



STATE OF WASHINGTON
HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

917 Lakeridge Way • PO Box 43430 • Olympia, Washington 98504-34310 • (360) 753-7808 • TDD (360) 753-7809

DRAFT PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Seattle Marriott SeaTac
3201 S. 176th Street, Seattle, Washington 98188
July 15, 1999

Approximate Times **Tab**

7:30 a.m. **Board Breakfast and Meeting Overview**
(No official Board action will be taken at this time.)

Welcome and Introductions

- Bob Craves, HECB Chair

Adoption of May HECB Meeting Minutes **1**

WORK SESSION: Master Plan 2000 for Higher Education

- Master Plan draft recommendations: MP Outline **2**
(Resolution 99-25)

12:00 Lunch *(no official Board action will be taken at this time.)*

1:00 p.m. **Public Comment on Draft Master Plan Recommendations 2000**

Implementation of Legislative Programs

- HECB staff briefing and grant-approval process proposal **3**

(Resolution 99-27)

State Need Grant Rules Amendment **4**
(Resolution 99-26)

Promise Scholarship, Draft Rules Outline **5**

Masters in Teaching, Briefing **6**

Running Start Program: Emergency Rules **7**

- HECB staff briefing

Rural Areas Study, Final Report	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HECB staff briefing (Resolution 99-22) 	
Higher Education Accountability Initiative, Update	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HECB staff briefing (Resolution 99-23) 	
WSU Spokane: Management Plan and Program Plan	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HECB staff briefing (Resolution 99-24) 	

CONSENT AGENDA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Ed. in Business and Marketing Education, CWU SeaTac Center (Resolution 99-19) 	11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS, Extended Degree Program in WA, OR, ID – WSU (Resolution 99-20) 	12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS in Computer Engineering, WSU Spokane (Resolution 99-21) 	13

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

- Update on Guaranteed Education Tuition program
- Promise Scholarship

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

1999 HECB Meeting Schedule

<i>DAY/DATE</i>	<i>TYPE</i>	<i>TENTATIVE LOCATION</i>
August	No meeting	
Sept. 15 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	Olympia
Oct. 27 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	UW, Seattle
November	No meeting	
Dec. 1 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	TBD

**HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 26, 1999**

HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair
Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair
Mr. David Shaw, Secretary
Mr. Jim Faulstich
Mr. Larry Hanson
Ms. Kristianne Blake
Dr. Frank Brouillet
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn

HECB Staff

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director
Ms. Linda Schactler, Deputy Director
Mr. Bruce Botka, Dir. Governmental Relations
Dr. Kathe Taylor, Associate Director
Mr. Jim Reed, Associate Director
Ms. Parker Lindner, Senior Policy Associate
Ms. Linda LaMar, Senior Policy Associate

Introductions

Mr. Bob Craves, HECB Chair, welcomed meeting participants, initiated Board introductions, and congratulated staff for a quick turn-around on the Washington Promise scholarship.

Mr. Marc Gaspard, executive director, provided an update on the Guaranteed Education Tuition (GET) program. The yearly period for the sale of individual units will end on June 30, 1999, after which the units will be re-priced. Susan Patrick has assumed the role of acting director for this program.

Mr. Craves, recognizing that these are two very important programs, suggested that subsequent board meetings include updates on the latest numbers for the GET program and the Promise Scholarship Program.

Minutes of May 26, 1999, Meeting

<p>Dr. Frank Brouillet moved for approval of the minutes as recorded. Mr. Larry Hanson seconded. The minutes were approved.</p>

WSU Tri-Cities

Dean Larry James discussed the changes occurring in the campus. The WSU campus sits at the center of a multi-cultural community and requires close working partnerships with Columbia Basin College. One good example is a community scholarship program where, with one application, a student gets admitted to Columbia Basin College for the first two years, and completes the remaining two years at WSU Tri-Cities. Dean James reported seeing an increase both in the traditional-age students, along with the older working students who take evening courses.

MASTER PLAN

Mr. Gaspard introduced the discussion and provided a brief overview of the Master Plan process and timeline. Ms. Linda Schactler, HECB deputy director, and Ms. Parker Lindner, senior policy

associate, reviewed for Board action two policy papers: enrollment goals and e-learning definitions.

On enrollment goals

Dr. Chang Mook Sohn asked why the 2020 enrollment number is only 35K more than 2010, seeming to imply a student population growth much slower than the US population growth. Mr. Gaspard clarified that the numbers are based on OFM studies of cohorts ages 17 to 25. The figures indicate the greatest increase between now and 2010, then levels off and increases only slightly until 2020. For the Master Plan, staff suggests using a range rather than a single specific number to reflect the Master Plan enrollment goals.

Ms. Blake suggested setting goals in terms of participation rate as opposed to a numeric goal. She also wanted to know if there are other things that will affect an increase in the participation rates. She said it is difficult to support the goal of increasing participation without knowing how or where it will come about. Dr. Selby concurred.

There followed a discussion on upper-division enrollment. Dr. Selby asked whether the Board would formulate strategies to reach the enrollment goal. Mr. Faulstich remarked that optimization of resources was implied in the resolution. Ms. Blake pointed out that some of our programs, like the Promise Scholarship, actually encourage lower-division work. Mr. Craves said that it is ultimately the students' choice. If there are jobs available that do not require a four-year degree, then the students will probably not go higher than a two-year degree. The question is, what could motivate students to pursue upper-division education? Ms. Blake suggested that four-year scholarships would be one incentive.

On e-learning

The board discussed e-learning, including the need to standardize definitions, to distinguish between site-based and distance learning programs, transferability of e-learning credits, and what data to collect. The Board acknowledged that much still has to be learned and researched as e-learning continues to change and grow.

Dr. Selby suggested focusing also on moving to an outcomes-based system of performance standards, how institutions provide this, and how students achieve it.

Mr. Hanson remarked that e-learning needs to be tracked because it will have an impact on infrastructure, but agreed that the focus of the Master Plan should be on outcomes.

ACTION: Ms. Gay Selby moved for consideration of Resolution 99-10 on enrollment goals. Mr. Larry Hanson seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

ACTION: Mr. David Shaw moved for consideration of Resolution 99-17 on e-learning. Ms. Kristi Blake seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.
--

MASTER PLAN POLICY PAPERS

Mr. Jim Faulstich, member of the Master Plan subcommittee, talked about the recently concluded stakeholder meetings and summarized some of the main ideas that have come out of those meetings. Mr. Gaspard described the role of the advisory group and introduced the five policy papers for discussion.

Non-traditional providers - This paper recognized other non-public providers that were not considered in the last Master Plan. These are schools that cater to the “convenience” market, and that offer job-related and skills-centered programs. Some of the institutions the HECB surveyed to determine future growth of these institutions projected “unlimited” growth, with plans to “respond to the market as needed.”

E-learning - Ms. Lindner discussed the results of an ongoing survey on distance providers, and the difficulty of getting hard data at this point. Out of 277 institutions surveyed, 77 have responded thus far. Two schools reported significant numbers: Portland Community College and City University.

Washington leads the nation in the use of information technology to deliver services to citizens and improve government operation.

Board member question and comments:

Bob Craves: If a state school offered an on-line course, do they set up the criteria? And are those credits then incorporated into the overall course workload? (Answer: yes)

Gay Selby: Does the transcript distinguish between distance and others. Does the tuition vary? (Answer: Variable to institutions.)

Dr. Frank Brouillet: What would encourage faculty to use e-learning technology? (Answer: Some faculty *already* are exploring with e-learning technology, but are concerned about how to incorporate it in existing or new curriculum without additional time and training.)

Bob Craves: Nowhere are you suggesting any kind of regulation, and I agree with that.

Kristi Blake: I'd like to see a statement about fiscal impact. We need to take a stand, to recognize that we are swapping capital for operation.

Capacity - Mr. Jim Reed, HECB associate director, discussed the subcommittee's recommended goal of 22 average weekly hours of classroom utilization by 2010 for the four-year institutions, and 24 average hours weekly by 2020 for two-year and four-year institutions. These goals work in conjunction with other capacity-related goals.

Mr. Hanson, member of the Capital subcommittee, stated that part of the challenge is how to use existing capacity on campuses that are not near place-bound students.

Dr. Selby commented that an increase of 2 hours in average weekly utilization during a 20 year period is far too modest. She mentioned that Florida and California are at 30 hours of weekly utilization currently. Mr. Hanson pointed out that system-wide, those two hours drive huge

numbers. Mr. Reed reminded the Board that the rooms are used for some other purposes as well. Dr. Chang Mook Sohn requested cost saving hours to reflect the proposed increased utilization.

Enhancing Access - To answer the policy question, “How can the state help its citizens efficiently and effectively achieve their education goals?” Dr. Kathe Taylor, HECB associate director, presented current articulation practices/policies (admissions, entry-level placement, remedial education, dual credit, and transfer) that affect students’ transitions across and through the K-12, community and technical colleges, and baccalaureate sectors. She also suggested that the HECB consider ways of expanding outreach services to provide better information to all prospective students and enhance the likelihood they would gain access to college.

Affordability - HECB policy associate Linda LaMar discussed some of the strategies the state can use to enhance the affordability of postsecondary education, including the issue of state support for students who choose nontraditional education pathways.

