i.e., the probability of earning a C average during the freshman year). It combines a student's high school cumulative grade point average with his/her less heavily weighed ACT or SAT test score. A 28 predicts an 80 percent probability of success; a 13 predicts a 65 percent probability.

ADMISSIONS DECISIONS: LEVELS AND PROCESS

- **Table 3** illustrates the three initial levels of review that occur during the admissions process, (**automatic regular admissions, further review, and deny**). Students who are clearly admissible and high achievers are granted **automatic regular admissions**. Students who fall below a 2.00 grade point average (GPA) or who are deficient in more than three core course units are routinely **denied** admission in accordance with HECB guidelines.
- **Table 3** also shows that **EVERY** institution reviews its middle-range applications at two levels: 1) **HECB 15 percent** – students below the HECB minimum standards with a 2.00 GPA or higher and not deficient in more than three core course units; 2) **non-automatic regular admissions** – students who fall below the institution’s automatic admit index (**Table 2**). Criteria other than GPA and test scores may be used during the **further review** level. This procedure allows each institution to manage enrollments, to identify students who may be a good match with the institution, and to select students who seem to have the potential to succeed. For example, at Western and the University Washington, applicants who meet the minimum HECB index but who are below the high achievement index set for automatic admit (65-75) must submit more information (e.g., an essay). Offers to students who apply within this band are based on the type and level of courses selected by the student, senior-year choices and performance, self-identified hardships, special circumstances, etc.

Table 3: Levels of Admissions Decisions

<u>Automatic Regular Admit</u>	<u>Further Review</u>	<u>Deny</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High achieving students • Exceed the HECB minimum index • Meet or exceed the institution’s high achievement index 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 1: <u>Non-automatic regular admissions:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Does not meet institution’s high achievement index ✓ Meets HECB index ✓ Meets HECB criteria • Level 2: <u>HECB 15%:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Below HECB and institution index ✓ Above a 2.00 cumulative GPA ✓ Deficient in three or fewer core course high school units (years) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Below a cumulative 2.00 GPA • Deficient in more than three core course high school units (years)

DEFICIENCY BREAKDOWN (INCLUDING SAT/ACT WAIVERS)

- Overall, students from the entering class of 2000, admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions review process, generally were either one core course unit short of satisfying the core requirement, or they were below the minimum HECB admissions index of 28 (UW, WSU) or 13 (CWU, EWU, TESC, WWU) (see **Table 4**).

- As adopted in April 2001, the Board amended the current alternative admissions standards to permit public baccalaureate institutions to waive the SAT or ACT examinations on a case-by-case basis. **Table 4** reflects that the number of students being admitted through waiver of SAT or ACT remains small. This past year, SAT and ACT waivers generally went to entry-level adults or Running Start students who had earned an AA degree.
- Overall, students learned about the SAT/ACT waivers primarily from counselors (high school, community college, and institution admissions counselors). Some students found the information from the institution’s Web site or college catalog.
- Although demographic information is collected on all applicants, it is not reported on each individual student. This makes it impossible for us to determine, for example, whether the Admissions Index is an important point of access for disadvantaged minority students.
- With regard to offers and acceptance rates, there is no uniform collection methodology. However, 40-75 percent of alternative admissions candidates receive an offer of admission, and anywhere between 50-80 percent accept their offers (see **Table 4**).
- Very few students who fail to satisfy more than one requirement are admitted through alternative admissions because their likelihood of success has been proven to be very low.

Table 4: Academic deficiencies of students admitted under alternative admissions

Institution	Deficiencies in core courses	Failed to meet minimum GPA/test score index	No ACT/SAT	Failed to satisfy more than one of the minimum criteria
CWU (n=151)	• 1 year: 76% • 2 years: 19% • 3 years: 5%	50%	0	15%
EWU² (n=248)	No data	42% (approx)	1%	No data
TESC (n=96)	• 1 year: 17% • 2 years: 4% • 3 years: 3%	30%	19% ³	3%
UW (n=53)	• 1 year: 62% • 2 years: 13% • 3 years: 4%	28%	2% ⁴	8%
WSU (n=452)	• 1 year: 52% • 2 years: 8% • 3 years: 1%	87%	<1%	66%
WWU (n=157)	• 1 year: 71% • 2 years: 4% • 3 years: < 1%	6%	20%	2%

² EWU has not collected this information on applicants.

³ The majority of these students were adults over the age of 25.

⁴ This was one Running Start student with 90 credits.

Attachments:

- **Attachment 1: Central Washington University**
- **Attachment 2: Eastern Washington University**
- **Attachment 3: The Evergreen State College**
- **Attachment 4: University of Washington**
- **Attachment 5: Washington State University**
- **Attachment 6: Western Washington University**

Attachment 1: Central Washington University**QUESTIONNAIRE TO ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS AND REGISTRARS
WITH REGARD TO
THE 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS PROCESS**

The 15 percent alternative admissions process was intended to assist students who may demonstrate an ability to succeed despite falling below current minimum standards. Although students still have the best chance to enter a state college or university through the regular admissions process, the alternative admissions policy can assist a small proportion of students (15 percent maximum). Alternative admissions are directed at students who may fall below the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) minimum admissions index, failed to complete the specified college preparatory curriculum, or in special cases, failed to take the SAT or ACT entrance examination. The Board had requested that HECB staff prepare for them a profile of the 15 percent admissions process as they continue to consider the issues of access and persistence. Your responses to the following questions will give the Board a clearer idea with regard to the 15 percent alternative admissions process. Please respond to these questions and return your answers to me by September 20th. Thanks for taking the time to respond!

Number of Students

1. How many of your entering freshman students were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process for fall quarter/semester 2001? *151*
2. What percent of your entering class was admitted as part of the HECB 15 percent alternative admissions? *12%*
 - If that percent is less than 15 percent, why weren't additional students admitted through this process?
We did not feel the students were prepared to succeed at CWU.
 - If that percent is 15 percent, how many students who met the minimum standards were denied an offer of admission in order to accommodate more students through the alternative admissions process?

Academic Preparation of Students

3. How many of these students:
 - Did not satisfy 1 year of core? *115* ; 2 years of core? *28* ; 3 years of core? *8*
 - Did not meet the minimum index of GPA/Test Scores? *76*
 - Did not take the SAT or ACT? *0*
 - Did not satisfy more than one of the minimum criteria? *23*

Admissions Process

4. How were those students notified about participating in the review process?
Students are sent the Supplemental Information form once their transcripts and test scores were received.
5. What additional materials were these students asked to submit?
Essay, responses to questions, option of sending in letters of recommendation.
6. What type of selection criteria was used to distinguish among the students applying as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process?
Quality of response, self-awareness, alternative plans, grades in Core subject areas, admissions index, rising or falling performance, etc.
7. What additional conditions generally accompanied these offers of admission?
Additional conditions could include mandatory meetings with academic advising or academic skills staff, restrictions from certain courses, or limitations on the number of courses they may take.

Acceptance Rates

8. What percent of the students reviewed under the 15 percent alternative admissions process:
 - Were offered admissions through the alternative review? 42%
 - Accept the offer? 80%
 - Are denied admissions? 58%
 - Do you collect demographic information with regard to students admitted under the 15 percent alternative admissions, and if so, what type?
No.

Institutional Index vs. HECB Index

9. Was there difference between the HECB minimum admissions index and the institutional minimum index and what was that institutional admissions index?
Automatic admissions requires a 28 AI.
10. Were students who were denied admissions for not meeting the institutional minimum standards reviewed under any type of alternative admissions process?
Students with AIs between 13-27 are reviewed by individual admissions counselors. Those who are not admitted are sent to the Admissions Review Committee.
11. Was that review process similar to students applying under the 15% alternative admissions review process?
No. They go directly to the Admissions Review Committee.

SAT/ACT Waivers

12. Did evaluation of students receiving the SAT/ACT waiver differ from other students being admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process?

The SAT or ACT requirement was not waived for any students.

13. How did these students learn about the SAT/ACT waiver process?

Again, no waivers were given.

