**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
*University of Washington GWP Bldg, Tacoma Room (3rd Floor Board Room)*
*1900 Commerce, Tacoma 98402*
***July 25, 2001***

| *Approximate Times* | | *Tab* |
|---|---|---|
| **8:15 a.m.** | BOARD BREAKFAST AND MEETING OVERVIEW (Tacoma Room) *No official business will be conducted.* | |
| **9:10 a.m.** | CAMPUS TOUR | |
| **9:45 a.m**. | **Welcome and Introductions** • Bob Craves, HECB Chair • Chancellor Vicky Carwein, University of Washington, Tacoma | |
| | CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS | |
| | **Adoption of Meeting Minutes** • **Regular board meeting, May 30, 2001** • **Joint work session with the SBCTC, June 25, 2001** | **1** |
| | **New Degree Programs for Approval** • **BS Neurobiology, UW** *(Resolution 01-26)* • **MS Information Systems, UW** *(Resolution 01-27)* • **MS Architecture, UW** *(Resolution 01-28)* | **2** **3** **4** |
| **10:00 a.m.** | **Legislative Update** • **HECB Legislative Priorities: 2001 Session Report** HECB staff briefing • **Overview of HECB Projects 2001-02** HECB staff briefing | **5** **6** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **10:30 a.m.** | B R E A K | |
| **10:45 a.m.** | **Tacoma Technology Center: Presentation & Discussion** | **7** |

- Ken Myer, Workforce Chair, Washington Software Alliance
- Vicky Carwein, Chancellor, UWT
- Rich Nafziger, former Policy Director for the Governor's Office, currently SBCTC Director for Workforce Education
- Larry Crum, UWT Director of Computing & Software Systems
- Bill Philip, Chair, UWT Advisory Board
- David Notkin, Boeing Professor & Associate Chair, Computer Science & Engineering, UW Seattle
- Jan Yoshiwara, SBCTC Director for Education Services

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 12:00 p.m. | **LUNCHEON WITH UWT ADVISORY BOARD AND ADMINISTRATORS (UWT Terrace)** | |

*No official business will be conducted.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **1:00 p.m.** | **The Evergreen State College Tacoma Campus** | **8** |

- Joye Hardiman, Director

| | |
|---|---|
| **1:15 p.m.** | HECB COMMITTEE REPORTS |

- ♦ *Planning & Policy Committee*
    Gay Selby, Committee Chair

**Distance Delivered BA in Business Administration Consortial Degree program**     **9**
- HECB staff briefing
- *(Resolution 01-29)*

PUBLIC COMMENT

**Review of Transfer & Articulation Policies & Practices**     **10**
- HECB staff briefing

- ♦ *Fiscal Committee*
    Larry Hanson, Committee Chair

**2003-05 Operating & Capital Budget Guidelines**     **11**
- HECB staff briefing

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **2:15 p.m.** | **UWT Student Panel** | **12** |
| **2:45 p.m.** | **Latino/a Educational Achievement Project** | **13** |

- Lydia Ledesma-Reese, Advisory Board Chair
- Ricardo Sanchez, Director

**3:15 p.m.**    <u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</u>                                         **14**

**Status Report: Notification of Intent (new degree programs)**

<u>PUBLIC COMMENT</u>

**3:30 p.m.**    <u>HECB EXECUTIVE SESSION</u>

**4:15 p.m**.    <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

*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.*

2001 HECB Meeting Calendar

| Date | TENTATIVE LOCATION |
|---|---|
| September 12 Wednesday | Washington State University, Pullman Junior Ballroom, Compton Union Building (CUB) |
| October 30 Tuesday | Cascadia Community College, Bothell Board Room (#260), Main Cascadia Bldg. |
| December 12 Wednesday | Gonzaga University, Spokane Foley Library Teleconference Room |

# MINUTES OF MEETING
## May 30, 2001

**July 2001**

### HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair
Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair
Ms. Kristi Blake, Secretary
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 8:15 a.m. and started the round of Board introductions. Pres. Steve Jordan welcomed the Board to Eastern Washington University.

### Minutes of April Board Meeting Approved

ACTION: **Larry Hanson** moved for approval of the minutes of the Board's April meeting, seconded by **Gay Selby**. The minutes were unanimously approved.

### Provosts Barbara Smith and David Dauwalder Honored

ACTION: **Larry Hanson** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-22** honoring Dr. Barbara Smith of The Evergreen State College. **Kristi Blake** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

ACTION: **Herb Simon** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-23** honoring Dr. David Dauwalder of Central Washington University. **Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

### New Degree Program Approved

ACTION: **Gay Selby** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-24**, recommending approval of the University of Washington's Master in Information Management. **Kristi Blake** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

### 2001 Legislative Session Report

Government Relations Director Bruce Botka provided a status report on HECB priorities, including enrollments, tuition, and financial aid. Associate directors Jim Reed and John Fricke discussed the differences between Senate and House capital and operating budgets.

Gay Selby stressed the importance of financial aid, reminding that this is the Board's highest priority.

**EWU Student Panel**
Eastern Washington University students spoke about their programs of study, their experience at EWU, and future plans.

**Spokane Higher Education Presidents and Business Leaders**

Rich Hadley, president and chief executive officer  of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, described the economic development effort in Spokane, particularly in high-tech, bio-tech, and health care areas.  He said higher education is critical to the business community's ability to grow and to diversify.  He credited ongoing collaborations between business and higher education for spurring the area's economic growth, including 5,000 new jobs and $1.3 billion in capital construction now under way.

To complement this effort, Jerry Straalsund, executive director of the Spokane Intercollegiate Research and Technology Institute (SIRTI), spoke of the many new programs and projects that SIRTI is helping to establish and grow by providing and maintaining linkages among the community and business entrepreneurs.  He spoke of the growth of the Riverpoint higher education complex, specifically the aggregation of various college campuses, the opening of the new health science building and the possibility of an academic center in the future.  Like Hadley, he stressed the importance of strong collaboration among the public and private presidents of both four-year and two-year colleges, and between higher education and the business community.

Kristi Blake asked what higher education lacks -- or needs to do -- that would help the economy grow further.  Mr. Hadly mentioned increasing high-technology training, growth in upper-degree programs and doctorate degrees, and focusing on bio-tech and health sciences, including nursing programs, to meet labor demand.

Finally, Spokane higher education presidents and administrators presented on their individual institutions, highlighting high-demand and innovative programs, and the collaborative work going on among the institutions to respond to the needs of the community.  There was also discussion on transfer and articulation, the problems currently experienced by students and administrators, and suggestions for improvement.  The panel was composed of:
- Pres. Stephen Jordan, Eastern Washington University (EWU)
- Pres. William Robinson, Whitworth College
- Father Robert Spitzer, Gonzaga University
- Chancellor Charles Taylor, Community Colleges of Spokane
- Provost Ronald Hopkins, Washington State University (WSU)
- Dean Bill Gray, WSU Spokane

**Postsecondary Opportunity and  Achievement Report**

Marc Gaspard and Gay Selby, chair of the HECB Policy Committee, provided introductory comments and background information.  Deputy Director Ruta Fanning presented the details of the report.

Working with an advisory committee, staff has developed a new approach that establishes goals -- and in partnership with K-12 and higher education stakeholders – monitors the entire span of the learning careers of all students from (1) preparation to (2) participation to (3) achievement. Ruta Fanning reviewed the specific goals and indicators, highlighted key findings, and discussed future steps.  Staff will focus next on identifying barriers to greater opportunity and achievement.  The last step would be to develop policies and recommendations for the governor and the Legislature.

**Barriers to Student Learning and Institutional Responsiveness**

One of the barriers indicated in the study conducted by staff and stakeholders is the problem of transfer and articulation.  Jim Reed presented staff recommendations for board approval.

The first step would be to develop a coordinated plan of action that would "sort out" and help determine who is already working on the different elements of transfer and articulation policy and procedure.  The next step would be to go beyond anecdotal information to actual quantitative data that will help to prioritize and focus on the problems affecting the greatest number of students.

ACTION:  **Herb Simon** moved for consideration of **Resolution 01-25**, adopting the recommendations of the report. **Kristi Blake** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

**Director's Report**

Marc Gaspard provided updates on the college savings plan and the establishment of an advisory board.  He reminded the Board of the upcoming joint meeting with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and informed them of the K-16 roundtable that staff is putting together through WICHE and SHEEO.

**The Board adjourned the meeting at 1:30 p.m.**

# RESOLUTION NO.  01-22

WHEREAS, Dr. Barbara Leigh Smith, Academic Vice President and Provost at The Evergreen State College, has announced her decision to step down after 31 years of energetic and dedicated service to the institution, its students, and the State of Washington; and

WHEREAS, Barbara's work at Evergreen and with The Washington Center for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education inspired a statewide and national educational reform movement in Learning Communities, a movement which she leaves her current post to support and strengthen; and

WHEREAS, Barbara has been an eloquent voice for student learning and education reform in the State of Washington; and

WHEREAS, Barbara served with distinction as President of the American Association for Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, Barbara has assisted the Board and its staff by providing valued counsel and advice on important matters of higher education policy and planning in a manner reflecting her values and vision of higher education;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby expresses its appreciation, respect, and admiration for the contributions and legacy of Dr. Barbara Leigh Smith to the higher education community and to the State of Washington, and wishes her continued excellence in her future endeavors.

Adopted:

May 30, 2001

Attest:

_____
Bob Craves, Chair


_____
Kristianne Blake, Secretary

# RESOLUTION NO. 01-23

WHEREAS, Dr. David Dauwalder, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs for Central Washington University, has announced his intention to return to the faculty of CWU's department of Administrative Management and Business Education; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Dauwalder served as Interim Provost from November 1996 through June 1997 and has been in his current leadership position since that time; and

WHEREAS, David has made many significant contributions to CWU, including his efforts to spearhead the establishment of the Center for Teaching and Learning, nurture the development of programs at the university centers around the state, and encourage the growth and quality of CWU's international programs; and

WHEREAS, David chaired the university's "synthesizing committee" that produced the campus strategic plan; and

WHEREAS, David has set an example of stability, integrity, professionalism and dedication to student learning that is a model for everyone on the campus and throughout the state's higher education system; and

WHEREAS, David has generously assisted the members and staff of the Higher Education Coordinating Board in their consideration of higher education policy and planning throughout his term as provost;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby expresses its admiration and thanks to Dr. David Dauwalder for his many contributions to Central Washington University and the state of Washington, and wishes him every success in his future career.

Adopted:

May 30, 2001

Attest:

_____
Bob Craves, Chair


_____
Kristianne Blake, Secretary

# RESOLUTION NO. 01 - 24

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

WHEREAS, The program will address the immediate and extensive need for information technology management professionals; and

WHEREAS, The program of study and resources are outstanding; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary; 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 Master of Science in Information Management, effective May 2001.