Public Comments on the Master Plan

- Wendy Rader-Konofalski, WA Federation of Teachers, presented WFT’s position paper on flexibility and change, and expressed the union’s commitment to working with the HECB on the future of higher education.
- Jane Sherman, WSU, commented that a 20-percent increase in capacity is significant. WSU is experiencing increased class utilization, but use classrooms in different ways, which may reduce capacity to some degree. On e-learning residency credits, she stated that institutions define the student’s previous work, and set the standards from there.
- Fred Campbell, UW, acknowledged the built-in dilemma of thinking in terms of student-based education; of making the institutions more efficient, but going against wishes of students. He spoke about a need for a new compact among the institutions and the HECB.
- Niel Zimmerman, EWU, acknowledged that institutions need to use their classrooms better, but didn’t think we should compare Washington State utilization rates to California. On competency-based education, he asked what the advantage would be to what we are moving away from, noting “The current system is common within states, even with its problems.”
- David Dauwalder, CWU, expressed his concern regarding the proposed increased in classroom utilization, specifically the adjustments e-learning will bring. We may achieve our goal of access, but e-learning will bring changes to the capacity issue.

Comments from Pat Callan

Mr. Callan, President of the National Center for Public Policy & Higher Education, and serving as an independent consultant on the Master Plan process, commented on the preliminary research and initial findings of staff.

He described the higher education environment nationally, identifying the large increase in the demand for postsecondary education and education opportunity as critical issues for all states. Education and training have become necessary for middle class life; not participating in higher education means not being able to compete in the job market. A critical question is being able to provide the same level of opportunity given in the ‘70s.

Some general suggestions regarding the Master Plan:

- Resist the temptation to make a plan for the *last* ten years. Don't repeat what you didn't like.
- Focus on four or five key issues that are interrelated.
- Think back to the end point. Where do you want to be? Who's going to be served? How served? How many? How do you want it to look? Outcomes: people who are served and how well they are served.
- Think in terms of the responsibility of all parties: taxpayers, institutions, students, etc. No single party can provide all the solutions.
- Don't make it too detailed, or prescriptive, not too mired in detail or too process oriented. Accountability needs to be in terms of results, how we urge the state to spend public money.
- Set attainable but challenging goals.
- Build on your strengths.

More specific comments:

- **Capacity** - HECB goals are quite modest. Hold Friday classes for more capacity utilization.
- **E-learning** - Think of technology as not providing a simple answer. It will help address the cost question for students although there will be initial huge up-front costs. Cost per student must go down.
- **Costing** - Cost issue is critical. Bring unit cost down. Less capital intensive or less labor intensive or both.
- **Access** - Encourage more of the kind of thinking that established the Running Start program and the branch campuses.
- **Affordability** - is a critical factor. Resources are usually given to those who are already going to college so it automatically excludes low-income students who can't even get started.

(To find out more about the Master Plan and the policy papers, visit our website at www.hecb.wa.gov)

Disposition of Spokane Center

In 1998 the Legislature asked the Board to evaluate the need for the Spokane Center, which houses most of EWU's programs in Spokane. In view of the Center's strategic location, acquisition cost, estimated replacement value, and projected enrollment and utilization levels, staff recommended that the state retain ownership of the facility. Staff also recommended that EWU and the Spokane Community College District evaluate the feasibility of sharing available instructional space in the Center and that the findings be reported to the HECB by Oct. 1, 1999.

ACTION: Dr. Gay Selby moved for consideration of Resolution 99-16. Mr. Bob Craves seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.
--

WSU Management Plan for the Riverpoint Higher Education Park

A letter from Samuel Kindred, WSU Vice President for Business Affairs, requested a one-month extension (up to July 1, 1999) of the deadline for submittal of the management plan for the

Riverpoint campus. The plan will incorporate the results of a needs assessment that will not be available until June 1.

ACTION: **Mr. Larry Hanson** moved for consideration of Resolution 99-18. **Dr. Frank Brouillet** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Legislative Session

Bruce Botka, Director for Governmental Relations, discussed the HECB's legislative priorities, which includes 19 new and expanded assignments.

Student Panel

A panel of students from WSU Tri-Cities shared their thoughts on higher education. Asked what the HECB can do to encourage enrollment in upper-division courses, students offered a variety of suggestions:

- Better information to students that education is available,
- Full use of branch campuses and
- Use of technology for place-bound and under-served communities, as well as outreach to underrepresented students.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-10

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board believes there are many paths Washington State citizens may follow in order to achieve their postsecondary education goals; and

WHEREAS, Those education goals might result in a certificate, skill-set, or degree; might occur at a public or private institution, or at a two- or four-year institution; or might occur entirely in an electronic format; and

WHEREAS, Enrollment is the common measure of participation in postsecondary education activities in this and other states; and

WHEREAS, The state's higher education enrollment can be established in terms of the participation rate of Washington citizens in higher education compared to similar measures of those in other states; and

WHEREAS, The higher education aspirations of Washington citizens are likely equal to, or greater than that of their counterparts across the nation; and

WHEREAS, Long-term projections of the state's population will fluctuate over time as will other states' participation rates and other factors used in enrollment projections;

WHEREAS, Since the 1996 Master Plan, the State has made good progress toward Master Plan enrollment goals to maintain the current participation rate for lower-division higher education, and for upper-division and graduate/ professional levels to achieve the national-average participation rate by 2010 and the 70th percentile nationally by 2020;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, In order to provide as complete picture as possible of postsecondary education in the state, the Board's Master Plan for the state to the extent possible should reflect the variety of providers and their contribution to postsecondary education in the state; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The HECB should maintain enrollment goals articulated in the 1996 Master Plan: to maintain the current high participation rate goal for lower-division enrollment, and to achieve the national average participation rate by 2010 and the 70th percentile nationally by 2020 for upper-division and graduate/ professional enrollment.

Adopted:

May 26, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-14

WHEREAS, RCW 28B.80.330 directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to prepare a comprehensive Master Plan for postsecondary education and to submit this plan to the Legislature every four years; and

WHEREAS, The HECB is now preparing the aforementioned Master Plan for submittal to the Legislature in January 2000; and

WHEREAS, The HECB has determined that the 2000 Master Plan will include recommendations on methods to maximize the enrollment capacity of instructional space at the public institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, The HECB has, at its meeting of May 26, 1999, reviewed the recommendations contained in Master Plan Policy Paper #4-A: Capacity, and concurs in the recommendations contained therein;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That for the public four- and two-year sectors, it is recommended that:

1. The Board adopt the utilization goal of 22 average weekly hours of classroom station utilization by 2010 for the four-year institutions and 24 average hours weekly by the year 2020 for two-year and four-year institutions; and
2. The Board incorporate an e-learning assumption of 1.5 weekly lecture and lab hours by 2010, and 2 hours by 2020, and monitor this utilization on an annual basis with capacity estimates adjusted accordingly.

For the public four-year institutions, it is recommended that:

3. (a) All capital projects currently being planned, designed, and constructed should be funded and completed to create classroom and class lab capacity needed to accommodate 2010 enrollment goals; and
(b) Additional office, student-support space, and other infrastructure enhancements will be needed on the campuses of the four-year institutions to accommodate enrollment growth.
4. The Master Plan recommend enrollment policies to fully utilize excess available capacity at upper-division institutions in eastern Washington; and
5. On-going planning efforts be funded to promote upper-division access opportunities in the Puget Sound area.

For the community and technical colleges, it is recommended that:

6. The Board request the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) to re-examine its current 10-year capital plan in view of the projected enrollment and space shortages within the community and technical college system, and to advise the Board on how the SBCTC capital budget process and priorities will address lower-division enrollment demand in high population growth regions.

Adopted:

May 26, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-16

WHEREAS, Substitute Senate Bill 6655 directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in Eastern Washington and the Spokane area and continue to provide the highest quality for students; and

WHEREAS, this Legislative directive called for each institution to prepare and submit a long-term program plan for the Spokane area for HECB review and approval and for the HECB to adopt recommendations concerning the disposition of the EWU Spokane Center facility; and

WHEREAS, the HECB did adopt Resolution 99-09 at its meeting of April 14, 1999 which approves the continuation of most programs currently offered by EWU in Spokane at its Spokane Center facility.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that in view of the Spokane Center's strategic location, acquisition cost, estimated replacement value, and projected enrollment and utilization levels it is the recommendation of the HECB that the state retain ownership of the facility; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in view of the highly efficient use of the Spokane Center instructional space by the University in the afternoon and evening hours, that EWU and the Spokane Community College District evaluate the feasibility of sharing available instructional space in the Spokane Center and that the findings of this evaluation be reported to the Board by October 1, 1999.

Adopted:

May 26, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Director

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-17

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is directed by statute [RCW 28B80.330(3)] to prepare a Master Plan for higher education in the state and the next update is to be presented to the Legislature in 2000; and

WHEREAS, The use and application of electronic learning technologies will have a significant effect on the development of higher education in the next century; and

WHEREAS, An integral part of the Master Plan will be recommendations for integration of Electronic Learning (E-learning) technologies into the planning process; and

WHEREAS, Establishment of common definitions for these technologies and their applications is required for planning, coordination, and evaluation.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board, will utilize the definitions in Policy Paper #3, "The Use of Electronic Technology in Delivering Post-Secondary Education" as common terms for the purposes of developing the Master Plan.