Name of individual responding: Michael Reilly

Position: Director of Admissions

Name of institution: Central Washington University

Attachment 2: Eastern Washington University**QUESTIONNAIRE TO ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS AND REGISTRARS
WITH REGARD TO
THE 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS PROCESS**

The 15 percent alternative admissions process was intended to assist students who may demonstrate an ability to succeed despite falling below current minimum standards. Although students still have the best chance to enter a state college or university through the regular admissions process, the alternative admissions policy can assist a small proportion of students (15 percent maximum). Alternative admissions are directed at students who may fall below the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) minimum admissions index, failed to complete the specified college preparatory curriculum, or in special cases, failed to take the SAT or ACT entrance examination. The Board had requested that HECB staff prepare for them a profile of the 15 percent admissions process as they continue to consider the issues of access and persistence. Your responses to the following questions will give the Board a clearer idea with regard to the 15 percent alternative admissions process. Please respond to these questions and return your answers to me by September 20th. Thanks for taking the time to respond!

Number of Students

1. How many of your entering freshman students were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process for fall quarter/semester 2001? **248 as of 9/7/01**
2. What percent of your entering class was admitted as part of the HECB 15 percent alternative admissions? **9.6% as of 9/7/01**
 - If that percent is less than 15 percent, why weren't additional students admitted through this process? **Several issues would apply- space, the goal of having higher achieving students, and the fact that the student may not have provided the additional information we ask for- i.e. letters of recommendation and a personal statement. With the special review process, our review committee looks for the students potential to be successful here on the EWU campus. If what we have doesn't reflect this potential, we make other recommendations.**
 - If that percent is 15 percent, how many students who met the minimum standards were denied an offer of admission in order to accommodate more students through the alternative admissions process?

Academic Preparation of Students

3. How many of these students:- **we do not collect the data in this exact format. Our admit codes reflect a student being core deficient, below a 2.5, and admitted to our Focus program- which could be core or below the index. If this report will become an annual report, we can change our database process.**
 - Did not satisfy 1 year of core? _____; 2 years of core? _____; 3 years of core? _____
 - Did not meet the minimum index of GPA/Test Scores? **__apx. 105**
 - Did not take the SAT or ACT? **__3__**
 - Did not satisfy more than one of the minimum criteria? _____

Admissions Process

4. How were those students notified about participating in the review process? **We outline the process in our application packet. Students who receive a letter that states they do not currently meet our admission requirements have the process explained to them again. At times, we will also phone a student to encourage them to send additional information.**
5. What additional materials were these students asked to submit? **We prefer two letters of recommendation and a personal statement. In this statement we like to hear from the student about what may have affected their progress in high school, what their goals are and anything else they would like to share with us that would help us make an informed decision- i.e. their motivation, what they would do differently here at EWU, multicultural experiences and school and community activities.**
6. What type of selection criteria was used to distinguish among the students applying as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process? **We again try to determine their ability to succeed here at EWU. We want to see and hear if we interview them, what they will do differently here at EWU compared to high school, what motivates them, what others think of their ability, and so forth. We also make certain we have capacity in special academic programs that will assist in their transition to EWU.**
7. What additional conditions generally accompanied these offers of admission? **One condition for students below the minimum index is participating in the Academic Support program that offers tutoring and study skills. At times, we have required a summer course or a Running Start course while still in high school. It really depends on the student. Most recently, I requested that a student we decided to admit go back and speak to his high school freshmen about the importance of working hard while in high school- because it does make a difference. He thought that was a great idea because the “kids” don’t want to always listen to their parents and/or teachers, but he felt from another student would be a great idea!**

Acceptance Rates

8. What percent of the students reviewed under the 15 percent alternative admissions process:
 - Were offered admissions through the alternative review? **I would estimate 40-50%- however, this is not tracked.**
 - Accept the offer? **___Based on our enrolled percentage of specials last year, approximately 60-70% accept the offer.**
 - Are denied admissions? **___I would estimate 50-60 % are denied admission.**
 - Do you collect demographic information with regard to students admitted under the 15 percent alternative admissions, and if so, what type? **All students have demographic information on them, however, we do not have a report that lists all the demographic information on each student.**

Institutional Index vs. HECB Index

9. Was there difference between the HECB minimum admissions index and the institutional minimum index and what was that institutional admissions index?
Yes, our HECB minimum is a 13 and our institutional automatic admit index is a 25.
10. Were students who were denied admissions for not meeting the institutional minimum standards reviewed under any type of alternative admissions process?
Yes, they were also sent to our special review committee.
11. Was that review process similar to students applying under the 15% alternative admissions review process? **Yes- the very same.**

SAT/ACT Waivers

12. Did evaluation of students receiving the SAT/ACT waiver differ from other students being admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process? **This year we really did not receive a large demand for this waiver. It seemed to only be on the students under the alternative admission process.**
13. How did these students learn about the SAT/ACT waiver process? **These students seemed to have learned about the process from their counselors.**

Name of individual responding: Michelle Whittingham,

Position: Director of Admissions

Name of institution: Eastern Washington University

Attachment 3: The Evergreen State College**QUESTIONNAIRE TO ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS AND REGISTRARS
WITH REGARD TO
THE 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS PROCESS**

The 15 percent alternative admissions process was intended to assist students who may demonstrate an ability to succeed despite falling below current minimum standards. Although students still have the best chance to enter a state college or university through the regular admissions process, the alternative admissions policy can assist a small proportion of students (15 percent maximum). Alternative admissions are directed at students who may fall below the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) minimum admissions index, failed to complete the specified college preparatory curriculum, or in special cases, failed to take the SAT or ACT entrance examination. The Board had requested that HECB staff prepare for them a profile of the 15 percent admissions process as they continue to consider the issues of access and persistence. Your responses to the following questions will give the Board a clearer idea with regard to the 15 percent alternative admissions process. Please respond to these questions and return your answers to me by September 20th. Thanks for taking the time to respond!

Number of Students

1. How many of your entering freshman students were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process for fall quarter/semester 2001?

160 freshmen were admitted as part of the alternative admission process at Evergreen.

2. What percent of your entering class was admitted as part of the HECB 15 percent alternative admissions?

12% of the entering class of freshmen were admitted as part of the HECB 15% alternative admission.

- If that percent is less than 15 percent, why weren't additional students admitted through this process?

Evergreen did not need to use up to the 15% allowed because most of the entering freshmen class met the standard admission criteria.

- If that percent is 15 percent, how many students who met the minimum standards were denied an offer of admission in order to accommodate more students through the alternative admissions process?

Academic Preparation of Students

3. How many of these students:
- Did not satisfy 1 year of core? 16; 2 years of core? 3; 3 years of core? 2
 - Did not meet the minimum index of GPA/Test Scores? 48
 - Did not take the SAT or ACT? 30
 - Did not satisfy more than one of the minimum criteria? 4

Admissions Process

4. How were those students notified about participating in the review process?
Most students were not aware of the review process because we automatically considered students for admission through our professional judgment process if the student failed the GPA/test score index.

Students who were core deficient were contacted and asked to either (a) show evidence that they planned to take additional course work (prior to September 1, 2001) to address the deficiency; or (b) provide an explanation for not meeting the course requirements. Professional judgment decisions to waive the requirements depended upon the student to provide information regarding a documented learning disability or provide information that the high school did not offer appropriate course work.

Students were contacted and asked to provide a written response in lieu of SAT/ACT test scores. Students who are allowed to waive the test scores are those who are 25 years of age or older.

5. What additional materials were these students asked to submit?
The additional materials sent to students were generally a personal letter with a response form. The student was required to complete and return the response form.
6. What type of selection criteria was used to distinguish among the students applying as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process?
The selection criterion includes course distribution, GPA, test scores, age, and GED completion. "Application type" is also considered – for example, high school-direct, high school graduate-lagged, college/university transfer student with fewer than 40 credits already earned, GED applicant, and home-schooled applicant.
7. What additional conditions generally accompanied these offers of admission?
For students who are "conditionally" admitted, we ask that they register in a program of study designed for first-year students. We also require the student to earn the full credit load and receive a good evaluation (showing academic progress) from the faculty. Finally, we may require the student to seek assistance from the Learning Resource Center for writing and quantitative reasoning.