Adopted:

May 30, 2001


Attest:



_____
Bob Craves, Chair


_____
Kristianne Blake, Secretary

# RESOLUTION NO. 01-25

WHEREAS, In the 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education, *The 21$^{st}$ Century Learner: Strategies to Meet the Challenge*, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) adopted five goals reflecting the Board's policy that the interests and needs of learners must be the fundamental priority of the state's higher education system; and

WHEREAS, The Master Plan called for a comprehensive review of how existing regulations or practices at the state and institutional levels create unwarranted obstacles to student progress and meeting program demand; and

WHEREAS, HECB staff undertook the review in collaboration with faculty, students, and administrators of the public colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, Preliminary findings of the review were presented to the Board at its meetings of July 2000 and January 2001; and

WHEREAS, The final report, *Barriers to Student Learning and Institutional Responsiveness,* recommends that a comprehensive assessment of transfer and articulation practices within and between the public universities and colleges be undertaken and that a coordinated system-wide plan for this assessment be developed; and

WHEREAS, The report also recommends that the HECB conduct a biennial review of barriers and report results in each four-year update to the Master Plan for Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, At its meeting of May 14, 2001, the Board's Policy & Planning Committee reviewed the final report and concurs with the reports recommendations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the recommendations of the final report and requests that the Board's Policy & Planning Committee work with HECB staff in preparing a detailed project schedule and scope of work for Board consideration at its July 2001 meeting.

Adopted:

May 30, 2001

Attest:

_____
Bob Craves, Chair


_____
Kristianne Blake, Secretary

## Minutes of Joint Work Session with the SBCTC
## June 25, 2001

**July 2001**

**HECB Members Present**: Bob Craves, chair; Gay Selby, vice chair; Kristi Blake, secretary; Ann Ramsay-Jenkins, Herb Simon, Chang Mook Sohn, Pat Stanford

**State Board Members**: Bob Bavasi, chair; Tom Koenninger; Jane Nishita; Carolyn Purnell; and Jose Ruiz

**Executive Directors**: Marc Gaspard, HECB
Earl Hale, SBCTC

## Agency/Systems Overview and Budget Updates

Staff from the HECB and the SBCTC provided updates on the operating and capital budgets as passed during the 2001 legislative session (subject to governor's signature). Common areas of interest included overall funding for enrollments, tuition levels, salary increases, and the capital budgets for both the two-year and four-year institutions in the state.

Each agency spoke to some areas of uniqueness. The HECB has responsibility for administering state financial aid, and various grants and scholarship programs. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges is focused on issues that affect the system of 34 community and technical colleges, including academic transfer, basic skills and literacy programs, education and training to meet the shifting workforce needs of the local economies.

Members of both boards expressed some concern about the operating and capital budgets. There was some sentiment of not making significant strides, reflecting the need for a louder, clearer, and more collaborative higher education message. There was general consensus that the passage of initiatives and limited bonding authority have resulted in a much more restrictive budget environment and fewer dollars available for discretionary funding.

## Access and Success for People of Color

The HECB and the SBCTC place a great deal of emphasis on diversity. The HECB is charged by state law with "monitoring and reporting on the progress of minority participation in higher education," and making recommendations "to increase minority participation" (RCW28B.80.350). In December 1999, HECB members directed the agency staff to conduct a comprehensive review of its work in meeting that responsibility. The result was a report entitled *Postsecondary Opportunity and Achievement in Washington*. The report poses three main

questions: (1) Who is ready for postsecondary education? (2) Who begins postsecondary education; and (3) Who completes postsecondary education?

Washington faces three principle challenges: (1) broadening the pipeline of students who are prepared to enter and succeed in higher education; (2) ensuring adequate access to selective institutions; (3) turning access into achievement at open enrollment institutions.

The HECB will meet with universities, colleges and other governing agencies to plan a collaborative research agenda to begin to review these issues and develop policy recommendations to broaden opportunity and strengthen achievement.

HECB Vice Chair Gay Selby relayed a suggestion from Terry Bergeson, superintendent of public instruction, to hold a joint meeting of the HECB, SBCTC, and OSPI to discuss these issues. Another suggestion was to expand on plans to look at barriers to students by looking at other kinds of data, such as those provided by the Employment Security Department and the Department of Social and Health Services.

HECB member Chang Mook Sohn spoke to the diversity issue – and urged the finding of other aspects (aside from racial data) such as income levels, geographic profiles, etc., that can help determine certain trends. He was assured that the HECB's new reporting format would allow these other factors to surface.

The community and technical college system places a priority on providing access to higher education and success for people of color in Washington state. The SBCTC produces an annual progress report on *Access and Success for System Goals for People of Color in Washington Community and Technical Colleges*, dated June 2001.

Through the use of research, data analysis, and annual reports from the college system, SBCTC staff, in consultation with college representatives, identify systemic issues relating to students of color and develop strategies and initiatives to address these issues. Several issues have been identified in the areas of enrollment, retention, employment and climate.

Three overall strategies that the State Board uses to address these issues are to: (1) publicize and talk about issues; (2) convene workshops and conferences targeted at issue areas; and (3) share best practices among colleagues.

In collaboration with the Washington Center at The Evergreen State College, SBCTC has held several multi-cultural conferences to have colleges assess diversity efforts in their service areas. Successful solutions and best practices are shared, as well as partnerships and other collaborative measures.

Successful English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) programs also have been combined with workforce education programs where ESL instructors are working with specific program instructors in the same classroom. Other specially designed programs, such as those offered to seasonal (migrant) workers, are in place.

The SBCTC also is looking at allied health programs where admissions criteria, curriculum, and career ladders are being examined.

**Articulation and Transfer**

Considerable discussion took place on this issue. The HECB, at its May 2001 meeting, took action to begin a review of current transfer and articulation policies and practices among the community and technical colleges and universities. The review will be accomplished with the help of a study group comprised of representatives of the public colleges and universities, the independent higher education institutions, the SBCTC and the Council of Presidents.

Lower division preparation for baccalaureate degrees has been a key mission area for the community colleges. Last year, the community and technical college system had 11,000 transfers — about half had an AA degree; 6,000 with a technical degree; and 7,500 with certificates. The actual transfer rate is currently about 44 percent for those students who declare a specific intent to transfer at the outset.

The SBCTC was asked about those students who complete by program area. Students' progress can be followed based on what they declare their intent to be upon entering the college. Students' goals within the community and technical college system are based on more intangible issues. Of all students who start college (regardless of program of interest), 25 percent transferred to a four-year institution – compared to an average 24 percent in other states. The SBCTC has been able to identify problem areas, such as in the areas of math and science, and has worked to correct them.

The two-year college system also is working hard to fill skills gaps. As the number of technical program graduates grows, demand for opportunities for technical students to complete bachelor's degrees has also increased. The system is working with several public and private universities on a dual-purpose transferable technical degree that can serve as the basis for articulation agreements with universities. The four-year colleges have also had their own special strategies in place for improving lower division transfer.

A joint HECB/SBCTC committee was proposed that would continue looking at articulation, transfer, and other higher education issues of mutual interest. The executive directors of both boards will discuss that idea in more detail.

**Distance Learning and K-20 Update**

The state's higher education institutions are becoming increasingly involved in distance learning to serve time- and place-bound students. A presentation was given about the SBCTC Washington Online Virtual Campus, which provides a centralized point of access to online courses offered across colleges for students, and one-stop registration, advising, etc.

An update was also given on the K-20 educational telecommunications network. There are currently 426 K-20 sites; 48 at the baccalaureate level; 71 sites at the community and technical

college level; and 307 sites at the K-12 level. Washington's K-20 telecommunications network serves as a national model, and the Department of Information Services gets frequent comments and inquiries from other states on how Washington has been able to implement such an extensive educational network, noting that the joint collaboration is commendable.

## **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the joint work session was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

# Bachelor of Science in Neurobiology
# University of Washington

**July 2001**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### INTRODUCTION

The University of Washington is a major center for research in neurobiology and currently offers a doctoral degree in neurobiology and behavior. A couple of years ago, the UW initiated a bachelor of science degree in neurobiology on a pilot basis. Based on the popularity and success of the pilot program, the UW is requesting Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval to offer the bachelor of science degree in neurobiology on a permanent basis.

### PROGRAM NEED

As documented below, there is a critical need for the BS in Neurobiology.

1. The program will contribute to a better understanding of the function of the brain and nervous system in health and disease.
2. Developments in the field of neurobiology have major benefits for society – neuroscience has demonstrated how children learn and has helped explain disorders such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases.
3. The program will connect undergraduate education to research in neurobiology and make the UW's undergraduate science curriculum competitive with other leading research universities.
4. The program provides a unique opportunity to bring together numerous faculty from the School of Medicine and the College of Arts and Sciences to serve students in an undergraduate degree program.
5. The program's graduates will be well prepared for medical school and/or graduate studies in the biological sciences.

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The major in neurobiology provides a comprehensive, laboratory-based introduction to the science of the nervous system at the molecular, cellular, systems, and behavioral levels. The curriculum of the neurobiology major includes: a required core of neurobiology courses; supporting course work in chemistry, physics, mathematics, and biology; electives from the biological sciences; and undergraduate research. The bachelor's degree in neuroscience would serve 72 FTE students at full enrollment. Existing resources, including a cadre of distinguished faculty, would support the program. Full-time students would complete the 86-quarter credit program in four or five years.

Four student-learning outcomes have been identified for the bachelor's degree in neurobiology.

1. Graduates would demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of animal and human physiology.
2. Graduates would demonstrate comprehension of key methods and fundamental assumptions underlying the study of the relations between neurobiology and behavior.
3. Graduates would be able to pose questions about neurobiology and behavior and create experiments that might be able to solve these questions.
4. Graduates would be highly prepared to go to medical school, as well as graduate school, in neurobiology or a related discipline.


## ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

Several methodologies would be employed to measure student learning outcomes. Students would take oral and written exams, pursue research projects with professors, and analyze current research articles. In addition, graduates of the program would be surveyed and tracked after graduation.

Program assessment would occur through students' evaluations of courses and instruction, exit interviews with graduating seniors, and regularly scheduled institutional program evaluations. Program faculty would meet annually to coordinate instructional materials, thus eliminating duplication and broadening coverage.

The program is committed to increasing interest among highly qualified applicants, including a strong group of minority students. To that end, the program director speaks to minority student groups to interest them in the program. Prospective applicants are also connected with second-year neurobiology majors so they can learn first hand about the program.


## REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Three external authorities reviewed the proposal: Ronald Harris-Warrick, professor of neurobiology and behavior at Cornell University; William R. Roberts, director of the Institute of Neuroscience at the University of Oregon; and Nicholas C. Spitzer, professor of biology at UC San Diego. All three gave the proposal high praise and attested to the quality of the program, the outstanding faculty affiliated with it, and the need for such an offering.