Adopted:

May 26, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Director

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 99-18

WHEREAS, In 1998 the Legislature, through SSB 6655, directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area, and continue to provide the highest quality education for students; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature directed responsibilities to the HECB, EWU, and WSU for refocusing public higher education in the greater Spokane area; and

WHEREAS, In that bill (SSB 6655) the Legislature specifically directed that Washington State University

“..By December 1, 1998....shall develop and deliver to the higher education coordinating board for approval a plan for the management of the Riverpoint Higher Education Park, excluding the land and the Spokane Intercollegiate Research and Technology Institute, that includes:

- (i) Capital facilities maintenance and development;*
- (ii) Coordination of upper-division course offerings; and*
- (iii) The coordination of graduate programs in Spokane.”*

WHEREAS, The Legislature further stipulated that plan shall incorporate, but not be limited to “...(i) Relocation of all Spokane-based upper-division and graduate course offerings and academic programs offered by public universities in the city of Spokane to the Riverpoint Higher Education Park, using existing and planned structures at the Riverpoint Higher Education Park, except that the nursing courses and programs located in the intercollegiate center for nursing education facility shall remain at that location”; and

WHEREAS, In December 1998, at the request of Eastern Washington University, the HECB agreed to extend to April 1, 1999, the findings of the Spokane program review of Eastern Washington University, and moved the due date of the Riverpoint management plan to June 1, 1999, so that WSU could incorporate in the management plan the findings of the EWU program review; and

WHEREAS, Washington State University Vice President for Business Affairs, Samuel L. Kindred, On May 18, 1999, requested an extension of the submittal date for the Riverpoint management plan to July 1, 1999.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby approves the request of Washington State University to extend the submittal date of the WSU Management plan for the Riverpoint Higher Education Park to July 1, 1999.

Adopted:

May 26, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Director

David Shaw, Secretary

Draft Master Plan Goals, Strategies, and Initiatives

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

State law [RCW 28B.80.330(3)] directs the HECB to prepare *a comprehensive master plan that includes but is not limited to:*

- a) *Assessments of the state's higher education needs...*
- b) *Recommendations on enrollment and other policies and actions to meet those needs;*
- c) *Guidelines for continuing education, adult education, public service, and other higher education programs.*

The statute further identifies the primary audience for this plan as the Legislature and governor, to whom the HECB is directed to submit the plan by January 1, 2000.

In September 1998 HECB Chair Bob Craves appointed a Master Plan subcommittee to organize and direct the work involved in the creation of the 2000 Master Plan. The Master Plan subcommittee members are Bob Craves, Gay Selby, Anne Ramsay-Jenkins, and Jim Faulstich. The Board approved a process for developing the Master Plan in December 1998; in January the Board held a planning session to discuss members' visions and goals for the plan.

Since January, the subcommittee has met in communities across the state with a wide variety of higher education "stakeholders." And the subcommittee itself has met regularly with staff to assess and direct the development of the plan, including the development of policy papers designed to discuss and analyze in-depth, the issues central to the Master Plan. The Board has considered several such papers at each of its regular Board meetings since January. The Board meetings also have given the public at large and institutions the opportunity to comment on the papers. In May, the Board began a series of meetings of a diverse advisory committee, which meets on-line one week per month to discuss topics central to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan Profile. The Board intends the 2000 Master Plan to be a strategic plan that presents policy makers with specific, concrete proposals for enhancing the quality, effectiveness, and availability of postsecondary education in Washington state. In addition, the Board has stated that the Master Plan should build upon prior Master Plans, and upon the work of the Governor's 2020 Commission on the Future of Higher Education. The Board has insisted on an open and inclusive process, sensitive to its statutory role to represent the "broad public interest in higher education, above the interests of individual institutions."

Master Plan Recommendations Table.

The table that follows contains in *outline form* three levels of draft Master Plan recommendations:

- **Policy Goals:** Three major recommendations that summarize the vision for higher education presented by this Master Plan.
- **Strategies:** Primary objectives that characterize each policy goal.
- **Specific Initiatives:** Specific steps that should be taken in order to effect the strategy and policy goal to which each is linked.

At its July 15 meeting, the Board will have the opportunity in a morning work session to discuss and revise each recommendation area, to suggest additional recommendations, or to delete some presented in the table. At the end of the work session, if the Board has agreed upon draft recommendations, the next step in the development of the Master Plan will be to refine and flesh out each category of recommendations; estimate the cost or cost-avoidance associated with each; and draft language to support the recommendations. This more fully developed Master Plan is the document that the subcommittee would review and discuss in a series of public meetings this fall. And it would go before the Board in September for review and discussion.

DRAFT MASTER PLAN GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The purpose of this plan is to place the interests of learners at the center of higher education decision-making, so that Washington citizens can 1.) take advantage of career opportunities in this state; 2.) thrive in an increasingly technological, knowledge-based world; and 3.) enjoy an improved quality of life in their communities across the state.

DRAFT GOALS	STRATEGIES	SPECIFIC INITIATIVES
<p>POLICY GOAL #1:</p> <p>PLACE THE INTERESTS OF LEARNERS AT THE CENTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION DECISION-MAKING.</p>	<p>a. Award academic credentials based on what people know and are able to do.</p>	<p>a. -1) Establish fundamental student learning outcomes for statewide-transfer associate degrees and for baccalaureate degrees.</p> <p>a.-2) Establish a statewide credit clearing-house for prior learning.</p>
	<p>b. Link high school achievement to post-secondary opportunity.</p>	<p>b.-1) Create a two-year scholarship for all students who pass the certificate of mastery.</p> <p>b.-2) Align college admissions standards with K-12 school reform by creating competency-based admissions standards.</p>
	<p>c. Accommodate new ways of learning, particularly e-learning.</p>	<p>c.-1) Align financial aid programs with new learning patterns and systems.</p> <p>c.-2) Identify state and institutional rules and processes that are impediments to student articulation among sectors, institutions, and learning-delivery modes; identify strategies to eliminate such impediments; pilot two “barrier-free zone” projects that allow student cohorts to proceed toward a degree free from impediments.</p>
	<p>d. Keep college affordable.</p>	<p>d.-1) Clearly explain and obtain support for funding to meet board goals for financial aid (SNG and SWS) funding for the state’s neediest citizens.</p> <p>d.-2) Implement tuition policy that is affordable and predictable.</p>

DRAFT MASTER PLAN GUIDING PRINCIPLES

DRAFT GOALS	STRATEGIES	SPECIFIC INITIATIVES
<p>POLICY GOAL #2:</p> <p>ENHANCE QUALITY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND PRODUCTIVITY IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION.</p>	<p>a. Focus on quality undergraduate teaching and learning.</p>	<p>a.-1) Incorporate e-learning technologies into the traditional learning culture by supporting inter-institutional faculty/staff training, and providing incentives for e-learning curriculum/program excellence and innovation.</p> <p>a.-2) Establish student learning outcomes as “accountability measures”; monitor and report institutional performance in the area of student learning; earmark postsecondary education innovation resources to strategies demonstrated to improve student learning outcomes.</p> <p>a.-3) Reward and recognize as “Centers of Excellence” undergraduate programs for which institutions provide compelling evidence of uniqueness, high performance, or unusual excellence.</p> <p>a.-4) Recognize and reward faculty who demonstrate a high priority on student learning through their teaching and active involvement of undergraduate students in basic and applied research.</p> <p>a.-5) Determine the capacity and desirability of faculty to absorb additional undergraduate teaching workload; if warranted, link faculty salary increases to increases in productivity.</p>
	<p>b. Enhance the ability of institutions to compete in an increasingly complex and global marketplace.</p>	<p>b.-1) Identify institutional and state rules and processes that are impediments to entrepreneurial initiatives; if warranted, pilot an “<i>entrepreneurial</i>” project in which institutions would be able to meet student demands free from such impediments.</p> <p>b.-2) Create incentives for institutions to develop public and private partnerships, particularly those to start or expand programs likely to experience high employment demand and market demand in the future.</p> <p>b.-3) Give priority in HECB budget recommendations to institutional initiatives that reprioritize functions and reinvest resources.</p> <p>b.-4) Target state-funded enrollments to programs likely to experience high employment and market demand in the future.</p> <p>b.-5) Compensation strategies for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ institutional peers comparisons ▪ market and merit ▪ links to teaching or other workload ▪ cost-of-living allowances ▪ recruitment and retention
	<p>c. Minimize future capital costs.</p>	<p>c.-1) Assess the need for investment in <i>new</i> higher education construction, assuming optimal use of existing buildings.</p>