Acceptance Rates

8. What percent of the students reviewed under the 15 percent alternative admissions process:

- Were offered admissions through the alternative review? 75%
- Accept the offer? 48%
- Are denied admissions? 25%
- Do you collect demographic information with regard to students admitted under the 15 percent alternative admissions, and if so, what type?
Demographic information is collected on all students: gender, age, race/ethnicity, high school, community college/university, parent information (when provided by the applicant), directory information, etc.

Institutional Index vs. HECB Index

9. Was there difference between the HECB minimum admissions index and the institutional minimum index and what was that institutional admissions index?

No, there was no difference between the HECB minimum index and the institutional index.

10. Were students who were denied admissions for not meeting the institutional minimum standards reviewed under any type of alternative admissions process?

Students are not denied without being considered under alternative admission processes. The student's application is scrutinized by the Admissions Committee for professional judgment review prior to a "deny" decision. However, if the "deny" decision is made and the student would like to appeal this decision, by providing additional information, the request for review must be in writing from the student. The Director of Admissions initiates the review and the Admissions Committee is consulted.

11. Was that review process similar to students applying under the 15% alternative admissions review process?

Yes, the review process is very similar (if not identical) to the 15% alternative admission review process.

SAT/ACT Waivers

12. Did evaluation of students receiving the SAT/ACT waiver differ from other students being admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process?

Yes, the process of professional judgment review for students requesting a test score waiver is little different than the 15% alternative admission process. Students requesting a test score waiver must be 25 years of age or older, and they must provide a written response to an essay statement. We also ask for a personal/professional resumé. The Admissions Committee considers these additional materials in professional judgment review.

13. How did these students learn about the SAT/ACT waiver process?

Students may learn about the test score waiver by contacting the Office of Admissions – as directed by the academic catalog and web site – for additional information. Students may also learn of this alternative because we present it to them when we conduct an initial review of their application for admission.

Name of individual responding: **Diane H. Kahaumia**

Position: **Special Assistant, Enrollment Management**

Name of institution: **The Evergreen State College**

Attachment 4: University of Washington**QUESTIONNAIRE TO ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS AND REGISTRARS
WITH REGARD TO
THE 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS PROCESS**

The 15 percent alternative admissions process was intended to assist students who may demonstrate an ability to succeed despite falling below current minimum standards. Although students still have the best chance to enter a state college or university through the regular admissions process, the alternative admissions policy can assist a small proportion of students (15 percent maximum). Alternative admissions are directed at students who may fall below the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) minimum admissions index, failed to complete the specified college preparatory curriculum, or in special cases, failed to take the SAT or ACT entrance examination. The Board had requested that HECB staff prepare for them a profile of the 15 percent admissions process as they continue to consider the issues of access and persistence. Your responses to the following questions will give the Board a clearer idea with regard to the 15 percent alternative admissions process. Please respond to these questions and return your answers to me by September 20th. Thanks for taking the time to respond!

Number of Students

1. How many of your entering freshman students were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process for fall quarter/semester 2001? **53 students**
2. What percent of your entering class was admitted as part of the HECB 15 percent alternative admissions? **1 %**
 - If that percent is less than 15 percent, why weren't additional students admitted through this process?
The UW does not have space for all applicants who meet the minimum qualifications. Some applicants meeting minimum qualifications must be denied admission in order to manage enrollment levels.
 - If that percent is 15 percent, how many students who met the minimum standards were denied an offer of admission in order to accommodate more students through the alternative admissions process? **(N/A)**

Academic Preparation of Students

3. How many of these students:
 - Did not satisfy 1 year of core? **33** ; 2 years of core? **7** ; 3 years of core? **2**
 - Did not meet the minimum index of GPA/Test Scores? **15**
 - Did not take the SAT or ACT? **1 (Running Start Student w/90 credits)**
 - Did not satisfy more than one of the minimum criteria? **4**

Admissions Process

4. How were those students notified about participating in the review process?
Information about the petition process is included in the Freshman Information Packet along with the admission application form.
5. What additional materials were these students asked to submit?
A written request for special consideration.
6. What type of selection criteria was used to distinguish among the students applying as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process?
Petitions are reviewed on an individual basis.
7. What additional conditions generally accompanied these offers of admission?
Students admitted with deficiencies must complete qualifying course work to make up those deficiencies within their first year of enrollment at the UW.

Acceptance Rates

8. What percent of the students reviewed under the 15 percent alternative admissions process:
 - Were offered admissions through the alternative review? *There is no separate review process for students falling within the 15%. All petitioning students are reviewed individually and, therefore, no specific data on this group are available.*
 - Accept the offer? **68%**
 - Are denied admissions? *Data not available.*
 - Do you collect demographic information with regard to students admitted under the 15 percent alternative admissions, and if so, what type? **No.**

Institutional Index vs. HECB Index

9. Was there difference between the HECB minimum admissions index and the institutional minimum index and what was that institutional admissions index?
Yes. The minimum AI for admission based on grades and test scores was 70.
10. Were students who were denied admissions for not meeting the institutional minimum standards reviewed under any type of alternative admissions process?
Applicants with AI 28 – 69 were reviewed through a comprehensive freshman admission review process.
11. Was that review process similar to students applying under the 15% alternative admissions review process?
Yes.

SAT/ACT Waivers

12. Did evaluation of students receiving the SAT/ACT waiver differ from other students being admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process? *This policy change occurred after admission processing had been completed for autumn 2001. Evaluation of students without scores will, of course, be different from those with scores.*
13. How did these students learn about the SAT/ACT waiver process? *No one petitioned to be considered without scores.*

Name of individual responding: *WWW (Tim) Washburn*

Position: *Executive Director of Admissions & Records*

Name of institution: *University of Washington*

Attachment 5: Washington State University**QUESTIONNAIRE TO ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS AND REGISTRARS
WITH REGARD TO
THE 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS PROCESS**

The 15 percent alternative admissions process was intended to assist students who may demonstrate an ability to succeed despite falling below current minimum standards. Although students still have the best chance to enter a state college or university through the regular admissions process, the alternative admissions policy can assist a small proportion of students (15 percent maximum). Alternative admissions are directed at students who may fall below the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) minimum admissions index, failed to complete the specified college preparatory curriculum, or in special cases, failed to take the SAT or ACT entrance examination. The Board had requested that HECB staff prepare for them a profile of the 15 percent admissions process as they continue to consider the issues of access and persistence. Your responses to the following questions will give the Board a clearer idea with regard to the 15 percent alternative admissions process. Please respond to these questions and return your answers to me by September 20th. Thanks for taking the time to respond!

Number of Students

1. How many of your entering freshman students were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process for fall quarter/semester 2001?

452 were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process for fall semester 2001 at Washington State University.

2. What percent of your entering class was admitted as part of the HECB 15 percent alternative admissions?

15.6% of the students qualified to registered were admitted under the alternative admission criteria. However of those students offered admission (452), 283, which represents 10.8% of the incoming freshman class actually enrolled.

- If that percent is less than 15 percent, why weren't additional students admitted through this process?

All students who we believed had a reasonable chance for success in their college studies at Washington State University were admitted under the alternative admissions process.

Since Washington State University's enrollment is at contact for the fall semester 2001, and students admitted under the alternative admissions process often require additional learning assistance, the institution's already scarce resources would have been needed to provide this assistance.

- If that percent is 15 percent, how many students who met the minimum standards were denied an offer of admission in order to accommodate more students through the alternative admissions process?

Not applicable

Academic Preparation of Students

3. How many of these students:

- Did not satisfy 1 year of core? _235_; 2 years of core? 34_; 3 years of core? _3_____
- Did not meet the minimum index of GPA/Test Scores? 391_____
- Did not take the SAT or ACT? _____4__
- Did not satisfy more than one of the minimum criteria? __297_____

Admissions Process

4. How were those students notified about participating in the review process?

Students reviewed for alternative admissions, whose index is 28 and above, were evaluated only by admissions staff and were not made aware, other than being notified of core deficiencies in their admission letter, that they would be admitted through alternative admissions.