A review committee affiliated with the UW also evaluated the proposal and gave it high praise, noting the model collaboration for offering the program between the Medical School and College of Arts and Sciences. The committee also presented a few suggestions to enhance the program, such as increasing the interactions between the undergraduate and graduate programs in neurobiology. In addition the proposal was shared with the other public baccalaureate institutions, although no comments have been received.

## PROGRAM COSTS

The BS in Neurobiology would be supported by internal reallocation of funds from the University Initiative Fund that supports new program endeavors.  At full enrollment, the annual program costs would be about $767,373, or $10, 658 per FTE student.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

The undergraduate program in neuroscience is an excellent addition to the UW's science curriculum.  It is a model collaborative program that attracts highly qualified students who will be highly competitive in the workplace or graduate school.  An outstanding faculty who make significant contributions to the field support this program.

## RECOMMENDATION

The University of Washington proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Neurobiology is recommended for approval, effective July 25, 2001.

# 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

---

## Master of Science in Information Systems
## University of Washington

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### INTRODUCTION

The University of Washington is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board approval to establish a Master of Science in Information Systems (MSIS). The program would be housed in the UW's School of Business Administration, which offers successful information systems programs at the undergraduate and doctoral levels. The MSIS would be the first degree program of its kind in Washington, preparing graduates who will help organizations apply information technology to business problems to create efficient and effective solutions.

### PROGRAM NEED

The proposal presents a strong case to establish the MSIS to respond to the immediate and future needs of business and industry. Here are some examples from industry trade journals.

- *"...Finding people who can focus on IT and business is not getting any easier. He's desperately seeking people with a solid understanding of both technology and business..."(Computerworld: Job Forecast '99)*
- *"...The greatest need for IT workers is in the largest segment of the economy – smaller non-IT firms. Companies with 50-99 employees need 1 million IT workers next year or 70% of the total demand for all new IT employees. This group also has the highest skill gap; managers from these firms reported the highest rate of unqualified applicants and the greatest difficulty in filling positions..."(The Information Technology Association of America: Bridging the Gap-Information Technology Skills for the New Millennium).*

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The MSIS program will prepare graduates for a number of career paths, including consulting and systems integration, electronic commerce, consumer products and services, software development, and networking, telecommunications, and computing infrastructure. The curriculum (68 quarter credits) is modeled after the program standards of the Association of Computing Machinery and the Association for Information Systems. It consists of four major components: foundation, core, integration, and career tracks. Technology will play a central role in the both the content and delivery of the program.

At full enrollment, the program is expected to serve 100 FTE students. The program will take place over six consecutive quarters. Classes will be offered in the evening and on weekends, thus enabling students to remain employed while pursuing their degrees. A group of full-time faculty from the UW Business School will support the program. They will bring a wealth of academic, research, and industry expertise to the program and its participants. Administrative and support staff would be provided through existing resources. The proposed budget for the program includes the purchase of additional laboratory equipment and software to support the MSIS.

**ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

A Program Assessment Committee comprised of MSIS faculty, students, and advisory board members will be responsible for program assessment. The committee will evaluate the program's effectiveness, the success of program graduates in finding employment, and the adequacy of resources to support the program. In addition, all students will be surveyed at the end of their program and one year later to assess their perceptions of the market relevance of the program, as well as their self-assessment of the value of their own learning.

In keeping with the UW's diversity goals, the UW School of Business is committed to serving a diverse student population. Given this, the MSIS program will make concerted efforts to attract and retain students from a wide variety of backgrounds.

**REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

The proposal was reviewed favorably by several information systems executives in the Puget Sound area and by David Kroenke, considered one of the leading authorities on data base management. Mr. Kroenke did share a few words of caution: "I would caution you that such a program is difficult to do well. It requires riding the crest of a wave between pure business issues and technology without drowning in either."

In addition, the proposal was reviewed by two other external reviewers who enthusiastically endorsed the proposal: John L. King, dean of the School of Information at the University of Michigan; and Paul Grant, professor of Information Science at Claremont Graduate University. Finally, the proposal was sent to other public baccalaureate institutions. Central Washington University shared its support and best wishes to the UW as it establishes the MSIS.

**PROGRAM COSTS**

The MS in Information Systems would be supported on a self-sustaining basis with funds generated by student tuition and fees. At full enrollment, the annual program costs would be about $1,379,415, or $13,794 per FTE student.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The master's program in information systems would be a viable addition to the UW's School of Business. It responds to an increasing demand for professionals who have advanced training and expertise in technology and business. Finally, the external reviews attest to the high quality of the curriculum and faculty who will be affiliated with the program.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The University of Washington proposal to establish a Master of Science in Information Systems, beginning fall 2001, is recommended for approval, effective July 25, 2001.

# **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

| Master of Science in Architecture<br>University of Washington |
|---|

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### INTRODUCTION

The University of Washington is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval to offer a Master of Science in Architecture (a post-professional degree program in architecture), beginning fall 2001. For many years, the UW has offered a pre-professional bachelor's degree in architecture and a professional master of architecture degree, which prepares graduates for entry-level positions in professional architectural practice.

### PROGRAM NEED

The program recognizes the increasing complexity of architectural knowledge and the fact that life-long learning is now part of every architectural career. The proposal was stimulated by the growing need to serve a variety of audiences:

- individuals with professional degrees seeking advanced education for careers in architectural teaching and research;
- practicing professionals seeking specialized knowledge in a particular area;
- mid-career professionals seeking significant promotions; and
- individuals with architectural degrees seeking careers in related fields, such as design computing, software, or graphics.

Washington State University offers a master's of science degree in architecture with a focus in the areas of culture, environment, and technology. Over the years, the program has remained small, admitting about six students annually. The only other post-professional program on the west coast is offered at the University of California, Berkeley. This program is small as well, serving about 12 full-time students per year.

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the master of science degree in architecture is to make high-quality graduate education available and increase professionals' capabilities in specific technical and management areas.

The program requires completion of 45 quarter credits, including 36 credits of coursework and 9 credits of thesis. It is designed as an "umbrella" program with several focus areas: Design Computing, Design Services Management, and History/Theory/Cultural Studies. This proposal encompasses only the first focus area – Design Computing.

At full enrollment, the program will serve 12 FTE students. It is anticipated that full-time students will complete the program in four or five quarters. The program would be supported essentially through existing resources. New resources are limited to part-time grants for a contract staff position and three part-time research/teaching assistants.

## ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY

The assessment plan for the MS in Architecture describes the expected student learning outcomes and how they will be measured. These outcomes include:
- familiarity with professional practice
- knowledge of the field
- research competence
- graduate placement

The Department of Architecture reports that it is committed to providing a diverse community of scholars that is encouraging and welcoming to all students. Enhancing gender balance and diversity within the faculty, staff, and student body is a high priority. The curriculum has been expanded to include non-Western history, theory, and cultural studies. In studios and seminars, students experience the expression of cultural and social values of their instructors and fellow students.

## REVIEW PARTICIPANTS

The following three external professionals reviewed the proposal. All of them wholeheartedly endorsed the proposal and stressed the high demand for a high-quality advanced degree program architecture.
- Prof. Robin Liggett, Department of Architecture and Urban Design at UCLA
- Prof. Spiro Pollalis, Department of Architecture at Harvard University
- Prof. Trancik, Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell University

The other public baccalaureate institutions reviewed the proposal as well. Central Washington University and Eastern Washington University shared their support for the proposed program and wished the UW every success with its implementation.

## PROGRAM COSTS

The MS in Architecture would be supported through internal reallocation and revenues generated from student tuition and grants. At full enrollment, the graduate program is estimated to cost about $267,828 or about $22, 319 per FTE student.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This proposal will introduce advanced computing technologies in architectural education, and serve the needs of the profession well. The program of study conforms to standards in the field, and it will feature a cadre of excellent faculty. The assessment and diversity plans are suitable for a program of this nature. The costs associated with the MS in Architecture are reasonable.

## RECOMMENDATION

The University of Washington proposal to establish a Master of Science in Architecture, beginning in fall 2001, is recommended for approval, effective July 25, 2001.

# 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

# HECB Legislative Priorities:  2001 Session Report

*July 16, 2001 – Actions Through Second Special Session*

**July 2001**

| Issue | HECB Priority | Legislative Action |
|---|---|---|
| **Enrollment** | 6,594 FTEs, including 500 high-demand enrollment slots for competitive grants | Final budget includes a net biennial increase of 3,575 FTE.  No funds are included for a competitive high-demand enrollment pool, but baccalaureate institutions and the SBCTC are to report annually to the HECB on their use of new enrollments to meet high-demand enrollment needs. |
| **Tuition** | Limit basic tuition increases to three-year average change in per capita personal income (4.9%, 3.9% as of November 2000) | Final budget caps annual tuition increases at 6.7% and 6.1% for public colleges and universities. Higher limits, ranging from 12% to 20% per year, for law and graduate business programs.  Institutions may adjust tuition for time, day, delivery method and campus to encourage full use of facilities. |
| **Faculty salaries** | 10% for biennium for two-year and four-year faculty and staff, with state funding to cover full cost of increase | Final budget includes basic increases of 3.7% for all employees in July 2001.  Second-year raises will be set in 2002.  State funding covers a portion of increases for tuition-supported employees. |
| **Recruitment and retention, CTC increments and part-time faculty** | $25.7 million for all institutions; also, $20 million for CTC part-time faculty and $9.5 million for labor market adjustments at baccalaureates | Final budget provides $7.5 million for CTC part-time faculty equalization and $3.5 million for CTC faculty salary increments.  Baccalaureate recruitment and retention pools are not funded. |
| **State Need Grant** | Total request of $210.8 million, including enhancement for new enrollments, tuition increases, increase service level to 75% MFI and increase grant amounts | Final budget includes $193.2 million, an increase of $25.3 million from 1999-2001.  Funding level based on assumption that students will be served if family income is up to 55% of state median.  Tuition increases and new enrollments covered by state funds. |

| Issue | HECB Priority | Legislative Action |
|---|---|---|
| **Washington Promise Scholarship** | Full funding of two-year scholarship; also, support legislation to place program in statute to serve top 15% of high school graduates and SAT qualifiers | Final budget includes $17 million for scholarships to top 15% of high school graduates in 2001 and 2002, and those who score at least 1,200 on the SAT regardless of class rank. Funding also completes scholarships for 2000 graduates. Current income limit, 135% of MFI, is continued. Scholarships must be used in-state.<br><br>Governor's proposed legislation to place program in statute was not adopted. |
| **State Work Study** | $7.5 million enhancement to add 2,000 students to current total of 9,500 and increase average state earning award by $150 per year | Final budget includes $3 million enhancement to increase state-paid earnings and serve 800 more students. Average earning award would increase by $60, to $1,735. |
| **Capital budget** | • $529 million bonds<br>• $174 million from Education Construction Fund<br>• $230 million other funds | Final legislative capital budget:<br>• $404 million GO bonds<br>• $109 million Education Construction Fund<br>• $127 million other funds. |
| **Institutional eligibility for financial aid** | HECB supported amending statute to make students at additional institutions eligible for financial aid | Legislation to enable students at approximately seven institutions to become eligible for state financial aid was approved by the Senate but not by the House. |
| **College Awareness Project** | HECB was partner in institutional outreach and diversity proposal, with SBCTC, COP and OSPI | Legislation was proposed to earmark approximately $16 million to expand college outreach and diversity initiatives in K-12 schools. The proposal was not approved by legislative committees. |
| **Accountability** | HECB recommendation approved in October | Final budget includes accountability planning process in budget. Institutional plans due to HECB this summer. |

| Issue | HECB Priority | Legislative Action |
|---|---|---|
| **Guaranteed Education Tuition – College Savings Plan** | | On May 7, the Governor signed **HB 2126** into law. Requested by GET Committee and state Treasurer, the new law authorizes a college savings plan to supplement existing pre-paid tuition program. The GET Committee will receive advisory group recommendations in August on the structure of the savings plan. |
| **Eastern Washington University doctorate of physical therapy** | | On May 11, the Governor signed **SB 5921** into law. The measure grants Eastern Washington University the authority to offer a doctorate of physical therapy program subject to HECB approval. |