DRAFT MASTER PLAN GUIDING PRINCIPLES

DRAFT GOALS	STRATEGIES	SPECIFIC INITIATIVES
<p>POLICY GOAL #3: MEET THE DEMAND FOR COLLEGE EDUCATION.</p>	<p>a. Produce additional capacity to serve future students through the broadest possible range of means for delivering postsecondary education.</p>	<p>a.-1) Clearly explain and obtain legislative support for HECB enrollment goals.</p> <p>a.-2) Explore, support, and inform citizens about the use of alternative learning pathways, particularly e-learning opportunities.</p> <p>a.-3) Help students make efficient progress toward their higher education goals through a wide range of educational choices, better academic advising, scheduling, e-learning and other strategies.</p>
	<p>b. Enhance higher education opportunity in under-served communities.</p>	<p>b.-1) Complete a pilot project in a selected rural area to evaluate unique education needs of residents, and identify effective ways of reaching learners that can be duplicated throughout the state’s rural areas.</p> <p>b.-2) Give priority to institutional budget requests that show high levels of collaboration among education providers and sectors.</p> <p>b.-3) Redesign financial aid programs to respond to the unique needs of learners in under-served areas.</p>
	<p>c. Use public buildings to the fullest extent possible.</p>	<p>c.-1) Schedule classes more efficiently and change the <i>location</i> of contact hours through e-learning.</p> <p>c.-2) Create incentives for faculty to teach and students to attend classes at traditionally under-utilized times and places.</p> <p>c.-3) Promote shared use of buildings among institutions and sectors.</p>
	<p>d. Make Washington citizens active consumers of the knowledge, advantages and resources of postsecondary education.</p>	<p>d.-1) Create a “Users’ Guide” to Washington post-secondary education to inform citizens how to access the college opportunities available to them.</p> <p>d.-2) Create and communicate to learners the existence of a one-stop higher education e-learning information site.</p>

RESOLUTION NO. 99-25

WHEREAS, State law [RCW 28B.80.330(3)] directs the HECB to prepare a *comprehensive master plan that includes but is not limited to:*

- a) Assessments of the state's higher education needs;
- b) Recommendations on enrollment and other policies and actions to meet those needs;
- c) Guidelines for continuing education, adult education, public service, and other higher education programs; and

WHEREAS, In September 1998, HECB Chair Bob Craves appointed a Master Plan subcommittee to organize and direct the work involved in the creation of the 2000 Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Board approved a process for developing the Master Plan in December 1998, and in January 1999, conducted a planning session to discuss members' visions and goals for the plan; and

WHEREAS, The Board has insisted on an open and inclusive process, sensitive to its statutory role to represent the "broad public interest in higher education, above the interests of individual institutions;" and

WHEREAS, The Board has considered a number of in-depth policy papers designed to discuss and analyze the issues central to the 2000 Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The work of the Board and subcommittee has produced an outline for the 2000 Master Plan, including three primary policy goals that summarize the vision for higher education presented by this Master Plan, strategies that characterize each policy goal, and specific initiatives that describe specific steps that should be taken in order to effect the strategy and policy goal to which each is linked; and

WHEREAS; The Board has had the opportunity to discuss and revise each recommendation area;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the draft policy goals, strategies and specific initiatives presented; and directs staff to further refine the recommendations and draft a preliminary Master Plan for review at the Board's September 15 meeting.

Adopted:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Director

David Shaw, Secretary

Rule Development: New Grant Programs

July 1999

BACKGROUND

In 1999, the Legislature adjourned its regular session on April 25 after approving operating and capital budgets for 1999-2001 that include significant investments in higher education programs and services. In addition to major policy investments, the Legislature approved more than 12 **new and expanded programs and grant initiatives, and assigned primary responsibility for implementing them to the HECB.** The Board began work before the end of the legislative session on several of these initiatives, most of which will require some level of Board action to be fully implemented.

BOARD ACTION REQUIRED:

1. The Board is requested to authorize a process for the interim -- between the July and September Board meetings -- for the approval of proposals for information technology grants, child care grants, the Fund for Innovation, and teacher training grants.

Proposed Board approval process: Proposal review committees for each grant will rank the institutional proposals and forward the results to the Board's executive director and staff project group. The staff will report the findings and make funding recommendations to the Board. Board members will send their evaluation of the rankings to HECB Executive Director Marc Gaspard, who, on behalf of the Board, will make the final grant awards.

Information Technology Instruction grants: The Legislature created a \$2 million pool to be used to expand or start high-technology degree programs at public baccalaureate institutions. The board staff will convene a proposal review committee, which will include representatives of the technology industry and out-of-state higher education institutions and organizations. The project group has published a Request For Proposals for the \$2 million in grants, which must be matched with private funding.

Child care grants: Grants of \$75,000 each year are available to the baccalaureate institutions. The staff project group will publish an RFP by August 1. Again, funds are available in the first year of the biennium.

Fund for Innovation: The Legislature provided \$600,000 in grants, all in the first year of the biennium, solely for the baccalaureate institutions. The legislation for this program lists four critical statewide priorities and approximately seven specific desired program outcomes. The bill requires that funds be allocated by September 1.

Teacher training pilot project grants: This program provides a total of \$300,000 for competitive grants to stimulate innovative training of K-12 teachers. The staff project group has developed an RFP for \$150,000 in grants per year. This project is proceeding on much the same timeline as the information technology grants, because funds are available for projects in the first year of the biennium. Program rules, if needed, would be presented for Board adoption in the fall.

2. **State Need Grant rules:** The Board received the proposed rules for the SNG program at its May meeting in the Tri-Cities. The new rules are based largely on HB 1140, through which the Legislature and Governor endorsed the major program recommendations made by the Board last fall. These rules, which are included in this board packet under tab 4, are presented for formal adoption by the Board at the July 15 meeting.

NO FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED AT THIS TIME

- **Washington Promise Scholarship:** The scholarship, funded at \$9 million, will go to the top 10 percent of 1999 graduates and top 15 percent of 2000 graduates whose families earn up to 135 percent of median family income. Students must attend accredited higher education institutions in Washington State in order to receive the award. The award will be no more than \$1,585 in 1999-2000.

The HECB staff has received about 1,300 applications, and phone-call inquiries about the program are holding steady at nearly 20 per day. The staff has been able to respond to the telephone inquiries within one business day. The deadline for student applications is Sept. 1, 1999.

The staff plans to present program rules for the Board's adoption in the fall. In the meantime, the staff is processing applications and preparing to receive a list from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of all students who ranked in the top 10 percent of their senior classes. This list will be used to notify students who might qualify for the grant prior to the Sept. 1 deadline.

- **Master's in teaching reimbursement:** This \$2 million reimbursement program is for K-12 teachers who pursue master's degrees. Program rules will be developed for the Board's adoption in the fall. Meanwhile, the HECB staff has developed program information that is included in this agenda package under Tab6. This information will be made available to the public through the agency web site and through direct contact with state teacher organizations. Particular interest in this program is coming from the Washington Education Association and teachers who have begun master's programs or are considering whether to return to college.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-27

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has been directed by the Legislature and Governor to administer several higher education grant programs during the 1999-2001 biennium; and

WHEREAS, Several of these new initiatives must be implemented by Sept. 1, 1999, to enable the colleges and universities to achieve the goals of the grant programs; and

WHEREAS, The Board is not scheduled to meet again until September 15, 1999, and must develop a streamlined process for reviewing several grant proposals and approve the necessary funding;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the HECB adopts the following process for the review and approval of 1999-2001 grants in the areas of information technology instruction, child care, teacher training pilot projects, and the Fund for Innovation:

1. A review committee convened by the HECB staff, including experts representing external groups when appropriate, will evaluate the grant proposals and make recommendations to the staff and the HECB executive director.
2. The executive director will report to the Board members the recommended priorities for funding, taking into consideration the advice of the proposal review committee.
3. Board members will evaluate these recommendations and send their responses to the executive director, who, on behalf of the Board, will make the final grant awards.

Adopted:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Washington State Need Grant (SNG) Program Rule Changes

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Board resolution No. 98-40 adopted four key changes to the State Need Grant program, which require amendments to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

1. Grant amounts based on public institution tuition rates;
2. Self help requirement for all SNG recipients;
3. Documentation of dependent care costs; and a
4. Three percent income flexibility band within which continuing SNG recipients retain eligibility.

The Legislature endorsed the Board's recommendations in House Bill 1140, but added two eligibility changes of its own. They are:

1. The student may not have exceeded 125 percent of the published length of the program in which he or she is enrolled; and
2. A student may not start a new associate degree program as a state need grant recipient until at least five years have elapsed since earning an associate degree as a need grant recipient, except that a student may earn two associate degrees concurrently.

Both the Board's recommendations and the changes promoted by HB 1140 were incorporated into the proposed rules along with several minor technical corrections. The legislative changes regarding the second associate degree limitation is incorporated into WAC section 250-20-011.

The rules before you were filed on May 4, 1999. The preproposal filing was submitted November 10, 1998. The public hearing was held on June 8, 1999. Public testimony regarding the associate degree and the 125 percent of program length limitation was received via electronic mail. A copy of that testimony is enclosed.

As a result of public testimony, staff recommend that the original language proposed amending WAC 250-20-011 be modified to add the following sentence:

“A student shall be deemed to have received an associate degree as a state need grant recipient if the student received state need grant payments in more than three quarters, two semesters, or equivalent clock hours while pursuing an associates degree.”

A copy of the proposed amendments to WAC 250-20, as modified to reflect public comment and clarification of legislative intent, is attached.