Students with 20 to 27 AINs were reviewed by admissions officers and in some cases asked to provide additional personal information, letters of recommendation, etc. if the supporting documentation initially submitted was not definitive or substantial enough on which to reach an admission decision.

Those who were denied admission but whose gpa was at least 2.00 and had no more than 3 core deficiencies, were permitted to appeal to the Faculty Admissions Subcommittee. The Faculty Admissions Subcommittee interviews each student appeal and either upholds the denial of admission or extends an offer of admission following the interview.

5. What additional materials were these students asked to submit?

Students who were asked for additional personal information (referred to as a narrative) were asked to respond to four questions:

- a) **Your high school academic performance is below our minimum standard. Please explain the circumstances which affected your performance.**
- b) **We are interested in your success. Here at WSU, you will be in a classroom with freshman students whose average incoming grade point average (GPA) is 3.4. Given your previous academic performance, how do you plan to be competitive with other students and achieve academic success?**
- c) **If your appeal for admission is denied at this time, what alternative plans have you made for continuing your education?**
- d) **WSU requires completion of the high school core requirements. List all courses you have taken toward completing each subject requirement. Indicate the classes you are taking your senior year with an asterisk (*). Refer to the enclosed sheet for subjects and acceptable/non-acceptable courses. If you are not completing these requirements, please indicate the reasons and how you plan to make up this deficiency.**

We also ask students to obtain and submit letters of recommendation from their high school counselors and others who could address their ability and interest in higher education.

6. What type of selection criteria was used to distinguish among the students applying as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process?

A review of the high school GPA, completion of the high school core, test scores (SAT or ACT), their responses to the narrative questions if asked to answer those questions, the letters of recommendation

7. What additional conditions generally accompanied these offers of admission?

That core requirements be completed either before graduating from high school or through community college, correspondence study, or distance education opportunities. Foreign language can be completed within the first 60 credits at WSU.

Acceptance Rates

8. What percent of the students reviewed under the 15 percent alternative admissions process:

- Were offered admissions through the alternative review? **_16.3%_**
- Accept the offer? **_15.6%***

***Admission offer acceptance is indicated by the submission of a deposit. However of those students offered admission (452), 283, which represents 10.8% of the incoming freshman class actually enrolled.**

- Are denied admissions? **_26.6%_**
- Do you collect demographic information with regard to students admitted under the 15 percent alternative admissions, and if so, what type?
We do not collect any data other than information routinely collected about all incoming students.

Institutional Index vs. HECB Index

9. Was there difference between the HECB minimum admissions index and the institutional minimum index and what was that institutional admissions index?

The minimum index observed by Washington State University for direct admission is an AIN of 28.

10. Were students who were denied admissions for not meeting the institutional minimum standards reviewed under any type of alternative admissions process?

Yes, these were reviewed under the alternative admissions process if their gpa was above 2.00. If denied an admission offer, the student could request an appeal with the Faculty Subcommittee.

11. Was that review process similar to students applying under the 15% alternative admissions review process? **Yes.**

SAT/ACT Waivers

12. Did evaluation of students receiving the SAT/ACT waiver differ from other students being admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process? **No.**

13. How did these students learn about the SAT/ACT waiver process?
Primarily from high school counselors and friends.

Name of individual responding: _____Janet V. Danley, Ed.D._____

Position: _____Associate Director, Admissions_____

Name of institution: _____Washington State University_____

Attachment 6: Western Washington University

**QUESTIONNAIRE TO ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS AND REGISTRARS
WITH REGARD TO
THE 15 PERCENT ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS PROCESS**

The 15 percent alternative admissions process was intended to assist students who may demonstrate an ability to succeed despite falling below current minimum standards. Although students still have the best chance to enter a state college or university through the regular admissions process, the alternative admissions policy can assist a small proportion of students (15 percent maximum). Alternative admissions are directed at students who may fall below the Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) minimum admissions index, failed to complete the specified college preparatory curriculum, or in special cases, failed to take the SAT or ACT entrance examination. The Board had requested that HECB staff prepare for them a profile of the 15 percent admissions process as they continue to consider the issues of access and persistence. Your responses to the following questions will give the Board a clearer idea with regard to the 15 percent alternative admissions process. Please respond to these questions and return your answers to me by September 20th. Thanks for taking the time to respond!

Number of Students

1. How many of your entering freshman students were admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process for fall quarter/semester 2001? **157**
2. What percent of your entering class was admitted as part of the HECB 15 percent alternative admissions? **2.96 %**
 - If that percent is less than 15 percent, why weren't additional students admitted through this process?
None met both the minimum requirements for admissions and the criteria to be successful at WWU.
 - If that percent is 15 percent, how many students who met the minimum standards were denied an offer of admission in order to accommodate more students through the alternative admissions process? **NA**

Academic Preparation of Students

3. How many of these students:
 - Did not satisfy 1 year of core? 112; 2 years of core? 7; 3 years of core? 1
 - Did not meet the minimum index of GPA/Test Scores? 9
 - Did not take the SAT or ACT? 32
 - Did not satisfy more than one of the minimum criteria? 3

Admissions Process

4. How were those students notified about participating in the review process?
All applicants receive the same review process and are notified of the process in WWU publications, presentations, and on our web site. Western reviews the whole student—academic achievement is the most significant factor; level and difficulty of courses, grade trends, school and community activities, special talents, multicultural experiences, and personal circumstances are additionally considered.
5. What additional materials were these students asked to submit? **NA**
6. What type of selection criteria was used to distinguish among the students applying as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process? **NA**
7. What additional conditions generally accompanied these offers of admission? **A small number of applicants who do not meet core are required to complete additional coursework before entering.**

Acceptance Rates

8. What percent of the students reviewed under the 15 percent alternative admissions process: **See #4 above, all applicants receive the same review process.**
 - Were offered admissions through the alternative review? NA
 - Accept the offer? NA
 - Are denied admissions? NA
 - Do you collect demographic information with regard to students admitted under the 15 percent alternative admissions, and if so, what type? **The same demographic information is collected on all applicants.**

Institutional Index vs. HECB Index

9. Was there difference between the HECB minimum admissions index and the institutional minimum index and what was that institutional admissions index? **No**
10. Were students who were denied admissions for not meeting the institutional minimum standards reviewed under any type of alternative admissions process?
No, see #s 5 and 6 above
11. Was that review process similar to students applying under the 15% alternative admissions review process? **NA**

SAT/ACT Waivers

12. Did evaluation of students receiving the SAT/ACT waiver differ from other students being admitted as part of the 15 percent alternative admissions process? **No**

13. How did these students learn about the SAT/ACT waiver process?

High school counselors, community college counselors, and WWU Admissions counselors

Name of individual responding: Karen McMains

Position: Senior Assistant Director of Admissions

Name of institution: Western Washington University

Accreditation and Quality Improvement Challenges and Opportunities

October 2001

The Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges is one of six similar regional associations in the United States that accredit schools and colleges. The Northwest region includes Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. The bylaws of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges assign to the Commission on Colleges the responsibility for evaluating and accrediting post-secondary institutions.

Commission on Colleges Executive Director Sandra Elman will lead the presentation on accreditation, including what it means, how it works, and how it complements the HECB's responsibility for degree authorization in the state of Washington. Dr. Elman's presentation will focus on answers to some of the following frequently asked questions.

- How does accreditation emphasize outcomes assessment?
- How does accreditation review include emerging higher education issues?
- How does accreditation review handle distance education?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of accrediting associations in student transfer?
- What is the relationship between state accountability measures and accreditation?
- What is the Council on Regional Accreditation Commission?
- Why do regional accrediting associations not accredit branches of established institutions (like Antioch in Seattle)?
- What policies and practices have the regional accrediting associations established for accrediting "consortium-awarded" degree programs?
- What challenges and opportunities does NWASC face?

Dr. Barbara Smith, former provost for The Evergreen State College, will talk about accreditation from the institutions' perspective.

Higher Education Accountability Plans

October 2001

BACKGROUND

The six public baccalaureate institutions have submitted their 2001-2003 accountability plans to the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). The Board must review these plans and set biennial performance targets for each institution.