**TAB 5**

**Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board**

# Washington Public Colleges and Universities
## 2001-2003 Biennium Tuition Update

**Updated July 24, 2001**

The operating budget bill passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor for the 2001-2003 biennium (ESSB 6153) provides the public institutions with the flexibility to set tuition levels within prescribed limits.  Highlights of those limits are:

1.  The governing boards of the baccalaureate institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) may increase full-time tuition (operating fee and building fee) up to <u>6.7 percent in 2001-2002</u> over the amount charged for the 2000-2001 school year.

2.  The governing boards of the baccalaureate institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges may increase full-time tuition up to <u>6.1 percent in 2002-2003</u> over the amount charged for the 2001-2002 school year.

3.  Law and graduate business tuition at all institutions other than the University of Washington may increase up to 12 percent in each of the next two years.

4.  University of Washington graduate business tuition may increase up to 15 percent in 2001-2002 and 20 percent in 2002-2003.

Currently, all the public institutions have set tuition levels for the 2001-2002 school year, and some have set them for the 2002-2003 school year.  The percentage increases that have been adopted are:

### Resident Undergraduate Full-Time Tuition Increases

|  | 2001-2002 | 2002-2003 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| University of Washington | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Washington State University | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Central Washington University | 6.7% | TBD |
| Eastern Washington University | 6.7% | TBD |
| The Evergreen State College | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Western Washington University | 6.7% | TBD |
| State Board for Community & Technical Colleges | 6.2% | TBD |

**Note:  TBD – to be determined**

As indicated above, in 2001-2002 all the baccalaureate institutions increased resident undergraduate full-time tuition up to the prescribed maximum of 6.7 percent. The SBCTC increased tuition by 6.2 percent, less than the maximum allowed. For 2002-2003, three of the six baccalaureate institutions have deferred the decision on tuition rates until later, as has the SBCTC.

## Attachments

Attached are two tables. Table 1 shows state-controlled tuition only (operating fee and building fee). Table 2 displays tuition <u>and</u> services and activities (S&A) fees for the 2001-2003 biennium. The authorized increase for S&A fees is the same as for tuition, but may be treated separately. In other words, although most institutions have elected to increase tuition up to the prescribed limit, some institutions have chosen to increase S&A fees by a lesser amount. The percentage increases for resident undergraduate S&A fees are listed below.

### Resident Undergraduate Services and Activities Fees Increases

|  | **2001-2002** | **2002-2003** |
|---|---|---|
| University of Washington | 3.5% | TBD |
| Washington State University | 5.5% | 5.5% |
| Central Washington University | 6.7% | TBD |
| Eastern Washington University | 6.7% | TBD |
| The Evergreen State College | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Western Washington University | 6.7% | TBD |
| State Board for Community & Technical Colleges | 6.2% | TBD |

**Note: TBD – to be determined**
**Percentage increase for S&A fees is <u>not</u> applied to the bonded debt portion.**

## Other Fees

Each of the institutions sets other fees that must be paid by students (recreation, technology, laboratory, etc.). These fees are not controlled by the budget act and are set by the governing boards and the SBCTC. These other fees are not included in the attachments and are not included in other work that displays tuition and fee comparisons with other states.

**TABLE 1**
**WASHINGTON PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**
**ANNUAL TUITION RATES**
**2001-03 BIENNIUM**

| | Tuition (operating fee plus building fee) | | | | FY01/FY02 % Increase over Prior Year | FY02/FY03 % Increase over Prior Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | | | |
| **University of Washington:** *All Campuses:* | | | | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | $ 3,368 | $ 3,593 | $ 3,812 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Graduate | 5,352 | 5,539 | TBD | | 3.5% | N/A |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 12,060 | 12,868 | 13,652 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Graduate | 13,890 | 14,376 | TBD | | 3.5% | N/A |
| **Washington State University:** *All Campuses:* | | | | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 3,351 | 3,574 | 3,792 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Graduate | 5,353 | 5,541 | 5,735 | | 3.5% | 3.5% |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 10,267 | 10,955 | 11,622 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Graduate | 13,565 | 14,040 | 14,530 | | 3.5% | 3.5% |
| **Central Washington University:** | | | | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 2,490 | 2,658 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| Graduate | 4,199 | 4,482 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 9,741 | 10,395 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| Graduate | 13,500 | 14,406 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| **Eastern Washington University:** | | | | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 2,451 | 2,613 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| Graduate | 4,131 | 4,407 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 9,261 | 9,879 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| Graduate | 12,828 | 13,686 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| **The Evergreen State College:** | | | | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 2,490 | 2,657 | 2,819 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Graduate | 4,200 | 4,481 | 4,754 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 9,744 | 10,397 | 11,031 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| Graduate | 13,497 | 14,401 | 15,279 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| **Western Washington University:** | | | | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 2,490 | 2,655 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| Graduate | 4,200 | 4,482 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 9,744 | 10,398 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| Graduate | 13,497 | 14,400 | TBD | | 6.7% | N/A |
| **Community Colleges:** | | | | | | |
| Residents | 1,476 | 1,568 | TBD | | 6.2% | N/A |
| Nonresidents | 6,294 | 6,686 | TBD | | 6.2% | N/A |

NOTES:   TBD - to be determined

## TABLE 1 (continued)

*Tuition other than undergraduate and graduate are listed below:*

| | Tuition (operating fee plus building fee) | | | | FY01/FY02 % Increase over Prior Year | FY02/FY03 % Increase over Prior Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | | | |
| **University of Washington:** | | | | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | | | |
| Master Professional Accountant | 5,352 | 5,887 | 6,770 | | 15.0% | 20.0% |
| MBA | 5,466 | 6,285 | 7,542 | | 15.0% | 20.0% |
| Law | 5,823 | 6,521 | 7,303 | | 12.0% | 12.0% |
| MD/DDS | 9,140 | 9,752 | 10,346 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | | | |
| Master Professional Accountant | 13,890 | 15,279 | 17,570 | | 10.0% | 15.0% |
| MBA | 14,186 | 15,604 | 17,944 | | 10.0% | 15.0% |
| Law | 14,933 | 16,724 | 18,730 | | 12.0% | 12.0% |
| MD/DDS | 23,691 | 25,278 | 26,819 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| **Washington State University:** | | | | | | |
| **Resident** - DVM | 8,953 | 9,552 | 10,134 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| **Nonresiden**t - DVM | 22,653 | 24,171 | 25,644 | | 6.7% | 6.1% |

**TABLE 2**
**WASHINGTON PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**
**TUITION AND SERVICES & ACTIVITIES (S&A) FEES**
**2001-03 BIENNIUM**

| | Total Tuition and S&A Fees | | | | Total Tuition and  S&A Fees | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 |
| **University of Washington:** | | | | **Washington State University:** | | | |
| *Seattle Campus:* | | | | *All Campuses:* | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | **Resident:** | | | |
| Undergraduate | $ 3,641 | $ 3,872 | $ 4,091 | Undergraduate | $ 3,658 | $ 3,898 | $ 4,134 |
| Graduate | 5,625 | 5,818 | TBD | Graduate | 5,660 | 5,854 | 6,058 |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | **Nonresident:** | | | |
| Undergraduate | 12,333 | 13,147 | 13,931 | Undergraduate | 10,574 | 11,258 | 11,942 |
| Graduate | 14,163 | 14,655 | TBD | Graduate | 13,860 | 14,344 | 14,844 |
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 |
| **Central Washington University:** | | | | **Eastern Washington University:** | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | **Resident:** | | | |
| Undergraduate | 2,838 | 3,024 | TBD | Undergraduate | 2,790 | 2,964 | TBD |
| Graduate | 4,548 | 4,848 | TBD | Graduate | 4,470 | 4,758 | TBD |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | **Nonresident:** | | | |
| Undergraduate | 10,089 | 10,761 | TBD | Undergraduate | 9,594 | 10,224 | TBD |
| Graduate | 13,848 | 14,772 | TBD | Graduate | 13,161 | 14,031 | TBD |
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 |
| **The Evergreen State College:** | | | | **Western Washington University:** | | | |
| **Resident:** | | | | **Resident:** | | | |
| Undergraduate | 2,857 | 3,024 | 3,186 | Undergraduate | 2,834 | 3,015 | TBD |
| Graduate | 4,567 | 4,848 | 5,121 | Graduate | 4,544 | 4,842 | TBD |
| **Nonresident:** | | | | **Nonresident:** | | | |
| Undergraduate | 10,111 | 10,764 | 11,398 | Undergraduate | 10,088 | 10,758 | TBD |
| Graduate | 13,864 | 14,768 | 15,646 | Graduate | 13,841 | 14,760 | TBD |
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | | | | |
| **Community Colleges:** | | | | | | | |
| Residents | 1,641 | 1,743 | TBD | | | | |
| Nonresidents | 6,459 | 6,861 | TBD | | | | |

**NOTES:  TBD - to be determined**

## TABLE 2 (continued)

*Tuition and fees other than undergraduate and graduate are listed below:*

| | **Total Tuition and S&A Fees** | | | | **Total Tuition and S&A Fees** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 |
| **University of Washington:** | | | | **Washington State University:** | | | |
| *Seattle Campus:* | | | | *All Campuses:* | | | |
| Resident Master Prof Accountant | 5,625 | 6,166 | 7,049 | Resident DVM | 9,260 | 9,872 | 10,472 |
| Resident MBA | 5,739 | 6,564 | 7,821 | Nonresident DVM | 22,960 | 24,482 | 25,972 |
| Resident Law | 6,096 | 6,800 | 7,582 | | | | |
| Resident MD/DDS | 9,413 | 10,031 | 10,625 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Nonres Master Prof Accountant | 14,163 | 15,558 | 17,849 | | | | |
| Nonresident MBA | 14,459 | 15,883 | 18,223 | | | | |
| Nonresident Law | 15,206 | 17,003 | 19,009 | | | | |
| Nonresident MD/DDS | 23,964 | 25,557 | 27,098 | | | | |

**Footnotes:**

  **Tuition and fees** include operating fee plus building fee (tuition) and the services and activities fee.

   It does not include technology fees that are charged at all four-year campuses with the exception of WSU and TESC.