Board Action

The Board is requested to amend the Washington State Need Grant (SNG) program, and adopt permanent rules as presented in Resolution 98-26.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-26

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has completed its analysis of the State Need Grant Program and issued its recommendations; and

WHEREAS, Those recommendations include the adoption of a tuition-based award, a self-help requirement, a dependent care documentation requirement, and an income eligibility range for renewing students; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has endorsed the Board's recommendations; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has amended the State Need Grant statute to limit student eligibility to 125 percent of the published length of the program in which the student is enrolled; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has further amended the State Need Grant statute to limit the eligibility of students pursuing a second associate's degree; and

WHEREAS, The Board has directed staff to prepare amendments to the Washington Administrative Code to implement these changes; and

WHEREAS, The staff have filed notice of the proposed changes in WSR 99-10-074, held a public hearing, and prepared the proposed rules for adoption,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts as permanent rules the changes proposed to Washington Administrative Code 250-20-001; 250-20-011; 250-20-021; 250-20-031; and 250-20-041, as attached hereto.

Adopted:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

July 1999 Update: Washington Promise Scholarship

July 1999

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The 1999 Legislature and Governor Gary Locke created a new scholarship program for low- and middle-income students who achieve an excellent academic record throughout their high school careers. For 1999, the scholarship is available to students graduating from Washington high schools in the top 10 percent of their senior class who meet certain family income limits. The program offers a two-year scholarship for eligible students that may be used at any accredited institution within the borders of the state.

Upon signing of the 2000-01 appropriations act, HECB staff together with staff from both the Office of the Governor and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction immediately set about designing and implementing the program in accordance with criteria outlined in the budget bill.

Application forms were distributed to each of Washington's 425 high schools. To date over 1,500 completed applications have been received. There are about 7,000 students who qualify as being in the top ten percent of their high school class. The HECB anticipates receiving the verified listing of top 10 percent graduates by July 18, 1999. Letters and applications will then be mailed to eligible students who have not yet applied. All applications are due to the HECB by September 1, 1999. Once the number of eligible students is determined, the HECB will establish the scholarship amount and disburse the funds. The disbursement is planned for late September.

HECB staff anticipate having emergency rules in the form of proposed WAC's presented for approval at the September 15, 1999, meeting of the Board.

It is anticipated that the following issues will be defined in rules:

Student eligibility

- Graduates from a public or private high school located in the state of Washington; and
- Is in the top 10 percent of his or her 1999 graduating class or
- Is in the top 15 percent of his or her 2000 graduating class; and
- Has a family income less than 135 percent of the state's median; and
- Enrolls at least half time in an eligible post-secondary institution in the state of Washington.

Eligible Postsecondary Institution

- A public institution authorized by the Washington Legislature and receiving operating support through the state general fund, or
- A postsecondary institution, whose campus or branch campus is physically located in the state of Washington, and is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting body.
- The institution agrees to administer the program in accordance with the applicable rules and program guidelines.

Authorized use period

- The period of time the eligible student has to complete using his or her scholarship. The Board will determine the authorized use period for each class of graduating high school seniors.

Recipient selection

- The top 10 percent of the 1999 senior graduating class and the top 15 percent of the 2000 senior graduating class shall be determined by:
 - (1) Each school district, and
 - (2) Verified by the Board through a list compiled by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
- The Board will determine student eligibility based on completed applications submitted by the deadline.

Authorized award amounts

- The maximum annual authorized award shall not exceed the representative average annual tuition and fees for resident students attending the State's community and technical colleges, as determined by the Board.
- The actual authorized annual award for each recipient shall be the annual appropriation, determined by the Board to be available for grants, evenly divided among the eligible students.

Renewals and authorized use period

- The promise scholarship may be renewed for up to one year, subject to the availability of funding.
- For the classes of 1999 and 2000, the authorized use period is limited to two consecutive years following graduation. Receipt of the scholarship is dependent upon the availability of funding.

Appeals

- Appeals must be submitted to the Board in writing before the application deadline.
- The Board may use its judgement to except individual students from a program rule or rules based on substantial documented mitigating circumstances.

Program Administration

- The Higher Education Coordinating Board shall administer the program. The Board shall be responsible for:
 - (1) Collection of student applications
 - (2) Determination of student eligibility
 - (3) Determination of the eligibility of post-secondary institutions within Washington
 - (4) adjudication of all appeals
 - (5) disbursement of awards
 - (6) Maintenance of records

- The OSPI shall be responsible for:
 - (1) Determining the list of qualified high schools in the state of Washington.
 - (2) Providing guidance to high schools as to how the top 10 percent or 15 percent of each senior graduating class shall be determined.
 - (3) Specifying the number of students per high school that may be named as comprising the top 10 percent or top 15 percent of the graduating class;
 - (4) The collection and compilation of the list from each high school of the top 10 percent or top 15 percent of each graduating high school class; and
 - (5) The delivery of that list to the Board.

The Account

- The Washington Promise Scholarship account is established in the custody of the state Treasurer for the purpose of administering the Washington Promise Scholarship program.
- The annual allotment is to be deposited into the account for the purpose of making commitments to students for future scholarship payments, disbursements of the scholarship awards, and for the administrative expenses of the program, as limited by the Board's biennial budget provisos.
- All monies not claimed by students, the refund of tuition and fees, and contributions from non-state sources, are to be deposited into the account and used for future payments.

July 1999 Update: Master's Degree Reimbursement for Teachers

July 1999

BACKGROUND

The state's 1999-2001 operating budget directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to implement an aid program for public K-12 school teachers who receive master's degrees in education. The HECB will receive \$1 million in each year of the biennium to develop a program to partially reimburse teachers for education expenses they incur when they receive master's degrees and return to classroom teaching.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

This program overview reviews the progress in developing the program and outlines the Board's role in implementing the new program this fall.

The budget assigns the HECB broad authority to design the program around several basic criteria:

- The program is open to **current or future classroom teachers** who did not hold a master's degree as of June 30, 1999;
- Teachers **must receive master's degrees during the biennium** (i.e., no later than June 30, 2001);
- The only teachers who may be reimbursed through this program are those who attain **master's degrees in education or teaching**;
- Master's degree recipients **must resume or assume classroom teaching duties** in a public elementary or secondary school (or be under contract to do so) by June 30, 2001; and
- At the Legislature's direction, **priority** for reimbursement will be given to teachers who return to the classroom with **math and-or science teaching credentials**.

Program implementation issues. Within the broad conditions outlined above, there are many additional issues that must be addressed in Washington Administrative Code (WAC) rules before a reimbursement program can begin operation. The HECB has directed its project team to develop specific recommendations for program rules. Proposed rules will be developed for the Board's consideration at its September 1999 meeting.

When the Board discussed this initiative at its April meeting, several members indicated that a number of local school districts already reimburse classroom teachers for a portion of the cost of pursuing job-related graduate education. Since local reimbursement practices vary from district to district, staff will devise a state system that avoids double reimbursement by calculating a maximum total reimbursement when both local and state assistance are considered.

On other issues related to this program, the staff has outlined several tentative directions:

- **Reimbursements will be in the form of direct grants** to teachers after they demonstrate that they have met all the criteria.
- **Priority will be given to reimbursing teachers who have a math or science** teaching credential. The project team is considering a number of options for ensuring that priority.
- The staff will attempt to provide an estimate of the **likely maximum reimbursement** amount at the September meeting. The staff recommend that the reimbursement be no more than the average annual graduate tuition at the state's research institutions (\$5,334 for 1998-99). Depending upon the number of teachers who qualify for reimbursement, the grant may be significantly less than a full year's tuition.
- While the budget proviso does not require that participating teachers be Washington residents, staff propose that the **program serve qualifying teachers from within the state** before benefits are extended to non-residents.
- The **reimbursement program is exclusively for teachers who return to classrooms in *public elementary*** and secondary schools. However, teachers may receive their master's degree at any accredited public or private college or university within Washington State.

Proposed Running Start Program Rule Amendments

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

RCW 28A.600.390 requires the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), and the HECB to “jointly develop and adopt rules governing the Running Start program.”

Currently, state basic education funds are used to compensate colleges for the cost of educating Running Start high school students. The state reimburses colleges about \$79 per credit for academic programs, and \$94 per credit for vocational programs. The K-12 districts retain 7 percent of their basic per-student funding for administrative overhead and student counseling.

PROPOSED RULE AMENDMENT

In April, OSPI proposed to amend Running Start rules in order to establish clearly that students may not be charged tuition for the 16th, 17th, and 18th credit hours of enrollment. This will be accomplished by defining the maximum tuition-free entitlement of eligible students as 18 credit-hours per quarter or semester, or the current 30 hours per week in the case of those enrolled in technical colleges. Students who choose to enroll in excess of 18 credit hours or 30 hours per week) will be charged tuition for the excess hours in accordance with RCW 28B.15.100(3).

In June, OSPI adopted rule amendments contained in WAC 392-169-025, 030, 055, and 060 making the following clarifications:

1. Running Start students may not be charged tuition until a student’s enrollment exceeds 18 credit hours for a quarter or semester, and
2. the 15-hour definition of “full-time equivalent enrollment” only applies to the allocation of state funding, as distinguished from the definition of a student’s 18 credit-hour tuition-free entitlement.

In order to accommodate fall enrollments, which have already started for the community and technical colleges, SBCTC filed for emergency rule adoption by referencing OSPI’s adopted amendments. As mandated by RCW 28A.600.390, the HECB also must adopt the same emergency rules. These proposed changes to the Running Start rules do not affect the nature or intent of the program. The changes are administrative and permit students to participate at the same rate as all college and university students.