The institutions will not submit reports on their 2000-2001 performance on the accountability measures until November 2001. Therefore, the Board will not be considering new information on institutional performance at this time.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND DEADLINES

The operating budget for the 2001-2003 biennium (*Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6153, Section 601*) called for the institutions to develop accountability plans under the Board's direction.

Each institution receiving appropriations under sections 604 through 609 of this act shall submit a biennial plan to achieve measurable and specific improvement each academic year as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of the following long-term performance goals. The plans, to be prepared at the direction of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, shall be submitted by August 15, 2001. The Higher Education Coordinating Board shall set biennial performance targets for each institution and shall review actual achievements annually. Institutions shall track their actual performance on the statewide measures as well as faculty productivity, the goals and targets for which may be unique to each institution.

Because of the late passage of the budget, agency staff requested that the institutions be granted an extension of the deadline for the submission of plans to October 10. This request was granted. At its September meeting, the Board approved guidelines for the preparation of the accountability plans. The institutions were asked to develop their plans in accordance with these guidelines.

ACTION REQUIRED

The Board must set performance targets for the institutions for the 2001-2003 biennium. The Board must report to the Legislature on the plans and institutional performance in November 2003.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board set targets for the 2001-2003 biennium at the levels proposed in the institutions' performance accountability plans.

THE BOARD'S NOVEMBER 2000 PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

The Board's November 2000 Performance Accountability report acknowledged that there are significant flaws in some of the measures of institutional performance required by the Legislature. Despite these flaws, it recommended continuation of the statewide measures and several other actions. The table below summarizes the Board's recommendations for 2001-2003 and the impact of those recommendations.

Recommendation	Recommendation accepted?
Continue the statewide measures	Yes
No budget penalties for failure to meet targets	Yes
Priority in 2001-2003 Fund for Innovation projects for accountability and assessment efforts	No
Continuation and refinement of institution-specific goals and performance measures	Yes; some institutions report refinement of institution-specific measures
The Legislature should reevaluate its performance goals for the statewide measures	No

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF PLAN TARGETS

Assessment

In almost every case the institutions' 2001-2003 targets exceed 1996-1999 baseline performance. All of these targets would, if achieved, represent "meaningful and substantial progress toward the achievement of long-term performance goals."

The exceptions are reasonable. For example,

- The Evergreen State College's (TESC) transfer Graduation Efficiency Index (GEI) is already 6 to 12 percentage points higher than those of the other institutions. It has met the Legislature's long-term goals and there is little room for improvement on this measure.
- Western Washington University (WWU) probably cannot improve on its five-year *graduation* rates in this biennium because it has (due to declining selectivity and some of the consequences of enrollment increases) suffered declines in freshman *retention* the past few years.
- Central Washington University (CWU) is concerned that faculty participation rates in formal mentoring programs has been declining but sees this as a function of unexpected enrollment shortfalls that limited resources for formal programs. Further, the institution believes that *actual* mentoring has not declined at all, and will seek to develop a more refined "mentorship" measure.
- Western Washington University (WWU) projects a small increase in retention, but indicates that its research suggests that it cannot do much better than an 85 percent retention rate. This is a ceiling set by the rates at which students leave the university for desirable reasons or due to poor grades.
- The University of Washington (UW) and Washington State University (WSU) report that they have already exceeded long-term targets for performance on some institution-specific measures. They will sustain and expand their efforts in these areas.

In some cases institutions have set aggressive targets they are not confident they can meet in the coming biennium. They see aggressive targeting as consistent with the pursuit of the long-term goals set by the Legislature and the demand for continued efforts at improvement. For example,

- TESC notes the apparent stability of freshman GEI but, "in the spirit of developing more experience with this measure" and in view of the Legislature's long-term performance goals, it set high interim targets for GEI. TESC set aggressive retention targets that it knows it will not be able to attain, but finds that "striving for them is the clearest path we can see to achieving the long-term five-year graduation rate goal."
- WWU is actively engaged in efforts to improve freshman retention and it has set aggressive targets for this biennium, although the reforms that it implements are unlikely to have significant effects until 2003-2005.

- CWU set a graduation rate target of 5.6 percentage points in the coming biennium, though it is uncertain that it can sustain the significant improvements on this measure that it has seen in recent years.
- EWU set particularly ambitious targets for increased graduation rates, based in part on a strong undergraduate retention record.

Cautionary Notes

As the HECB noted in its last report, the highly aggregated performance measures are substantially outside the control of the institutions. *Some of these institutions have 15 years of data on retention, graduation rates, and the GEI. They have found that common to each measure is a pattern of small and apparently random fluctuation around a stable, long-run core.* In light of all of the factors affecting institutional performance on these measures and the long-term stability of institutional performance, projecting improvement over the 1996-99 baseline is, in some cases, problematic.

Conclusions

The institutions' many efforts to improve performance on the measures (e.g., improved advising, streamlined course enrollment practices, better freshman and transfer orientation efforts, better transfer articulation) will almost certainly enhance the experiences of undergraduate students at Washington's public baccalaureates. With this, the institutions will increase the effectiveness of their use of public resources. This will be the case even though the institutions' measured performance varies from year-to-year in ways that are beyond their control. Some benefits of the accountability process may not be easily measurable despite continuing (and justified) efforts to quantify results.

Is institutional performance on the statewide measures improving? The answer will depend on the baseline we choose. Some institutions report long-term improvements on some of the accountability measures, and this may indicate that the accountability planning process has had some beneficial consequences. If we take the four measures (GEI for freshman and transfers, undergraduate retention, and graduation rates) at six institutions, we have 24 total measures. If we compare the 1995-98 baseline to average performance in 1998-00, performance on 13 of the 24 measures went up, nine went down, and two were unchanged. (The University of Washington and The Evergreen State College showed improvement on each of the four measures in this comparison; the rest of the institutions showed mixed results.) This mixed pattern should not be very surprising given the nature of the accountability measures.

Several plans mention the importance that learning outcomes assessment efforts are playing in the institutions' thinking about accountability. TESC notes the impact of re-accreditation demands on its approach to specifying and measuring student learning outcomes. Several institutions see their participation in the inter-institutional assessment teams on quantitative reasoning, writing, information technology, and critical thinking as part of the larger effort to measure and improve institutional performance. These groups will report to the Board by the

year's end, and at this time it may be reasonable to ask whether these efforts can be expanded into effective statewide assessment systems.

The Board and the Legislature may also be interested in how the demands of accrediting agencies for information about learning objectives and outcomes are affecting the delivery of undergraduate education. The institutions' responses to these demands have implications for institutional accountability as well as assessment processes. In any case, to the extent that they think that assessment should be a fundamental part of the accountability planning and reporting process, the institutions must find ways to demonstrate the value of assessment data to policymakers interested in accountability.

SUMMARY OF SELECTED NEW INITIATIVES

No accountability plan can describe all institutional practices that affect the institutions' performance on the performance measures. No summary of accountability plans can include all of the strategies and initiatives described in those plans. The state colleges and universities are engaged in many continuing and new efforts to improve graduation efficiency, retention, and graduation rates. This is a brief summary of a few selected initiatives described in the institutions' accountability plans.

Central Washington University

The new provost and interim associate vice president appointed in summer 2001 will review current initiatives, plan new initiatives, and develop new measures. This review flows from dissatisfaction with current faculty productivity measures and the ways that the institution has measured minority student progress at CWU. CWU will also review its target for internship participation for students to determine whether the upper bound expectation for participation (10 percent) is too low.

Eastern Washington University

- Program reviews to streamline major size
- Refinement of articulation agreements with community colleges
- Implementation of EagleNet, online registration
- "Finish-in-Four" programs
- Diversifying advising into colleges and departments

The Evergreen State College

TESC's plan describes many ongoing efforts in considerable detail. Some newer initiatives include:

Efforts to improve graduation efficiency:

- New faculty advising requirement approved spring 2001.
- Per-quarter credit limit increased from 16 to 20 units in fall 2001; this may shorten time to degree for some students.
- Increased limit for transfer credit and/or concurrent enrollment credit that will count toward the degree from 16 to 20 credit hours.
- Seeking enabling legislation to begin a Running Start program at TESC.
- Continuing refinement of freshman and transfer advising structures.