 **University of Washington:**

   Services and activities fees for all UW campuses have not been determined for 2002-03.  S&A rates reported here for 2002-03 reflect S&A fees for FY2002.

   Branch campuses' tuition and fees vary from the main campus in the amount of services and activities fee.

# Comparison of FTE Enrollment Proposals for the 2001-2003 Biennium
## Enacted Budget and HECB Recommendation

| | Budget Level FY 2001 | Enacted Budget | | | | | HECB Budget Recommendations | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FY 2002 | Increase 2001/2002 | FY 2003 | Increase 2002/2003 | Biennium Total Increase | FY 2002 | Increase 2001/2002 | FY 2003 | Increase 2002/2003 | Biennium Total Increase |
| **UW** | 34,688 | 34,820 | 132 | 35,146 | 326 | 458 | 35,003 | 315 | 35,388 | 385 | 700 |
| Seattle | 32,266 | 32,321 | 55 | 32,427 | 106 | 161 | 32,391 | 125 | 32,516 | 125 | 250 |
| Bothell | 1,136 | 1,169 | 33 | 1,235 | 66 | 99 | 1,201 | 65 | 1,286 | 85 | 150 |
| Tacoma | 1,286 | 1,330 | 44 | 1,484 | 154 | 198 | 1,381 | 95 | 1,486 | 105 | 200 |
| Pool | | | | | | | 30 | 30 | 100 | 70 | 100 |
| **WSU** | 19,847 | 19,570 | (277) | 19,694 | 124 | (153) | 19,570 | (277) | 20,010 | 440 | 163 |
| Pullman | 17,609 | 17,332 | (277) | 17,332 | - | (277) | 17,332 | (277) | 17,582 | 250 | (27) |
| Spokane | 551 | 551 | - | 593 | 42 | 42 | 551 | - | 616 | 65 | 65 |
| Tri-Cites | 616 | 616 | - | 616 | - | - | 616 | - | 616 | - | - |
| Vancouver | 1,071 | 1,071 | - | 1,153 | 82 | 82 | 1,071 | - | 1,196 | 125 | 125 |
| **CWU** | 7,867 | 7,470 | (397) | 7,470 | - | (397) | 7,470 | (397) | 7,470 | - | (397) |
| **EWU** | 7,864 | 7,933 | 69 | 8,017 | 84 | 153 | 7,964 | 100 | 8,064 | 100 | 200 |
| **TESC** | 3,713 | 3,754 | 41 | 3,837 | 83 | 124 | 3,773 | 60 | 3,901 | 128 | 188 |
| **WWU** | 10,826 | 10,976 | 150 | 11,126 | 150 | 300 | 10,946 | 120 | 11,066 | 120 | 240 |
| **SBCTC** | 123,762 | 125,082 | 1,320 | 126,902 | 1,820 | 3,140 | 126,262 | 2,500 | 128,762 | 2,500 | 5,000 |
| **HECB** | 50 | - | (50) | - | - | (50) | 50 | | 550 | 500 | 500 |
| **Total** | 208,617 | 209,605 | 988 | 212,192 | 2,587 | 3,575 | 211,038 | 2,421 | 215,211 | 4,173 | 6,594 * |

\* Note: The original HECB recommendation was for 7,091 new FTE. Since that time, CWU reduced their request by 497 FTE.

| Total biennium increases: | | | Total biennium increases: | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Four-year | 435 | | Four-year | 1,591 | 1,094 |
| CTC | 3,140 | | CTC | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| HECB pool | - | | HECB pool | 500 | 500 |
| Total | 3,575 | | Total | 7,091 | 6,594 |
| | | | | (original) | (revised) |

# Overview of HECB Projects:  2001-2002

## BACKGROUND

This report provides a brief overview of Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) projects for which substantial work is required during calendar years 2001 and 2002.  This listing does not include descriptions of the ongoing, day-to-day administrative responsibilities of the Board and its staff, such as financial aid administration, enrollment and budget monitoring, and program approval.

Four project categories are described here, (projects are listed in alphabetical order within each category):

1.  Projects required by state law;

2.  Legislative initiatives;

3.  HECB policy and program initiatives related to the Higher Education Master Plan and other Board goals; and

4.  HECB special administrative projects related to ongoing Board responsibilities.

## DESIRED OUTCOME

This is an information item for the Board and interested parties at the HECB meeting on July 25, 2001. No formal action is required.

## A. Projects Required by State Law

| Issue | Project/Product | Due Date | Lead Staff | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Border County Pilot Project** | Report | November 30, 2001 | Patty Mosqueda | Required by RCW 28B.80.807 |
| **Budget Recommendations for 2002 Supplemental Budgets** | Recommendations to Governor and Legislature | November 2001 | Ruta Fanning John Fricke Jim Reed | Required by RCW 28B.80.330 |
| **Budget Recommendations for 2003-05 Biennium** | Develop operating and capital budget recommendations to Governor and Legislature | Guidelines to institutions – December 2001<br><br>Recommendations to Governor and Legislature – November 2002 | Ruta Fanning John Fricke Jim Reed | Required by RCW 28B.80.330 |
| **Cost of Instruction Disclosure** | Information about state support of higher education for colleges to disclose to students | October 2001 | Kathy Raudenbush | Required by RCW 28B.10.044 |
| **Cost Study for Higher Education** | Report on the undergraduate and graduate instructional costs at public colleges and universities | December 2003 | Kathy Raudenbush, John Fricke | Required by RCW 28B.15.070 |
| **Displaced Homemakers** | Biennial report | January 2002 | Brenda Landers | Required by RCW 28B.04.070 |
| **Faculty and Staff Salaries** | Report on peer comparisons | October 2001 | Kathy Raudenbush | Required by RCW 28B.80.350 as component of salary recommendations |
| **Gender Equity** | Report and recommendations on gender equity at public colleges and universities | December 2002 | Doug Scrima | Required by RCW 20B.110.040 |
| **Master Plan for Higher Education** | Develop work plan and timetable for 2004 master plan | December 2001 | Ruta Fanning, Becki Collins, Bruce Botka | Required by RCW 28B.80.330 |
| **Opportunity and Achievement Report** | Plan and execute collaborative research agenda with colleges and universities, leading to legislative policy proposals | Complete research agenda in 2002<br><br>Develop policy proposals for 2003 Legislature | Ruta Fanning and David Sousa | Required by RCW 28B.80.350 |

| Issue | Project/Product | Due Date | Lead Staff | Notes |
|-------|-----------------|----------|------------|-------|
| **Reciprocity** | Report on costs and benefits of various reciprocity agreements | January 10, 2003 | Patty Mosqueda | Required by RCW 28B.15.730-758 |
| **Tuition and Fee Report** | National comparison report | January 2002 | Patty Mosqueda Kathy Raudenbush | Required by RCW 28B.80.330 as component of tuition recommendations |

## B. Legislative Initiatives

| Issue | Project/Product | Due Date | Lead Staff | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Accountability** | Coordinate baccalaureate institutions' preparation of accountability plans, monitor performance and report outcomes | Institution plans due to HECB August 15, 2001<br><br>HECB is to review and report progress annually; next report fall 2001 | David Sousa | Required by 2001-03 operating budget |
| **Alternative Teacher Certification** | Washington Professional Educator Standards Board **may** award conditional scholarships to encourage alternative K-12 teacher certification. HECB would administer program | No date specified | Becki Collins | Scholarships authorized in SB 5695 and 2001-03 operating budget |
| **GET College Savings Plan** | Develop new savings program – advisory group to make recommendations to GET Committee | Recommendations due August 2001 to GET Committee | Betty Lochner | Program framework established in HB 2126 |
| **Grant Administration** | | | | |
| • **Child Care** | New matching grants and report on 1999-2001 projects | New grants to be awarded by November 2001 | Linda LaMar | Required by 1999-2001 and 2001-03 budgets |
| • **Fund for Innovation** | Report on 1999-2001 projects | January 2002 | Linda LaMar | Required by 1999-2001 budget |
| • **Information Technology** | Report on 1999-2001 matching grants | Summer 2001 | Bruce Botka | Required by 1999-2001 budget |
| • **Teacher Training Pilot Projects** | New grants and report on 1999-2001 projects | New grants to be awarded by September 2001 | Elaine Jones | Required by 1999-2001 and 2001-03 budgets |
| **High-Demand Enrollment** | Report outcome of 2000-2001 grants | January 2002 | Bruce Botka | Grants provided in 1999-2001 budget |
| | Coordinate reports from institutions on allocation of 2001-03 enrollments to high-demand projects | Annual reports due from baccalaureate institutions and SBCTC each year | Bruce Botka | Annual reports from institutions required in 2001-03 budget |
| **Migrant Programs (CAMP)** | Disburse grants to students who participate in College Assistance Migrant Programs | No deadlines specified | Becki Collins | Required in 2001-03 operating budget |
| **Promise Scholarship** | Evaluation of Promise Scholarship program | December 1, 2002 | Linda LaMar, Evelyn Hawkins | Required in 2001-03 operating budget |

## C. HECB Policy and Program Initiatives

| Issue | Project/Product | Due Date | Lead Staff | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Competency-based admissions** | Review options to continue project | | Doug Scrima | Project not funded in 2001-03 budget |
| **Facility Utilization Report** | Annual report summarizing efficiency of higher education facility use | March 2002 | Jim Reed | Data are used to estimate capital costs of projected enrollment |
| **GEAR UP** | Establish statewide advisory committee | Fall 2001 | John McLain | Advisory committee and reports required under federal grant |
| | Performance evaluations to federal Education Department | Biennial evaluation December 2001; annual report May 2002 | | |
| **K-16 Coordination** | Sponsor state conference jointly with SHEEO and Education Commission for the States | Fall 2001/ Winter 2002 | Ruta Fanning | |
| **Need Grant Administration** | Work group recommendations on SNG administration | August-September 2001 | Becki Collins | |
| **Transfer and Articulation** | Study of higher education transfer and articulation policies and practices | Scope of study determined by October 2001 | Gary Benson | |

## D.    HECB Special Administrative Projects

| Issue | Project/Product | Due Date | Lead Staff | Notes |
|-------|-----------------|----------|------------|-------|
| **Degree-Granting Institutions Act** | Evaluate current law, rules and administrative procedures.  Prepare report, including any recommendations for improvement. | Fall 2001 | Michael Ball | |
| **Financial Aid Unit Record** | Review the usefulness of current and prospective data elements.  If possible, increase use of technology in the reporting process. | Winter 2002 | Becki Collins Marty Harding | Unit record provides information on student participation in financial aid programs |
| **Higher Education Statistics** | Summary of information about Washington higher education | December 2001 | Patty Mosqueda and Barbara Dunn | Most recent edition published in 1998 |
| **Washington Scholars Program** | Evaluation of student use of scholarships | Winter 2002 | Linda LaMar and Evelyn Hawkins | |
| **Web Site Redesign** | Redesign HECB Web site in conjunction with new site for Hello Network | | Whitney DalBalcon and Barbara Dunn | |

# Tacoma Technology Center:
# Presentation and Discussion

**July 2001**

## BACKGROUND

The 2001 Legislature approved Governor Gary Locke's proposal to create a technology institute at the Tacoma branch campus of the University of Washington. The institute is designed to respond to regional technology needs, particularly in computing and software systems. To create the institute, the final legislative budget includes $4 million, which will be augmented by private donations. As of mid-June, donors had contributed more than $3.7 million. In addition, the budget includes $966,000 to help 12 community and technical college districts prepare students for transfer to the institute.