NEXT STEPS

There is no Board action required at this time. In our September meeting, there will be hearing on these amendments and the board will be asked to adopt formally the permanent rules defining the maximum tuition-free entitlement of eligible students as 18 credit hours per quarter or semester, or 30 hours per week in technical colleges.

Rural Areas Study: Final Recommendations

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

In 1997 the Legislature directed the HECB to complete a study on rural areas “with consideration given to alternative approaches to educational service delivery, facility expansion, relocation or partnership, and long-term growth and future educational demands of the region.” The HECB established Community Advisory groups to represent each county, and formed a Project Coordination Team (PCT). The PCT included representatives from the institutions, the Office of Financial Management, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and the HECB. The PCT provided the oversight and management of the study effort. The Community Advisory groups and the PCT have worked cooperatively throughout the project.

MGT of America completed the following work in September 1998:

1. Economic and social analysis of each county;
2. Identification of educational needs, including many community suggestions and opinions;
and
3. Recommendations to improve access.

Consistent with the findings in the study effort, the 1999 Legislature provided capital funds (\$900,000 state bonds) to expand the Wenatchee Valley College science lab at Omak. In addition, \$500,000 was provided for equipment and staff for a pilot demonstration project in Jefferson County.

HECB staff analysis and final recommendations were developed jointly with the community and institutions. A future work plan was developed for implementation.

Lessons Learned For Statewide Application From This Study:

1. Socio-economic conditions are similar in under-served rural areas, but there are important differences among and within them. Common threads include the need for more higher education services of all kinds, and the clear linkage to economic growth and community well being.
2. Providing higher education access in rural areas may well be the final access challenge in this state.
3. Lack of information, limited student services and support, and financial, family, and geographic challenges seem to affect rural students more intensely than urban students.
4. Public and private institutions have responded in a variety of ways to the need for services in many rural areas, but under-served rural populations still exist for reasons that institutions

have not been able to surmount: limited demand, limited resources, and geographical distance and terrain.

5. Small and dispersed populations preclude the traditional campus-based approach to higher education. To successfully reach isolated populations, future efforts must be much more creative and flexible in terms of facility requirements and usage.
6. Constantly and quickly changing economic and community needs require a consortial governance structure that enables quick program creation/elimination. Reliance on a number of institutions offers the breadth of program opportunity that is required. Institutions can cooperatively respond to needs on a community- and student-centered basis once the community has developed the ability to measure, monitor, and communicate those needs.
7. To serve rural areas, consortia will rely primarily on distance and e-learning, the use of existing community facilities, and reliance on small centers for visibility and outreach.
8. Success in an under-served rural area effort is very much related to a high level of community support and active assistance to institutions in their consortia efforts.
9. The HECB, or some other central body, may sometimes be needed initially to help communities implement a consortium and complete a needs assessment — but should then withdraw and let the institutions operate.
10. Recommendations specific to under-served rural areas should be incorporated into the 2000 Master Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Transmit completed study report and recommendations to the Legislature and Governor for consideration.
2. Transfer \$500,000 to Peninsula College and Washington State University for implementation of the pilot demonstration project. The funds will support activities cooperatively defined by the institutions and the community.
3. Monitor Jefferson County pilot demonstration project activities; maintain contact with community groups in both counties, and HECB staff report back to the Board on progress and achievements. Particular attention will be devoted to learning lessons that can apply to under-served rural areas across the state.
4. HECB staff contact Workforce Training Board and Office of the Governor's to identify opportunities to include higher education aspects in rural revitalization assistance.
5. Incorporate consideration of under-served rural areas into the 2000 Master Plan process in the areas of increasing access, affordability, and financial aid, and building new pathways through electronic learning.

Rural Areas Study: Final Recommendations

July 1999

BACKGROUND

In 1997 the Legislature directed the HECB to complete a study of two selected under-served rural areas “with consideration given to alternative approaches to educational service delivery, facility expansion, relocation or partnership, and long-term growth and future educational demands of the region.” HECB staff has worked closely with members of the two areas, the involved institutions, and an expert consultant (MGT of America) to complete the study effort. Community advisory groups representing Okanogan and Jefferson counties and a Project Coordinating Team were formed.

The consultant’s report was completed in September 1998 and includes an economic and social analysis of each county, an identification of education needs, and a set of recommendations to improve access to higher education services. Active community and institutional support were evident throughout the study effort, in the review of the consultant’s recommendations, and in preparation of final HECB staff recommendations contained in the attached report.

Consistent with the findings in the study effort, the 1999 Legislature provided capital funds (\$900,000 state bonds) to expand the Wenatchee Valley College science lab at Omak. In addition, \$500,000 was provided for equipment and staff for a pilot demonstration project in Jefferson County.

THE STUDY EFFORT

Profiles of Jefferson and Okanogan Counties: Socio-economic factors. This study provides a profile of each of these counties in order to understand how to enable residents to achieve their education goals. At the same time, this study shows how education is one key to an improved economic base. While each county has unique characteristics, each shares socio-economic conditions commonly seen in other rural areas. Therefore, they offer an opportunity to explore some of the postsecondary education needs of rural counties generally, and to consider cost-effective ways to address them. At the same time, it became clear in this study that differences between (and within) rural areas require individual strategies to best meet identified needs.

Both Jefferson and Okanogan counties are strong candidates for economic growth and development. Both contain regional service centers and important small cities. New employment sectors are displacing older ones. Both counties are relatively close to the populations, visitors, markets, and industries of British Columbia. Both counties comprise substantial uninhabited rural areas where much land is owned by the federal government or Indian nations. Both counties are displaying population growth: Jefferson County is the second fastest growing county in the state, while Okanogan County is growing at a somewhat slower rate.

Participation Rates. Both counties have higher education enrollments below statewide average participation rates. In Jefferson County the 1996 community college participation rate was 2.53

percent, well below the statewide average of 4.06 percent. In that year, the community college participation rate in Okanogan County was 2.65 percent.

The participation rate for Jefferson County residents in upper-division programs was .57 percent, also well below the state average of .95 percent. In Okanogan County the rate was .75 percent. The HECB goal for upper-division enrollments — the 50th-percentile nationally by 2010 — equates to a participation rate of 1.13 percent. The additional numbers of students associated with achieving the HECB goal participation rates are not great by urban county criteria, but they represent important deficits by Jefferson and Okanogan County standards. When taken together, the participation deficits in rural counties represent a substantial challenge to the State of Washington since per capita participation is below the state average in many rural counties without four-year institutions.

E-learning Possibilities. This study directed particular attention to examining the possibilities of distance and e-learning education meeting the needs of rural areas for two obvious and inter-related reasons: cost control and limited demand. The capital costs associated with the development of conventional campuses remain high, and the numbers of students that could be served in this manner are both limited and dispersed. Thus, if opportunity is to be increased and access is to be affordable, creative alternative delivery modes involving e-learning and traditional distance education are the most likely approaches to offer feasible solutions.

Electronic approaches are becoming more practical and available every day, and they may offer the most reasonable solution to increasing higher education services in rural areas. However, it is important to understand if these approaches will meet local goals and expectations. For this reason, community involvement was a very important aspect in the study.

This study effort also provided an opportunity to review and discuss some of the challenges and opportunities of e-learning and distance education among a number of higher education institutions. The willingness of some institutions to entertain such solutions may represent something of a departure from earlier service delivery approaches. The need for e-learning and distance education became clear because of costs and economies of scale. Therefore, the focus of the discussion quickly turned to how to make these approaches work. Continued progress to develop, refine, and implement these approaches will be of great benefit to students all across the state — both in rural and urban settings.

Higher Education Access: An Historical Perspective. The consultants have presented their view of various periods of emphasis in the development of public higher education in this state, beginning with the creation of the University of Washington and Washington State University as traditional, residential, research institutions. This was followed by the development of the regional universities, originally as residential “normal schools.” In the 1960s and 1970s the creation of the community college system and The Evergreen State College represented further efforts to provide widespread access in additional areas of the state. This was followed by the creation of the branch campuses to recognize the needs of growing urban areas. The culmination of this expansion phase may be the effort to find a way to serve the major population area in North Snohomish, Island, and Skagit counties.

Next Steps: Meeting the Needs of Rural Communities. The next developmental phase of the state higher education system might well be bringing higher education services to citizens that are separated from the current system by distance and economics. These efforts already have begun through community college satellite campuses, university outreach efforts, and the

formation of multi-institutional consortia. All of these efforts share the goals of extending access and controlling costs.

This study enters at this point. The attention is on the specific education needs of residents of Jefferson and Okanogan Counties, although the findings and recommendations also may carry implications for other rural areas of Washington. The higher education needs of residents of rural-areas are no less pressing than the needs of those who live in cities. But the unfavorable cost-benefit ratios that have precluded conventional campus solutions are no more favorable now. By virtue of the widening spectrum of electronic knowledge media that are now available, effective responses to the higher education needs of rural area residents are becoming feasible. Perhaps most important, they promise to greatly increase the equity in the system and the prospects for achieving the state's long-standing higher education goals of access, responsiveness, and affordability.