Efforts to improve retention and graduation rates:

- Implementing strategies to improve academic advising information and timing among faculty and through the Academic Advising Office.
- New faculty advising requirement approved spring 2001.
- Two-year pilot project to assess the impact of an intrusive advising model on student retention.
- Enhanced attention to the first-year student's experience on campus.

Institution-specific measures:

- January 2001 faculty approval of "Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate." These expectations are now factoring in curriculum, course construction, and advising.
- Restructured the Learning Resource Center, with two new directors hired to assist in supporting changes in general education.

University of Washington

- Focus efforts to improve GEIs on transfer students in science and engineering.
- Test run for the Degree Audit Requirement System in the coming academic year.
- Introduction of the Mutual Research Transcript Enterprise (MRTE), a data-sharing project between the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) and the UW. The MRTE allows research focused on enrollment and course-taking patterns and improves the transfer articulation process. For example, community college researchers can now learn how students who completed a particular series of courses at their institutions performed at the UW. UW is attempting to expand the MRTE dataset to include other public four-year colleges in the state.
- Offering pay and/or credit to highly motivated undergraduates for intensive work with faculty members in research with goal of involving 600 undergraduates (in 1995-1996, 300 students were involved).
- Efforts to increase the proportion of UW students receiving individualized instruction.
- Ambitious efforts to increase the number of students involved in public service internships and having some research experience with faculty.

Washington State University

- Institution-wide Strategic Planning Process including an oversight committee, nine design teams, and public meetings, information-gathering sessions, and public review. The design team reports have produced two central goals: an aspiration to be recognized as offering the best undergraduate experience at a research university, and a renewed emphasis on the factors that support quality research and WSU's stature among research universities. This process is likely to yield the creation of an *Office of Undergraduate Education* with responsibilities for enhancing the undergraduate experience.
- *WSU has recently hired a new Vice President for Student Affairs.* This represents "a greater focus at a higher level than in the past on the student experience in the classroom." This replaces a system in which a Vice Provost for Student Affairs reported to the Provost.
- *In spring 2002, WSU opens its Center for Undergraduate Education.* This center will house a Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology, the General Education Program, the university's writing programs, and the Student Computing Center.
- *Concerted effort to raise the academic level of the entering class.* WSU is focusing its recruitment and scholarship initiatives on attracting better prepared students and expects that its minimum admissions index for routine admissions will gradually rise.
- *Focusing on contributions that assessment initiatives can make to the accountability discussion.* WSU is exploring ways that its Critical Thinking Rubric, supported by grants from the Fund for Innovation grant and FIPSE, can be integrated with the writing, quantitative reasoning, and information and technology literacy assessment efforts that are underway.

Western Washington University

- *Revising the General Education program to enhance student engagement.* This effort is aimed at improving freshman retention rates and will affect the institution's approach to the goal of increasing the student credit hours per undergraduate FTE in writing-intensive courses. The effort is aimed more broadly at improving institutional performance on all of the accountability measures by improving students' experiences and increasing student engagement with the university. It is hoped that this effort will have larger effects on the quality of the undergraduate experience at Western.
 - ✓ Last year WWU published its Quality Undergraduate Education Report articulating its vision of the qualities it wishes to impart to its undergraduates.
 - ✓ In fall 2001, a faculty taskforce and five working groups will define expected student learning outcomes in the General Education program. The taskforce will then develop major options for implementing a revised General Education program. 2001-2003 will see faculty-wide assessment of the options and planning for implementation.

-
- *Advising.* Assessment research has suggested that advising can be strengthened and that improving the advising program will have beneficial effects on retention and graduation rates. *Western has significantly upgraded advising by major departments, and is now developing plans to improve lower-division, pre-major advising.*
 - ✓ New Assistant Vice President of Academic Support Services is charged with developing a strategic plan for lower-division advising.
 - ✓ Planning begins in fall 2001 and will continue throughout the year, and perhaps into next year.

**SUMMARIES OF INSTITUTIONAL TARGETS
AND
INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES**

Central Washington University
Eastern Washington University
The Evergreen State College
University of Washington
Washington State University
Western Washington University

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<i>COMMON MEASURES</i>			
Graduation Efficiency Index			
•Freshman	88.0%	90.0%	2.0
•Transfers	83.8%	85.0%	1.2
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	80.5%	84.0%	3.5
5-Year Graduation Rate	39.4%	45.0%	5.6
<i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i>			
Faculty Productivity			
Expected learning outcomes	92.6%	100%	7.4
% faculty mentoring students	22.5%	22.5%	0
Student-faculty ratio	22.2	22.5	0.3
Other Measures			
Transfer students with declared majors	75.1%	77.0%	1.9
Minority graduation rate	22.6%	24.0%	1.4
Internship participation	7.3%	8.0%	0.7

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY*Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

Student Learning Outcomes: Percentage of degree programs with specifically stated, publicized learning outcomes.

% Faculty Mentoring Students: Percentage of full-time faculty mentoring students in established programs that incorporate a faculty student mentoring relationship (e.g., CWU research symposium, McNair Scholars Program).

Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE: The ratio of FTE students to the FTE faculty for IPEDS faculty.

Transfer Students with Declared Majors: The percentage of undergraduate transfer students who have declared majors by the end of their third quarter at CWU.

Minority Graduation Rate: Ratio of the number of minority students graduating to all enrolled minority students fall quarter (averaged over three years).

Internship Participation: Percentage of students participating in cooperative education internships (averaged over three years).

EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<i>COMMON MEASURES</i>			
Graduation Efficiency Index			
Freshman	87.9%	91.0%	2.2
Transfers	77.9%	83.1%	5.2
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)	88.5%	89.2%	0.7
5-Year Graduation Rate	41.7%	49.0%	7.3
<i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i>			
Faculty Productivity			
Student credit hours/FTE faculty	305.9	333.6	27.7
Other Measures			
Use of enrollment resources	48.5%	--	--
Internship/service learning experience	2,422	2,998	576
Courses using distance learning technology	6.4	37	30.6
Freshman academic involvement index	33.7	37	3.3

EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Description of Institution-Specific Measures

Student Credit Hours/FTE Faculty: A ratio of student credit hours to the number of IPEDS-defined faculty for fall quarter.

Use of Enrollment Resources: This measure was eliminated as of the 2000 plan.

Experiential Learning (previously entitled Internship/Service Learning Experience):

Total number of students taking experientially-based courses including research directed studies, internship, cooperative education and/or service learning credits.

Courses Using Distance Learning Technology: The annual number of courses offered by faculty who use the worldwide web.

Freshman Academic Involvement Index: The sample average for an 11-question index derived from the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) administered annually to students.

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<i>COMMON MEASURES</i>			
Graduation Efficiency Index			
Freshman	93.0%	94.0%	1.0
Transfers	90.0%+	90.0%+	0.0
Undergraduate Retention			
Overall	76.0%	78.0%	2.0
Freshman	65.0%	75.0%	10.0
5-Year Graduation Rate			
	45.0%	46.0%	1.0
<i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i>			
Faculty Productivity			
Life-long Learning Index, Undergrads	31.7	31.9	0.2
Freshman "Familiarity w/ Computers"	2.28	2.48	.20
Freshman "Quantitative Thinking"	1.88	2.08	.20
Other Measures: Diversity			
Retention of students of color, Olympia campus	77.0%	80.0%	3.0
Student diversity learning	3.18	3.49	.31

+Meets long-term performance goal set by the Legislature.

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

Description of Institution-Specific Measures

Life-Long Learning Index: TESC has used the “Life-Long Learning Index” from the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) as its faculty productivity measure. This index is a composite measure of students’ estimated gains in learning in the following 11 areas: specialization for further education, broad general education, writing, familiarity with computers, understanding/getting along with different kinds of people, working as a team member, understanding developments in science/technology, analytical/ logical thinking, quantitative thinking, synthesizing ideas, and learning on your own. For the current biennium, Evergreen is focusing on two specific items within this index, specifically improvement reported by **freshmen** students. The items are learning gains in “**familiarity with the use of computers**” and “**quantitative thinking.**” This focus is consistent with institutional initiatives related to General Education at Evergreen.