The budget directs the UW to earmark funding to support at least 99 new full-time enrollments at the institute. It also directs the university to work with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges or individual colleges to establish articulation agreements in addition to existing agreements related to associate transfer degrees. The budget also directs the UW to establish performance measures to recruit, retain and graduate students, including nontraditional students, and to issue a progress report by September 2002.

Community and technical colleges that will participate in the program are Bates Technical College, Bellevue Community College, Centralia College, Clover Park Technical College, Grays Harbor College, Green River Community College, Highline Community College, Tacoma Community College, Olympic College, the Pierce College District (Steilacoom and Puyallup), the Seattle Community College District (North Seattle, South Seattle and Seattle Central), and South Puget Sound Community College.

Impetus for creation of the institute has come from a number of sources, including the Washington Software Alliance and American Electronics Institute, whose studies of the regional technology economy have identified shortages of skilled college graduates to fill available jobs. The WSA recently updated its 1998 Workforce Study, *"Washington State Software Industry Challenges,"* to provide a more current employment picture of the rapidly evolving high-tech sector.

## BOARD MEETING OUTCOME

The presentation and discussion at the HECB meeting on July 25 will include an overview of the latest WSA research and a discussion of the development of the UWT Technology Institute. The discussion is for information purposes; no formal Board action is scheduled.

Participants will include:

- Ken Myer, Workforce Chair, Washington Software Alliance
- Vicky Carwein, Chancellor, University of Washington Tacoma
- Rich Nafziger, former Higher Education Policy Adviser to Governor Gary Locke; currently Workforce Education Director for the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
- Larry Crum, Director of Computing and Software Systems, UWT
- Bill Philip, Chair, UWT Advisory Board
- David Notkin, Boeing Professor and Assistant Chair, UW Department of Computer Science and Engineering
- Jan Yoshiwara, Director for Education Services, SBCTC

**ATTACHMENTS**

Two attachments are included for the Board's information: A briefing document from the UWT, and an opinion column from the *Tacoma News Tribune* by Vicky Carwein.

# University of Washington, Tacoma
## Technology Institute

The University of Washington, Tacoma is moving quickly to build the Technology Institute. Searches have been launched to fill 16 positions. New articulation agreements with community and technical colleges to create a range of pathways for students are in development. Capital planning is moving forward. Fund raising continues to build the private and other non-state support for the Institute. Highlights of progress follow:

**Fund raising:** As the 2001-2003 budget was finalized, private supporters had raised $3.73 million. A campaign to bring private support to at least $7 million is now under way to provide a margin of excellence for the institute. These private funds will support such things as student scholarships and endowed professorships. Whereas much of the funding to date has been raised from visionary individuals and organizations in the South Puget Sound, the next phase of the campaign will concentrate on a wider region to reach companies that rely heavily on employees with strong preparation in the high-tech fields.

**Non-state gifts to date:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Anonymous | $1,000,000 |
| City of Tacoma    (in kind) | 500,000 |
| Pierce County | 500,000 |
| Port of Tacoma | 500,000 |
| Intel | 270,000 |
| Frank Russell Company | 250,000 |
| Jim/Gary Milgard | 250,000 |
| Anonymous | 200,000 |
| Columbia Bank | 100,000 |
| The News Tribune | 50,000 |
| Simpson Company | 50,000 |
| John and Mary Folsom | 25,000 |
| William Kilworth Foundation | 25,000 |
| Anonymous | 10,000 |
| Total | $3,730,000 |

**Faculty and staff searches underway**

- **Faculty recruitment** for at least four positions to begin fall 2002 emphasizes software engineering, systems, networks, database systems and enterprise applications. At least one of these new faculty members will have experience with successful, innovative distance education programs.

- **Staff hires** will include an information specialist, community college coordinators, high school-level coordinators, a senior computer specialist, a multicultural coordinator, internship manager, retention coordinator and instructional support positions.

## Special Mission – Partnerships and Student Support

- An innovative articulation agreement that will provide a pathway for students from Pierce College and Tacoma Community College to the Institute will soon be finalized. This articulation agreement will serve as a model for articulation with community and technical colleges across the state.

- Programs will be developed that focus on outreach to community and technical colleges, as well as to high schools, in order to increase the number of students who consider technology degrees. Special emphasis will be placed on increasing participation by women and people of color. The Institute will create an environment that will encourage and support a diverse student population and will support faculty in developing innovative and inclusive teaching and learning approaches.

- Programs will be developed to support and retain students through the challenging curriculum.

- Internships and other partnership arrangements with industry will be established.

## *The News Tribune, July 3, 2001*

## Creation of technology institute at UW Tacoma is major success story

VIEWPOINT: Legislative budget, public, private fund-raising cap efforts of many to make region center of technological growth

**By Vicky Carwein**
 A year ago today, my colleagues and I at the University of Washington Tacoma had never heard of a technology institute. This week, with the ink just beginning to dry on the state budget that created a technology institute at UW Tacoma, we are in high gear building this wonderful new resource. But I can assure you, success was never assured until that last legislative budget was passed just over a week ago.
 It was a warm July afternoon last year when three members of the governor's staff visited and asked how we might go about building an institute designed to increase the number of workers with bachelor's and master's degrees in technology fields while spreading the prosperity of the tech economy. We gave them some ideas. They liked what they heard.
 Throughout the year, there was a lot of suspense about whether we would be able to build an institute during the next two years as an evenly divided Legislature grappled with one of the most difficult budgets in memory. Would legislators find the funds to match what our donors had pledged to build the kind of institute originally proposed by Gov. Gary Locke? An amazing cast of activists and supporters persevered.
 Our Pierce County contingent of legislators was united, strong and consistent in carrying support for the institute to their legislative colleagues. In addition, they won support for our community and technical college partners, not only to enhance programs on their campuses that will provide the first two years of the institute, but to create other programs that will enhance educational access in our region.
 The winning combination included all our private and public donors. The institute brought $3.7 million in non-state funds to the table - a fact that set this proposal apart from all the others competing for funding this year in Olympia. Their visionary support made the difference. The City of Tacoma not only contributed funds, it spearheaded one of the most amazing teams in history to advocate for the institute. Pierce County and the Port of Tacoma each contributed $500,000, demonstrating an unprecedented level of support for a public-private initiative.
 UW Tacoma received its first-ever $1 million pledge, donated by someone who chooses to remain anonymous. It came in support of the institute. Bill Philip and Herb Simon, community members who led the fund-raising campaign for the institute, not only raised $3.7 million, they have committed to raise a total of $7 million to ensure the institute provides the highest-quality programs from the start. So many others contributed in so many ways. It is this level of teamwork that gives us confidence that the institute will have tremendous success.

One of the really exciting components of the technology institute is our commitment to support all students who are interested in pursing these careers. The institute will reach out to groups of people who have not traditionally participated in the high-technology fields, encourage them to earn UWT degrees and support them along the way.

In particular, there are not enough women and people of color who found opportunities to pursue these kinds of jobs. The institute's strongly stated commitment to encourage women and people of color to pursue tech careers helped attract support from Intel, which provided $270,000, the first gift to the institute.

We are in the process of hiring people who will build partnerships with K-12 schools and community groups in collaboration with our community and technical college partners, to encourage kids to take the math and science courses needed to become leaders in technology fields and to support them along the way. We plan for these programs to become models that can be duplicated across the state and beyond.

Who else will come? Research shows that higher education is the No. 1 economic development tool for attracting high-tech business to a region. We expect the institute will help the South Sound attract new businesses and will spawn start-up companies.

We are also hiring people who will work closely with companies, businesses, federal and other government agencies and the military to place students in internships not only here, in the South Sound, but in the technology core around Seattle and, over time, across the state.

We are also developing mechanisms to ensure the institute stays ahead of the rapid changes characteristic of this industry. U.S. Rep. Adam Smith (D-Tacoma), who makes supporting our region's technology economy a major priority in his work, and U.S. Rep. Norm Dicks (D-Belfair), one of UWT's earliest and staunchest supporters, along with Democratic Sens. Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell, are diligently exploring the great potential for federal partnerships to support the institute. Their support helped put the institute on the map.

As for students, they are already coming. Our computing and software systems program, founded less than two years ago, provides the foundation for the institute. This program grew from 30 students in its first year to 140 in the second. The number of students working toward this degree will more than double over the next two years, as the institute not only provides funding for growth, but allows faculty to enhance the program by providing a range of educational options.

We are beginning to develop the professional master's degree to open in fall of 2002 that will be attractive to students who have bachelor's degrees in fields other than computer science.

During the next two years, we will be able to add enough faculty to not only teach students but who will develop other technology programs. High on the list is some kind of technology-related engineering degree. Like the computing and software systems degree, an engineering degree would be developed in collaboration with the internationally acclaimed faculty in the College of Engineering at the UW's Seattle campus. We are also exploring degree options that will serve students whose two-year degrees are focused on applied technology.

The suspense is over. Our team has won funding for a tremendous resource. The teamwork that led to funding the institute will ensure it thrives.

While our work has just begun, it is really part of a continuum. We are building on the foundation of the most-wired city, where the Chamber of Commerce, business and others have united to form a technology consortium and promote the region as a hotbed of technology growth, and where public and private entities unite to support a vision, just as they did over a decade ago to bring a new campus to Tacoma.