SUMMARY OF STUDY FINDINGS

Major study findings are summarized as follows:

Socio-economic analysis:

- Most population growth is in the older age groups, particularly the group 65 years and older. This growth phenomenon is contributing both to an increase in the average age of the population and, unless ways are found to retain larger numbers of out-migrating younger adults (ages 15 to 24), to possible future labor shortages.
- Economic emphases are shifting from natural resources-based to service and tourism industries.
- There is slow but steady employment growth, although the State Department of Employment Security classifies both counties as “distressed areas” because of current rates of unemployment.

Education program needs:

The field studies indicate that the greatest needs are for the following:

- coordinated and cooperative approach among providers of postsecondary service;
- vocational and continuing education programs plus selected four-year degree opportunities;
- improved affordability of higher education; and
- improved information about program availability, student support services, financial aid, counseling, etc.

The economics of higher education also dictate that there be extensive and effective use of electronic technologies and distance education in meeting local needs.

Special considerations include the following items:

- Expanded access in these rural areas should be provided in a non-traditional approach that is tailored to the needs of the areas, is flexible to meet changing needs, and builds on the specific strengths of a number of institutions.
- Creative new approaches with reliance on current capabilities of rural areas and heavy involvement by local community organizations will be required.
- Possible adjustments to funding systems and financial assistance to recognize the unique needs and characteristics of rural area students could help increase participation.
- A “center” is required that residents could identify with higher education service availability, and that would provide a focus for information, student services, and some course delivery.
- A process of continuing needs assessment should be implemented in each rural area to ensure programs are directly responsive to the changing economic and community environment.

Lessons Learned For Statewide Application:

1. Economic and social conditions in rural under-served areas have common threads, but there are important differences among (and within) them. Common threads include the need for more higher education services of all kinds (degrees, non-degree courses, vocational and career programs) and the clear linkage to economic growth and community well being.
2. Rural areas may well represent the final stage (and challenge) of higher education system development in this state.
3. Lack of information, limited student services and support, and financial, family and geographic challenges seem to impact rural students more intensely than urban students.
4. Institutions have responded in a variety of ways to the need for services in many rural areas. But under-served rural populations still exist for reasons that institutions have not been able to surmount (limited demand, limited resources, geographical distance and terrain, etc.).
5. Small and dispersed populations preclude the traditional campus-based approach that institutions and communities have traditionally seen. To successfully reach these populations, future efforts must be much more creative and flexible in terms of facility requirements and usage.
6. Constantly and quickly changing economic and community needs require a consortial governance structure that enables quick program creation/elimination. Reliance on a number of institutions offers the breadth of program opportunity that is required. Institutions can cooperatively respond to needs on a community- and student-centered basis once the community has developed the ability to measure, monitor and communicate those needs.

7. Distance learning, e-learning, using existing community facilities, and relying on small centers for visibility and outreach will predominate the activities of consortia that are formed to bring services to under-served rural areas.
8. Success in an under-served rural area effort is very much related to a high level of community support and active assistance to institutions in their consortia efforts.
9. The HECB, or some other central authority, may sometimes be needed initially to assist other motivated under-served rural areas implement a consortium and complete a needs assessment—but should then withdraw and let the institutions operate.
10. Recommendations specific to under-served rural areas should be incorporated into the master plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board is requested to approve the staff report prepared pursuant to Section 610 of the 1997-99 Operating Budget Appropriations Act (Chapter 149, Laws of 1997) for submission to the Governor and Legislature.

Additionally, the Board is requested to approved the following actions:

1. Transfer \$500,000 to Peninsula College for implementation of the pilot demonstration project. The funds will support activities cooperatively defined by the institutions and the community.
2. Monitor Jefferson County pilot demonstration project activities; maintain contact with community groups in both counties, and HECB staff report back to the Board on progress and achievements. Particular attention will be devoted to learning lessons that can apply to under-served rural areas across the state.
3. HECB staff contact Workforce Training Board and Governor's Office to identify opportunities to include higher education aspects in rural revitalization assistance.
4. Incorporate consideration of under-served rural areas into the master plan process in the areas of increasing access, affordability and financial aid, and building new pathways through electronic learning.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-22

WHEREAS, Section 610 of the 1997-99 Operating Budget Appropriations Act (Chapter 149, Laws of 1997), provides funding for the Higher Education Coordinating Board for activities related to higher education facilities planning and access issues related to capital facilities; and

WHEREAS, Included within this mandate is specific provision to conduct a study regarding the postsecondary education needs of Okanogan and Jefferson counties and surrounding communities with consideration given to alternative approaches to educational service delivery, facility expansion, relocation or partnership, and long-term growth and future educational demands of the regions; and

WHEREAS, The Board retained MGT of America (hereinafter referred to as the "Consultant") to assist in carrying out these legislative directives by providing a thorough socio-economic profile of these two rural areas and an analysis of economic and educational needs; and

WHEREAS, The Board established a Project Coordination Team consisting of representatives of the University of Washington, Washington State University, Western Washington University, Central Washington University, Big Bend Community College, Peninsula College, Wenatchee Valley College, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and the Office of Financial Management to provide expert advice and program consultation to the Consultant and HECB staff on the elements of the study; and

WHEREAS, The Consultant has submitted the final report and recommendations concerning the postsecondary education needs of Okanogan and Jefferson counties; and

WHEREAS, The Consultant has concluded that expanded postsecondary education opportunities are essential to the economic and community vitality of Okanogan and Jefferson counties, and to rural areas across the State of Washington; and

WHEREAS, The Project Coordination Team has concluded that the needs of rural areas can best be served by a consortial approach combining the programs and offerings of a number of institutions to respond quickly to the constantly changing needs of rural areas in the appropriate scale and delivery mode; and

WHEREAS, Strong community support and interest has been demonstrated in Okanogan and Jefferson counties to obtain additional higher education services in an economical and feasible manner; relying on community efforts to address the special economic, social and geographical challenges that confront rural area students; and

WHEREAS, The lessons learned in this study of under-served rural area issues can be further explored and refined through the initiation of pilot programs to develop and implement creative approaches to deliver flexible, targeted, responsive higher education programs to rural areas across the State of Washington; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has demonstrated its interest and support of finding ways to address the special higher education needs of under-served rural areas by providing funding in the 1999-2001 state budget to the Higher Education Coordinating Board for a pilot demonstration project in Jefferson County; and

WHEREAS, Staff of the Higher Education Coordinating Board have, in consultation with the project Coordination Team and Community Advisory Groups in Okanogan and Jefferson Counties,

reviewed the methodology, findings, analysis and recommendations of the Consultant, and based on such review, and in consideration of the public input received from surveys and in Town Meetings, have prepared a staff report entitled "Postsecondary Education Needs of Okanogan and Jefferson Counties: Staff Recommendations", dated July 14, 1999; and

WHEREAS, The Executive Director of the Higher Education Coordinating Board has transmitted the staff report to the Board and is proposing Board action on the findings and recommendations contained in that staff report; and

WHEREAS, The Board has reviewed the staff analysis and recommendations submitted by the Executive Director and, based on that review has incorporated said staff report in its action to adopt the recommendations advanced by the Executive Director;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby adopts the following policies and actions in response to the requirements set forth in Section 610 of the 1997-99 Operating Budget Appropriations Act (Chapter 149, Laws of 1997):

The Board approves the staff report entitled "Postsecondary Education Needs of Okanogan and Jefferson Counties: Staff Recommendations", dated July 14, 1999, and directs that this report be transmitted to the Legislature, Office of Financial Management, and participating higher education institutions.

The Board clarifies that the participation rate goals established for the state in each master plan effort are intended to apply to all the citizens of the state. To the extent that residents of rural areas confront unique challenges in obtaining access to higher education programs, the state should make every effort to develop innovative, effective and economical approaches to providing educational opportunity to those residents.

The Board recognizes that methods and approaches to provide improved access to higher education services in under-served rural areas across the state will be developed and tested in pilot programs in Okanogan and Jefferson Counties. Distance education, e-learning, continuing needs assessment, inter-institutional cooperation and new strategies for student information and support will be implemented in these two areas, and many of the lessons learned will be applicable to all under-served rural areas of the State of Washington.

The Board endorses the ongoing efforts of staff to integrate into the master planning process consideration of the special needs and opportunities that lie within the rural areas of the state. Policies and proposals to address these needs in a flexible, effective and economical manner will be addressed in the final master plan.

Adopted:

July 14, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Update on Higher Education Accountability

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Legislature modified the accountability initiative for the 1999-2001 biennium and called for the institutions to prepare new accountability plans. Those plans are due to the Board on August 15, 1999. The Board must review and approve new guidelines for the institutions' 1999-2001 accountability plans.

Changes to the 1999-2001 Accountability Initiative. Several of the recommendations made in the Board's 1998 accountability recommendations to the Legislature were incorporated into the 1999-2001 initiative. Such measures include the Board's recommendation that no funds be withheld from the institutions' base budgets, and that the performance measures and goals continue for at least another two years. Briefly, the following elements from the original initiative remain the same:

- There are four performance measures: undergraduate student retention, graduation efficiency, graduation rate, and faculty productivity.
- For all performance measures *except* faculty productivity, the Legislature has stipulated performance goals.
- The HECB must review and approve Accountability plans that describe how institutions will make "measurable and specific" improvements toward the performance goals.
- The HECB must review the institution's progress toward the performance goals annually.