Retention: While reporting overall fall-to-fall retention, Evergreen continues to focus on retention of freshmen students in the current biennium. Again, this is consistent with an internal focus on improvement. Evergreen also selected retention of students of color on the Olympia campus as one of its two institution-specific diversity measures.

Student Diversity Learning: Students’ reported gains at Evergreen in “understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people” (from the Life-Long Learning Index/CSEQ).

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<i>COMMON MEASURES</i>			
Graduation Efficiency Index			
Freshman	89.6%	93.2%	3.6
Transfers	81.7%	87.0%	5.3
Undergraduate Retention (Overall)			
	87.2%	92.4%	5.2
5-Year Graduation Rate			
	63.8%	65.0%+	1.2
<i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i>			
Faculty Productivity			
Enrollment demand satisfied	84.8%	89.4%	4.6
Quality of instruction	93.7%	96.9%	3.2
Research funding/faculty member	\$216,774	*	*
Student credit hours/faculty FTE	202.9	209.5	6.6
Other Measures			
# undergrads with intense research involvement	1,122	<u>Met</u>	**
Individualized instruction	4.0%	4.6%	0.6
Public service internships	842	1,535	693
% undergrads in faculty research	22.4%	23.7%	1.3

+This goal meets long-term performance goal set by Legislature.

*Performance is dependent on availability of federal research funds.

**UW's initial goal for 2004-05 was 600; they have exceeded this goal and promise continuing aggressive effort in this area.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON*Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

Enrollment Demand Satisfied: The proportion of enrollment demand satisfied by offered enrollment space (course openings).

Quality of Instruction: Percent of students evaluating “amount your learned in the course” as “good or better” (3.0 or above on 5 point scale) on standardized course evaluations.

Funding for Research per Faculty FTE: Grants and contracts per faculty FTE (in nominal dollars).

Student Credit Hours Instructed Per Faculty FTE: Hours at graduate level are multiplied by 1.5 hours, then added to undergraduate hours to create total student credit hours.

Undergraduate Credits Taken as Individualized Instruction: Numbers of hours taken as individualized instruction/all undergraduate hours.

Number of Undergraduates Intensively Involved in Research: Number of students who receive research grants, data provided by Office of Undergraduate Education.

Percent Undergraduate Credits Taken as Individualized Instruction: This measures one-on-one mentoring opportunities for undergraduates offered by University faculty.

Number of Undergraduates Involved with Public Service Internships: Data provided by Carlson Center For Public Service.

Percent of Undergraduates Reporting a Research Experience with Faculty: Derived from an annual survey of graduating senior students, provides a measure of the cumulative experience over all undergraduate years.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<i>COMMON MEASURES</i>			
Graduation Efficiency Index			
Freshman	90.0%	91.5%	1.5
Transfers	81.0%	83.6%	2.6
Undergraduate Retention			
Overall	84.4%	86.4%	2.0
Freshman	83.7%	84.7%	1.0
5-Year Graduation Rate			
	53.8%	55.9%	2.1
<i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i>			
Faculty Productivity			
Student credit hours/FTE faculty	198.5	207.7	9.2
Individualized enrollment/faculty	3.7	3.8	0.1
Research and scholarship	80.3%	<u>Met</u>	*
Other Measures: Technology for Learning			
Distance student credit hours	24,204	<u>Met</u>	*
Degree programs via distance	6	12	6
Reengineered courses	131	<u>Met</u>	*
Classrooms with technology	51.4%	70.0%	18.6

*2004-2005 targets in these areas have been met or exceeded.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY*Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

Freshman Retention: In order to better manage its efforts, WSU has set a target for Freshman Retention rather than for Overall Retention, while continuing to report Overall Retention as well.

Individualized Enrollment/Faculty: Measures the amount of work faculty do with students in the form of supervising undergraduate research, internships, senior theses, private lessons, and independent studies. (This measure tends to rise and fall with the size of the junior/senior classes.)

Student Credit Hours per Faculty FTE: Number of credit hours generated per instructional faculty FTE. (This measure tends to rise and fall with the size of the freshman/sophomore classes.)

Research and Scholarship: Percent of faculty completing the expected amount and type of scholarship during the past year, based on each college's definition of what constitutes scholarly work in that field.

Distance Student Credit Hours: Credit hours earned through interactive video courses, pre-recorded video courses, online courses and multiple mode courses.

Degree Programs via Distance: Number of different degree programs offered entirely at a distance, through electronic media such as interactive video, online courses, etc.

Reengineered Courses: Number of courses taught "primarily" by electronic means, including WHETS, online, e-mail, video-conference, etc.

Classrooms with Technology: Percent of university classrooms equipped to support technology-intensive teaching.

WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<i>COMMON MEASURES</i>			
Graduation Efficiency Index			
Freshman	86.6%	87.0%	0.4
Transfers	80.5%	82.0%	1.5
Transfers graduating with a B.S. in science	71.3%	74.0%	2.7
Undergraduate Retention			
Overall	85.5%	86.0%	0.5
Freshman	80.3%	82.0%	1.7
5-Year Graduation Rate			
Freshman	54.0%	54.0%	0
Minority	38.4%	39.0%	0.6
<i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i>			
Faculty Productivity			
Individualized Credit/FTE Student	1.43	1.5	0.07
SCH/Undergrad FTE in writing courses	2.1	2.25	.15
Other Measures			
Hours scheduled in computer labs	22.4	25.0	2.6
Departments adopting advising model	0	75%	50

WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY*Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

Individualized Credit/FTE Student: Measures the number of credits generated per FTE student through individual instructional activities, including internships, work on faculty research projects, and other one-on-one activities.

SCH/Undergrad FTE in Writing Courses: Student credit hours per undergraduate FTE in courses designated as principally or specifically writing-based.

Hours Scheduled in Computer Labs: Measures the number of student hours scheduled in university or departmental computer labs per FTE undergraduate.

Departments Adopting Advising Model: Measures the proportion of Western's academic departments that have fully implemented all elements of Western's Departmental Advising Model. Components: (a) a clearly defined departmental advising program, with advisor, location, hours, etc., easily accessible and known; (b) a departmental advising web page fully operational, based on the established template and criteria; (c) provision of an individualized, written plan of study to each student upon declaration of the major; (d) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help pre-majors decide on a major; and (e) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help advanced majors in the department explore career and graduate school options.

PROJECTED IMPROVEMENTS OVER BASELINE PERFORMANCE

The tables below present information on baseline performance for 1996-1999, the 2001-2003 targets, and projected improvements over baseline performance.

Differences in institutional baselines can teach something about the unique characteristics of the institutions but they cannot tell us whether one institution is in fact performing better than another. *Differences in baseline performance are caused mainly by differences in the characteristics of the student populations the institutions serve.* For example, CWU and EWU admit more students with weak academic preparation than WWU and TESC. For this reason, CWU and EWU have lower graduation rates than Western and Evergreen.

Projected improvements over baseline performance vary from institution to institution. This variation results from differences in baselines (higher baselines may mean diminished room for improvement) and factors unique to each institution. For example, TESC's GEI is much higher than that seen at any other institution and there is little room for improvement; WWU cannot project improved graduation rates because it has suffered weak freshman retention in recent years. Further, some institutions have set aggressive baselines they are not certain they can meet in this biennium. They see efforts to reach ambitious objectives as the clearest path to the statewide goals set by the Legislature.