We are also building on the success of the UW Department of Computer Science and Engineering in Seattle. The computer science program is ranked among the top seven in the nation. Department chairman Ed Lazowska has been a tireless advocate for the technology institute, has helped us build our computing programs on this campus and will continue to provide partnerships that will ensure the institute draws the best faculty and produces strong graduates.

There are so many people to thank. I must finally thank our more than 3,000 graduates, who have shown the value of the educational opportunities UWT provides through their good work and contributions, and our hard-working faculty and staff, whose record of offering outstanding educational programs while building a new campus is the bedrock of our success.

With this kind of foundation to build on, I am confident, as we build a technology institute at UW Tacoma, success in many forms will come - to our students, to our region and to our state.

- - -

Vicky Carwein is the chancellor of the University of Washington Tacoma.

# The Evergreen State College - Tacoma

The Evergreen State College (TESC)-Tacoma has been committed to academic access, excellence, and equity through a curriculum based on the concepts of community betterment, capacity building and well-being.  The program is nationally recognized for its exceptional retention rates and graduation of students of color, and for its rate of graduate and professional school acceptance and completion.  In addition, the college has been regionally recognized for excellence. The campus has engaged in constructive partnerships with a variety of community organizations, businesses, and social service agencies, resulting in the following outcomes, among others: negotiated a successful grant with the Intel Corporation to bring the Intel Computer Clubhouse to the Hilltop; modeled a Community Health Fair program; educated the community through a series of Public Service Announcements about environmental toxicity issues in Commencement Bay and the Puyallup River; paraphrased and translated juvenile justice laws for the Korean community; negotiated with Pierce Transit to develop a bus shelter installation program for transit users in the Hilltop; and developed a successful grant through the Unisys Corporation for technology development for TESC.  The campus has now grown from occupying a storefront to a new campus encompassing an entire city block.  Our current community outreach and improvement project is an intergenerational public art collaboration that involves students, scholars, community members and international artists from the Ndebele People of South Africa.

The Tacoma Campus is a diverse community, with students ranging in age from 23 to 64 years old, with the majority of the students in the 25-50 age group.  Eighty percent of our students are working adults who come from Pierce, King, Thurston, and Kitsap Counties.  Fifty-seven percent of the students are people of color, with 40% African American, 8% Latino/Hispanic, 5% Native American, 4% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 4% international students.  Seventh-four percent of the students are female and 26% male.  From our 2001 graduating class, twelve ethnic groups were represented and 14 languages were spoken.  The TESC-Tacoma campus has a retention and graduation rate of 89%, in fact the highest for people of color in the State of Washington.  We believe that one of the main reasons for this outstanding record is our emphasis on cultural advocacy and inclusivity.  Additionally, graduate schools in Social Work, Organizational Development, Law and Education actively recruit our students.  Many of our former graduates occupy significant leadership roles  in neighborhood, city, and state government.  There are nine faculty members, 86% of whom are people of color, with 43% female and 57% male.  Forty percent of the support staff are people of color.

As of January 2001, TESC-Tacoma has a home specifically designed to support the curriculum and related projects, including a Civics and Democracy Lab, Public Health and Environmental Science Labs, Multimedia Resource Center and Computer Lab, and a Commons area to support whole-school gatherings.

# Distance Delivered Bachelor of Arts In Business Administration Consortial Degree Program

**July 2001**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### BACKGROUND

In June 1998, Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, Washington State University, and Western Washington University formed a consortium to design and offer a "consortium-awarded" distance-delivered Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration. This work grew out of a Washington State University proposal for a distance-delivered bachelor's degree in business administration discussed at the May 28, 1998 HECB meeting. The proposal was tabled pending development of a collaborative agreement for the delivery of the program.

Representatives of the public baccalaureate institutions met in June and July of 1998, to work through the issues and roles for collaborative distance delivery of the program. At the July 21, 1998 HECB meeting, the consortium reported that members agreed to:
1. pursue a consortial business degree to be delivered in a distance format by July 1, 2001;
2. jointly request conditional approval from the HECB for WSU to offer its distance-delivered BA in Business Administration as a first step toward the consortial program; and
3. allow all of the participating institutions to contribute courses to the program.

In light of these institutional agreements, the HECB conditionally approved the WSU program on a time-limited basis.

### CURRENT STATUS

WSU continues to deliver the distance BA in Business Administration to both Washington residents and non-residents. During spring semester 2001, a total of 264 students were enrolled in courses. Courses are predominately delivered via the Internet.

The consortium has continued to work toward developing a consortial degree. To date, the participating institutions have accomplished the following:
1. The Policy, Curriculum, and Student Services Committees have been formed.
2. The consortium members have written a vision and mission statement.
3. The core courses have been specified for the consortial degree.
4. The consortium members have identified several remaining tasks, including developing core courses, transfer guides, an annual catalog, and student services.

Two major issues have impeded further progress. The first issue is how to define and award a degree that would maintain the accreditation of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC). NASC awards accreditation only to colleges and universities – not an entity such as a consortium. The second issue involves resource constraints among the consortium members and concern over adding another layer of administrative costs to deliver this type of program.

The consortium reported in its May 2001 proposal to the HECB, *"First, largely due to problems of regional accreditation and the costs of establishing an extra layer of administrative overhead, the concept of a state-based consortium-awarded Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration is an unworkable one for the foreseeable future."* Given this situation, in May 2001, the consortium institutions proposed that, as members of the consortium, each institution should be authorized by the HECB at this time to deliver the BA in Business Administration by distance as a complement to its residential-based baccalaureate program.


## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on discussions with the HECB Policy and Planning Committee, and in keeping with the HECB's program review and approval responsibilities, HECB staff is proposing a series of alternative recommendations for HECB consideration. These recommendations are intended to incorporate the collaborative program guidelines and goals the Consortium adopted for the delivery of a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration: 1) sharing common core business courses; 2) joint development of a transfer guide; 3) coordination of Internet-based courses; 4) joint development of an on-line catalog; and, 5) adding specialized program options.

The following recommendations have been shared with the provosts at the public and independent institutions, the Inter-institutional Committee for Academic Program Planning, the Council of Presidents, and the Washington Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. To date, Central Washington University and Eastern Washington University have declared their support for the alternative recommendations. The University of Washington has indicated it has no objection to the development of a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration offered by a consortium of Washington State public institutions.

1. Extend 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 would automatically convert to permanent approval on July 1, 2003.

2. Grant 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. Each institution would have to complete a program delivery plan. The plan would have to be approved by the HECB by July 1, 2002. Each institution would have to deliver its distance-delivered BA in Business Administration by June 30, 2003. The program delivery plan would have to 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;
   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 that gain conditional approval and implement their programs by June 30, 2003 would be granted permanent approval on July 1, 2003.

3.) 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, or does not initiate its own distance-delivered BA in Business Administration by June 30, 2003, conditional approval would lapse. At a later date, if the institution chose to offer a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, it would have to submit a Notification of Intent to the HECB for consideration.

4.) In the event other public baccalaureate institutions chose to offer a distance-delivered BA in Business Administration, they would have to submit a Notification of Intent to the HECB for consideration.

# 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

**Preliminary Scope and Process of HECB Review
of Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices**

**July 2001**

## BACKGROUND

At its May 30, 2001 meeting, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) took action (Resolution 01-25) to begin a review of current transfer and articulation policies and practices among the community colleges and universities.

This review resulted from the HECB's 2000 Master Plan directive to work with students, faculty and university and college administrators to identify barriers or obstacles to student learning and how institutions would respond to such obstacles. This review identified many potential obstacles; for some, specific plans for corrective action are already underway. Other barriers grew out of confusion or misunderstanding of current law or policy. But many other obstacles stemmed from problems with transfer and articulation.

Specifically, in the review process, stakeholders shared stories about the consequences of ineffective transfer and articulation policies or practices, such as students having to make up courses or take much longer to earn a degree. Other issues on transfer and articulation included:

- The need for a General Education Requirement (GER) Transfer Agreement among the four-year institutions;

- Ensuring the availability of lower-division course work for students attending the branch campuses <u>and</u> the need to reimburse the community and technical colleges for the cost of providing GER or other lower-division courses to students enrolled full-time at the branch campuses; and

- Credit transfer limitations resulting from designating community college courses as part of a technical curriculum.

Concurrent with the review of these reported obstacles, the Board also recognized that numerous transfer and articulation agreements have been and are being developed by various entities within the higher education community. Many of these activities are cooperative direct transfer agreements generated through the Intercollege Relations Commission (ICRC), such as the associate in arts degree and the two associate in science degrees. Other efforts originate through the Inter-institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning (ICAPP) or dual admissions/ concurrent enrollment (e.g., University of Washington and Shoreline Community College). There are also individual institutional initiatives.

While supporting these efforts, the Board also recognized the need to understand these activities and agreements within the overall context of statewide transfer articulation policy and law and to assess how these efforts address the transfer and articulation problems reported to the Board. In this regard, the Board also concluded that quantitative information is needed to fully understand the magnitude and consequences of the transfer and articulation problems, thus allowing remedial efforts to focus on the areas of greatest need.

In response to these needs, a preliminary study framework is presented below. It is important to emphasize that, in accordance with Resolution 01-25, the preliminary study scope will be reviewed and refined through the collaborative study process discussed below.

## PRELIMINARY SCOPE

Four components to the study have been identified.

- A *chronology and summary of transfer and articulation law and policy* needs to be developed and reviewed with appropriate state policy-makers. This review will help clarify legislative intent and expectations concerning transfer and articulation.

- An *inventory of existing transfer agreements and agreements being planned* needs to be developed.

- The study should determine if *system-wide measures or indices of transfer and articulation effectiveness* could be developed and reported. This aspect of the study could include a review of how other states measure transfer and articulation performance.

- The study should identify the "gaps" between (1) existing policies, agreements, and transfer planning efforts and (2) reported problems, then advance *specific recommendations and plans to correct transfer and articulation deficiencies.*

## STUDY PROCESS

One approach to undertaking the study is to establish a Transfer and Articulation Policy and Practices Study Group. This group would be comprised of representatives of the public universities and colleges, the independent institutions, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and the Council of Presidents. The group would be responsible for making the following recommendations:

- Refining and finalizing the study scope

- Reviewing current transfer articulation law and policy

- Compiling the inventory of existing and planned transfer and articulation agreements

- Reviewing possible quantitative measures of transfer and articulation effectiveness

- Recommending changes in policy or other administrative actions to correct existing problems

With respect to timelines, the Board could invite participation and convene the study group in **August 2001**. While the group would need to discuss the specific schedule of the study, initial milestones could be:

- Finalize study scope and schedule – by **October 2001**

- Complete the review of transfer articulation law and policy – by **November 2001**

- Compile the inventory – by **December 2001**

- Review quantitative measures – by **February 2002**

- Develop recommendations and submit final report – by **April 2002**

---

*Discussion Draft*
# 2003-2005 HECB Operating and Capital Budget Guidelines
# For Public Colleges and Universities

---

**July 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. These guidelines 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 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 fiscal environment evolves.