I. GRADUATION EFFICIENCY INDEX: NATIVE FRESHMAN

	1996-99 Baseline	2001-03 Target	Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	88.0%	90.0%	2.0
EWU	87.9%	91.0%	2.2
TESC	93.0%	94.0%	1.0
WWU	86.6%	87.0%	0.4
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	89.6%	93.2%	3.6
WSU	90.0%	91.5%	1.5

II. GRADUATION EFFICIENCY INDEX: TRANSFER STUDENTS

	1996-99 Baseline	2001-03 Target	Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	83.8%	85.0%	1.2
EWU	77.9%	83.1%	5.2
TESC	90.0%	90.0%	0
WWU	80.5%	82.0%	1.5
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	81.7%	87.0%	5.3
WSU	81.0%	83.6%	2.6

III. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT RETENTION

	1996-99 Baseline	2001-03 Target	Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	80.5%	84.0%	3.5
EWU	88.5%	89.2%	0.7
TESC	76.0%	78.0%	2.0
WWU	85.5%	86.0%	0.5
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	87.2%	92.4%	5.2
WSU	84.4%	86.4%	2.0

IV. 5-YEAR FRESHMAN GRADUATION RATE

	1996-99 Baseline	2001-03 Target	Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	39.4%	45.0%	5.6
EWU	41.7%	49.0%	7.3
TESC	45.0%	51.0%	6.0
WWU	54.0%	54.0%	0
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	63.8%	65.0%	1.2
WSU	53.8%	55.9%	2.1

RESOLUTION NO. 01-33

WHEREAS, In its 2001-2003 biennial budget, the Legislature directed the public baccalaureate institutions to prepare accountability plans for the 2001-2003 biennium that would lead to “measurable and specific” improvements toward the performance goals; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) developed and approved Accountability Guidelines in September 2001 for the institutions’ 2001-2003 Accountability Plans; and

WHEREAS, In the guidelines, the Higher Education Coordinating Board gave responsibility for setting meaningful targets to the institutions; and

WHEREAS, The institutions have presented their accountability plans to the Board;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the targets set in the 2001-2003 Accountability Plans presented by Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, The Evergreen State College, University of Washington, Washington State University, and Western Washington University.

Adopted:

October 30, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

Child Care Grants

October 2001

BACKGROUND

The 2001 Legislature provided \$150,000 in state funds for child care grants for the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to distribute through competitive application to public baccalaureate institutions in the 2001-2003 biennium. A separate pool of funds was provided for community and technical colleges.

This is the second biennium for these grants. The HECB approved a similar amount of funds to three institutions in December of 1999:

- Central Washington University -- \$70,906;
- Eastern Washington University -- \$29,025; and
- Washington State University -- \$50,069.

All of these grants were distributed last biennium, and the programs were implemented.

Applications for matching grants for the current biennium were due to the HECB by Oct. 15, 2001. The \$150,000 provided for these grants is to be divided equally in each of the two fiscal years at \$75,000 per fiscal year. No single institution may receive more than half the funds appropriated for this program.

APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCESS

HECB staff established a review committee of individuals representing the Washington Association for the Education of Young Children, the Child Care Coordinating Committee, and the Child Care Resource and Referral Network, together with several HECB staff. This committee met Oct. 22 to review and evaluate the applications received, and to make recommendations for project awards. Below are the review committee's recommendations:

Central Washington University \$69,000

The review committee recommends that the board authorize \$69,000 in grant funds (\$34,500 in FY 2002 and \$34,500 in FY 2003) to support Central Washington University's proposals to enhance infant-toddler care provided through Child Care Central, one of the university's child care programs, and add evening/weekend care through the campus' Early Childhood Learning Center. This award would fund the entire proposal, except for \$3,000 requested in each year for indirect costs. The maximum amount available to any one institution under this grant program is \$37,500 for each of the next two years.

With help from a child care grant provided by the HECB in the last biennium, CWU opened slots for infants and toddlers in June 2000. These slots were quickly filled, and then expanded to a

total of 32 by fall 2001. These slots serve a pressing need for students with young children. The recommended funding will allow the infant-toddler program to continue and become programmatically and fiscally stable on a long-term basis. The program also will provide parenting education for low-income students.

The second major element of this request is to expand the hours of the Early Childhood Learning Center to include evenings and weekends. Students have classes, projects and other activities that require child-care services be available at these times. Upon receipt of this grant, CWU will initiate evening and weekend child-care services starting winter quarter 2002. In a recent survey of parents, more than 70 percent indicated evening and weekend care is important to them. The child-care staff to be employed in this program will possess the training and qualifications and be paid consistent with state licensing requirements.

Washington State University/Pullman**To Be Determined**

The review committee recommends that the board direct staff to continue working with Washington State University (WSU) on a proposal to enhance evening child care services and continue the parent cooperative program.

WSU currently provides on-campus evening child-care program for 124 children to accommodate students taking evening labs and classes. This drop-in evening program currently is the only one available in the community. The university is seeking the state grant to keep parent fees affordable for students. Ongoing discussions center around the staffing plan for this program.

WSU also operates a parent cooperative program in which student parents may work at the Children's Center in exchange for a reduction of their child-care costs. This opportunity benefits parents both financially and through the training and experience they gain working in a supervised child-care setting.

The Evergreen State College**To Be Determined**

The review committee recommends that the board also direct staff to continue working with The Evergreen State College (TESC) on a proposal to enhance student teacher training, provide parent education materials, and provide furnishings for both a parent support area and for a planned new child development center.

The grant request would provide additional student teacher training of 11 hours per quarter. The college would purchase books, videos, materials and a TV/VCR to establish a parent training area. The college plans to open the new center in winter quarter of 2003, and will double the capacity of the child care program. The school is requesting grant funding for furniture, play area and activity equipment, furnishings for the toddler and pre-school rooms, and student-parent desks and chairs.

NEXT STEPS

Following the board's action, an interagency agreement between the HECB and Central Washington University will be executed, spelling out the terms under which the grant is provided, including reporting requirements. The HECB executive director and the chief financial officer of the university will sign the agreements.

Discussions will continue with Washington State University and The Evergreen State College, and recommendations for grant awards will be brought to the board for its consideration at the December 2001 meeting. If the board approves these awards, interagency agreements will be executed. Fiscal year 2002 funds for the approved child-care programs will become available as soon as possible after the interagency agreements are executed. Second-year grant funds will become available as soon as possible after July 2002, upon satisfactory completion by the institutions of first-year progress reports.

RESOLUTION NO. 01-34

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) has been directed by the Legislature and Governor to administer grants totaling \$150,000 for the 2001-2003 biennium to encourage programs providing high-quality, accessible, and affordable child care for students attending public baccalaureate institutions; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board staff prepared and circulated a Request for Proposals to all the public baccalaureate institutions, and invited proposals from each institution; and

WHEREAS, Grant requests were received by three institutions: Central Washington University, The Evergreen State College, and Washington State University; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board staff and external experts representing child care organizations have evaluated the grant proposals and recommend funding a grant in the requested amount to Central Washington University, and continuing the review of grant proposals for the remaining funds available;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves a grant to Central Washington University in the amount of \$69,000, and directs HECB staff to release the funding upon the execution by the executive director of an inter-agency agreement spelling out the terms of the grant process; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That HECB staff is directed to continue review of the two remaining grant proposals and bring recommendations to the board for consideration at the December 2001 meeting.

Adopted:

October 30, 2001

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

Roundtable: Community Colleges/Branch Campus Issues

October 2001

Executive Summary

The Higher Education Coordinating Board has long had a special interest in the success of the branch campuses in expanding citizens' access to higher education. A key to that success is the working relationship between the branches and the two-year colleges that prepare lower-division students for transfer to the branches. Along that line, the state's 1989 branch campus legislation directs the HECB to "ensure a collaborative partnership between the community colleges and the four-year institutions."

At the roundtable discussion on Oct. 30, legislators and institutional representatives are being invited by HECB members and staff for an informal conversation about the current issues faced by branch campuses and the community and technical colleges as they attempt to meet the state's higher education needs in these challenging times. The following questions will guide the discussion.

- How would you assess the current working relationship of the branch campuses and their nearby community and technical colleges? Could you identify some of the ongoing challenges that affect those relationships?
- What are the experiences of students who wish to transfer to the branch campuses from community and technical colleges? Are there actions the institutions could take – or are there statewide policies – that would make the transfer process more effective for students?
- The co-location of the University of Washington Bothell and Cascadia Community College was designed, in part, to create a unique institutional environment that would stimulate innovation and creativity. How are the institutions responding to this challenge?
- The HECB is charged with representing the broad citizen interest in a statewide higher education system, rather than advocating for any particular institution or institutions. With that mission in mind, how could the HECB help support and improve the collaboration between the two-year colleges and the branch campuses?