**The HECB's budget principles** reflect the long-standing values of the Board and form the basis to discuss the state's biennial higher education budget. The Board has 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.

- *Link State Tuition Policy and the Funding of Financial Aid Programs*

  These two areas should work together 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 any higher education institution is related primarily 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 <u>preparation, participation, retention, and completion</u> 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 <u>transfer and articulation</u> 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 <u>strengthen the state's economy</u>. 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 <u>connections between K-12 schools and higher education</u>. 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 <u>role and mission</u> 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. 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 talk and meet regularly with the institutions' staff to better understand the proposals that will be included in the formal budget requests.

# HECB Operating Budget Guidelines Options

| **Current Approach** | | **Proposed Approach** |
|---|---|---|
| *2001-2003 Biennium* | | *2003-2005 Biennium* |
| 1. Fully funded carry-forward budget | | **Budget Principles**<br><br>Fully funded carry-foward budget, ample enrollment, financial aid, and compensation |
| 2a. Enrollment (linked)<br>2b. Financial Aid<br><br>3. Outreach, Diversity | SALARY INCREASES NOT PRIORITIZED | |
| 4. Competency-based Admissions<br><br>5. E-learning Technology<br><br>6. Competency-based Degrees<br><br>7. Other Investments | | **Biennial Priorities**<br>1. Student Preparation, Participation, Retention, Completion<br>2. Transfer/Articulation within higher education<br>3. Strengthening the state economy, high-demand programs (not FTEs)<br>4. Re-design K-12 connections, competency-based admissions/degrees |
| **TOTAL:**<br>**Equals ALL Institution Requests** | | **TOTAL:**<br>**Does NOT Equal All Institution Requests** |
| | | Other enhancement proposals, related to an institution's unique role and mission, will be evaluated outside this framework. |

Differences:
1. Salary increases will be included as a budget principle, rather than presented as a separate item.
2. HECB recommendations will be focused on the ongoing budget principles and the 2003-2005 biennium priorities.
3. 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.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Promote the Efficient and Effective Use of Public Resources in Providing a Quality Learning Environment* | 1 | **Unanticipated Repairs and Non-Deferrable Regulatory Compliance**<br>(A) Funding proposals within an omnibus appropriation request to respond to emergent repair and replacement needs potentially arising within the 2001-2003 biennium.<br><br>(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 requires 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. | **100** |
| | 2 | **Critical Repairs**<br>Omnibus appropriation requests whose deferral would jeopardize:<br>1. The ability to operate or occupy campus systems and space<br>2. Compliance with building occupancy codes<br>3. Program accreditation | **98** |
| | 3 | **Minor Improvements and Equipment Acquisitions**<br>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. | **96** |
| | 4 | **Major Replacements, Renovations, and Infrastructure Improvements**<br>Renovation, replacement, or upgrade of existing space or infrastructure needed to sustain an acceptable level of program quality for current or projected enrollment. | **94** |
| *Reaffirm the State's Commitment to Opportunity in Higher Education* | 5 | **Expanded Capacity Projects**<br>Projects which support the enrollment goals of the 2000 Master Plan by creating additional capacity at locations:<br>(A) Where existing enrollment is in excess of instructional space capacity<br><div align="right">Construction Phase Projects</div><div align="right">Design Phase Projects</div><div align="right">Predesign Phase Projects</div>(B) Serving regions/programs of near-term projected enrollment demand in excess of existing capacity<br><div align="right">Construction Phase Projects</div><div align="right">Design Phase Projects</div><div align="right">Predesign Phase Projects</div>(C) Where additional capacity will accommodate longer-term regional/program growth/demand needs<br><div align="right">Construction Phase Projects</div><div align="right">Design Phase Projects</div><div align="right">Predesign Phase Projects</div> | **84 – 92**<br><br><br><br><br>92<br>91<br>90<br><br><br>89<br>88<br>87<br><br><br>86<br>85<br>84 |

## ATTACHMENT A
## HECB CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION MODEL

| MASTER PLAN INITIATIVE | | PROJECT TYPE | SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Support the Delivery of High-Demand Programs* | 6 | **Program Specific Improvements**<br>Improvements (renovation or new construction) needed to house high demand vocational/degree programs | **80-82** |
| | | Construction Phase Projects | 82 |
| | | Design Phase Projects | 81 |
| | | Predesign Phase Projects | 80 |
| *Support Institutional Competitiveness* | 7 | **General Improvements**<br>Improvements (renovation or new construction) or acquisitions needed to support "mission critical" space and infrastructure needs | **76-78** |
| | | Construction Phase Projects | 78 |
| | | Design Phase Projects | 77 |
| | | Predesign Phase Projects | 76 |
| *Prioritize Expenditures Within Recognized Fiscal Constraints* | 8 | **Other Improvements**<br>Line-item projects which could be deferred one biennium without jeopardizing:<br>1. The ability to operate or occupy campus systems and space<br>2. Compliance with building accessibility and occupancy codes<br>3. Program accreditation<br>4. An acceptable level of program quality or facility operations<br>5. Near or longer-term enrollment demand | **74** |

# UWT Student Panel

**Shellie Jo White** is a 2000 graduate of Pierce College Fort Steilacoom who won a UWT Next Step scholarship, which provides a two-year, full scholarship along with funds for books and a stipend to a top student from each of the six community college districts that serve as primary partners with UW Tacoma. A member of the Cherokee Nation, she is 37 years old and married to a staff sergeant at Fort Lewis. They have two children, both entering 8th grade. White is working three-quarter time as Student Life Coordinator in the UWT Office of Enrollment Service and Student Affairs, and attends UWT three-quarter time as a student in the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program, where she is also pursuing an American Humanics certificate in nonprofit management and a minor in human rights. She is a first-generation college student who didn't graduate from high school and has ambitions of continuing her education to the Ph.D. level to become a college president.

**Burke Anderson** is earning a master of education degree. He has 10 years of teaching experience and has taught 6th- and 7th-grade science for eight years. Today, he teaches in the Olympia School District and also coaches high school swimming. Anderson, 39, lives in Olympia with his wife and two boys, ages 8 and 3. "UW Tacoma was precisely the prescription for my next step," he says. He decided on the UW Tacoma Education program after checking out several other colleges and universities in the region, both public and independent. "I haven't had to compromise anything to take this program. It offers everything I need to extend my knowledge and refine my craft."

**Erika Escobar** is a 1999 graduate of Tacoma Community College enrolled in the Business Administration program, where she is pursuing a concentration in international business. She is active in the UWT Marketing Society and Global Business Society, two student groups that provide service to the campus and community. Escobar, 22, intends to apply her degree working for local companies that need assistance exploring potential foreign markets – she will evaluate cultural, economic, social and political considerations to determine the viability of business plans for the region. Born in Columbia, she came with her family to the United States in 1980. Education helped her father become an entrepreneur and her mother become a registered nurse, instilling in her a value for education. Escobar works as an education coordinator for MultiCare, making sure 5,000 employees stay current with CPR and safety-related training.

**Barry Nelson**, 36, managed a pulp mill in Steilacoom that recently closed and is earning a bachelor of science in Computing and Software Systems with re-training assistance through the North American Free Trade Act. He earned a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering in 1990 and is pursuing the CSS degree to embark on a new career path.

# Latino/a Educational Achievement Project (LEAP)
## Advisory Board

**Dr. Lydia Ledesma-Reese**
President
Skagit Valley College, Mount Vernon
Chair, LEAP Advisor Board

**Mateo-Arteaga**
Director, Educational Opportunity Center
Central Washington University, Ellensburg

**Dr. Bernal C. Baca**
Retention Specialist
Yakima Valley Community College, Yakima

**Rodrigo Barron**
Program Supervisor, Migrant and Bilingual
Education
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction,
Olympia

**Alma Chacon**
Principal, Columbia Elementary School
Wenatchee School District, Wenatchee

**Raul de la Rosa**
Migrant Education Specialist
Achievement Technologies, Inc.

**Carlos M. Diaz**
Chief Executive Director
Washington State Migrant Council, Sunnyside

**Norberto Espindola**
Director of Admissions and Recruitment
Heritage College, Toppenish

**Lucy Estrada**
Teacher, Sarah J. Anderson Elementary
Vancouver School District, Vancouver

**Mark Fogelquist**
Teacher, Pioneer Middle School
Wenatchee School District, Wenatchee

**Tatiana Gabriel**
Curriculum Generalist
Northwest Educational Service District, Mount
Vernon

**Guadalupe Gamboa**
Regional Director
United Farm Workers, AFL-CIO, Sunnyside

**Lisa Garcia-Hanson**
Assistant Director, Office of Admissions
Central Washington University, Ellensburg

**Roberto Maestas**
Executive Director
El Centro de la Raza, Seattle

**Sarita McReynolds**
Teacher, Kennewick High School
Kennewick School District, Kennewick

**Enrique Morales**
Assistant Director of Admissions and Recruitment
University of Washington, Seattle

**Elizabeth Padilla Flynn**
Director, Special Programs and Assessment
Pasco School District, Pasco

**Gabriel Portugal**
Teacher, Plymouth Elementary School
Kennewick School District, Kennewick

**Mary Pruitt**
Director, Special Programs
North Franklin School District, Connell

**Jim Rigney**
Coordinator, Migrant and Bilingual Education
Programs
Davis High School, Yakima School District

**Margarita Tobias**
Teacher, Toppenish High School
Toppenish School District

**Vicki Ybarra, RN MPH**
Director, Planning and Development
Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinic, Toppenish

**Norma Zavala**
Teacher, Gatewood Elementary School
Seattle School District, Seattle

---

**Ricardo Sanchez**
LEAP Director, Seattle

**LEAP is an initiative of the
Concilio for the Spanish Speaking**
115 N. 85th Street, Suite 200
Seattle, WA 98103
Concilio@nwlink.com

**Samuel Martinez,** Chair, Board of Directors
**Raquel Orbegoso,** Executive Director

# NOTIFICATION OF INTENT
## Status Report

**July 2001**

## INTRODUCTION

In January 2001, the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted the revised *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval and Review* to expedite and improve the process for the institutions and the HECB. 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 through a combination of delivery methods.

The process requires that institutions 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 through a combination of delivery methods. If there is controversy, the HECB will employ its dispute resolution process.

## STATUS REPORT

From January 1, 2001 through July 15, 2001, the HECB executive director has approved the following existing degree programs in accordance with the NOI process.

| Institution | Degree Title | Locations | Approval Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| CWU | M.Ed. Master Teacher | SeaTac  Wenatchee  Yakima  Steilacoom   Moses Lake | April 11, 2001 |
| CWU | BA Education/Elementary | SeaTac | July 11, 2001 |
| UW | MS Applied Math | Distance Delivery | May 25, 2001 |