The biggest change is that no money will be withheld from the institutions' base budgets and awarded on the basis of institutional progress. Performance measures relating to distance education or student learning outcomes are not mentioned. Another small change is that institution-specific measures are now optional.

1999-2001 Guidelines. In November 1998, the institutions submitted reports describing their experiences with implementing the accountability measures. In those reports they recommended changes that would enable them to direct their attention to the problem areas they had discovered, or more generally to practices that would help them improve their efforts to work in the best interests of students. Those issues were taken into consideration in preparing new guidelines to assist institutions in preparing the Accountability plans.

The guidelines reflect two changes in approach from the last biennium.

1. **Baseline year.** We have asked the institutions to use an average to calculate the baseline against which performance will be compared. This approach will mitigate concerns that

the statistics for the 1995-96 baseline year were unusually high, and therefore represent an unfair basis for comparison.

2. **Measurable and specific improvement.** The guidelines place responsibility *on the institution* for setting the 1999-2001 targets for each performance measure. This is a deliberate change from the incremental, across-the-board percentage increases the Board used in the last biennium. Final approval of the targets rests, of course, with the Board.

Distance education. Although the operating budget did not stipulate performance measures for distance education, HECB staff convened meetings attended by institutional representatives and OFM staff to establish common distance learning definitions. These definitions will be used in the Master Plan and by OFM to capture distance learning enrollments in the Public Comprehensive Higher Education Enrollments System (PCHEES) reporting. The institutions will code courses to reflect the applicable category of distance learning:

- **correspondence** (print);
- **tele-class technologies** (interactive television, satellite tele-classes, broadcast or cable-cast live instruction);
- **pre-recorded** (video or audio cassettes, tele-courses and computer-based instructional packages); and
- **Internet and online.**

Student learning outcomes. The Operating Budget did not stipulate performance measures for student learning outcomes. The HECB Accountability recommendations, submitted to the Legislature in December, 1998, encouraged institutions to develop new assessment projects in the areas of quantitative skills and technological literacy. By 2003, all institutions were to have student learning outcomes in place for every undergraduate academic program, aligning those outcomes where appropriate with the K-12 and community college systems.

Beginning in December 1999, institutions were to report annually to the HECB on progress in establishing and assessing those outcomes. By December 1999, institutions were to report to the HECB on the development of the senior writing project.

BOARD ACTION.

The following actions are recommended:

- 1.) Adoption of the proposed guidelines for the 1999-2001 Accountability Plans; and
- 2.) Reiteration of the Board's interest in seeing institutions identify student learning outcomes in all undergraduate academic programs, develop assessment projects in the areas of writing, quantitative skills and technological literacy, and to report annually, beginning December 1999 on their progress in those areas.

Guidelines for Higher Education Accountability Plans

July 1999

As the state moves into the second biennium of higher education accountability goals and performance measures, it will be critical to monitor the affect of these initiatives on students. The guidelines for the 1999-2001 biennium offer institutions the flexibility to direct strategies to address the needs of particular groups of students, and to propose challenging intermediate targets on the performance measures mandated by the Legislature.

Authority for these guidelines is contained in the Operating Budget for the 1999-2001 Biennium (*Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5180, Section 601*):

Each institution receiving appropriations under sections 604 through 609 of this act shall submit a biennial plan to achieve measurable and specific improvement each academic year as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of the following long-term performance goals...The plans, to be prepared at the direction of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, shall be submitted by August 15, 1999. The Higher Education Coordinating Board shall set biennial performance targets for each institution and shall review actual achievements annually. Institutions shall track their actual performance on the statewide measures as well as faculty productivity, the goals and targets for which may be unique to each institution.

Furthermore, the agency summary from the proposed Senate budget for each institution states:

Senate does not provide financial incentives or require funds to be held in reserve for accountability purposes but does reaffirm goals and performance measures in the omnibus appropriations act. The Higher Education Coordinating Board is expected to continue to review accountability plans and monitor institution progress towards the legislature's set of long-term performance goals for four-year baccalaureates. Each institution is encouraged to explore and define campus-specific intermediate goals for the 1999-01 biennium that are both challenging and meaningfully related to the statewide accountability measures.

These guidelines set the framework for the accountability plans due on August 15, 1999, from each of Washington's six four-year public baccalaureate institutions. After receiving and reviewing these accountability plans, at its September 1999 meeting the HECB will set biennial performance targets for each institution for each of five accountability measures.

1999-2001 Accountability Plans. The Accountability plans should be divided into two sections. The first section should present an historical context that will provide a foundation for understanding the proposed targets contained in the second section.

Part I. Strategies Implemented in 1997-1999.

This section should summarize each institution's experience during the previous biennium through a brief description of the strategies that were implemented to affect the performance measures. These descriptions should provide the background and context needed to understand the strategies and targets proposed for the 1999-2001 biennium.

Part II. Proposed Targets and Measures.

1. **Baseline:** A baseline from which to assess "measurable and specific improvement" should be calculated on the basis of the average of fiscal years 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98. Use of an average will address the concerns of some institutions that performance measured in the original, single baseline year of 1995-96 was unusual and not representative of typical performance.

2. **Statewide Performance Goals:** The 1999-2001 Appropriations Act maintained the statewide performance goals set in 1997-99 for three of the accountability measures. It also specified faculty productivity as an additional performance measure, and included again the possibility of institution-specific measures.

These guidelines call for the college and universities to propose institution-specific performance goals and 1999-2001 targets for faculty productivity and optional institution-specific measures. The HECB expects that the institutions will, at a minimum, continue with their current faculty productivity and institution-specific measures unless compelling reasons are presented to change them.

The HECB strongly encourages institutions to respond positively to the Legislature's encouragement to establish institution-specific goals for 1999-2001 "that are both challenging and meaningfully related to the statewide accountability measures." By so doing, the institutions will help shape "the next generation" of the higher education accountability initiative in Washington State.

Institutions' plans should continue to strive toward these performance goals:

<i>Accountability Measure</i>	<i>Long-term Performance Goal:</i>
a. Undergraduate Graduation Efficiency Index	
For Students Beginning as Freshmen	95
For Transfer Students	90
b. Undergraduate Student Retention:	
Research Universities	95%
Other Public Four-year Institutions	90%
c. 5-year Graduation Rate	
Research Universities	65%
Other Public Four-year Institutions	55%
d. Faculty Productivity	Institution-specific

3. **Measurable and Specific Improvement:** Each institution should propose and present a compelling case for a standard of “measurable and specific improvement” that will demonstrate a “continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress” toward the performance goals. Institutions should proposed intermediate targets should be proposed to address performance in any of the five measures, and may introduce targets to address improvements in performance measures for particular groups of students (e.g., retention of freshmen). Institutions shall report annually progress toward intermediate targets *and* progress toward the overall performance measures.

4. **HECB Approval.** Staff will review institutions’ proposed plans and work with institutions to resolve any questions. Plans should go forward to the Board for approval at the September 1999 meeting.

5. **Annual Report:** Annual reports to the Board describing achievement of the performance targets will be due on November 1 of each year, beginning November 1, 1999. The reports should present the data and analyze the impact of the strategies implemented to date—what worked and didn’t work, and why.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-23

WHEREAS, The Washington Legislature modified the accountability initiative in the Operating Budget for the 1999-2001 biennium; and

WHEREAS, The Washington Legislature required institutions to prepare accountability plans at the direction of the Higher Education Coordinating Board and submit them to the Board by August 15, 1999; and

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts these guidelines for the 1999-2001 Accountability Plans; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Higher Education Coordinating Board encourages institutions to identify student learning outcomes in all undergraduate academic programs, develop assessment projects in the areas of writing, quantitative skills and technological literacy, and to report annually, beginning December 1999 on their progress in those areas.

Adopted:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Spokane-area Higher Education Services Study: Washington State University Final Program Plan

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Substitute Senate Bill 6655 directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area, and continue to provide the highest quality postsecondary education services for students. In December 1998, the HECB granted conditional approval for *WSU's Mission and Operating Plan* pending the June 1, 1999 completion of several activities. In May, at the request of WSU, the Board extended the deadline for that work to July 1, 1999 (HECB Resolution No. 99-18). The work to be completed by July 1 included the following:

1. A Riverpoint-specific mission statement that reflects WSU's aspirations to become a destination campus for various areas of study;
2. Program-delivery plans that include predominately on-site instruction;
3. Re-evaluation of the proposed Executive Development Center;
4. Continued development of the Health Sciences Consortium's organization and operating guidelines for implementation of core services and multi-institutional programs of study;
5. A market analysis/education needs assessment, to determine how WSU Spokane can help meet the demand for higher education statewide; and
6. A final management plan for the Riverpoint campus.

OVERVIEW

WSU Spokane Mission Statement: The WSU Spokane mission statement appears to meet HECB criteria and legislative intent — with the exception of offering practice-oriented doctoral degrees. Since 1990, the HECB has limited such programs to the two main research university campuses, due to the high cost and heavy demand on resources of such programs.

Program Delivery: Between fall 1999 and 2003, WSU Spokane proposes to initiate 20 new degree programs, four of which are practice-oriented doctoral degrees. Of the 20 programs proposed, 16 are undergraduate and graduate programs that appear to meet HECB criteria and legislative intent. Little information, however, is presented on higher education and market need and demand for the four WSU Spokane proposed practice-oriented doctoral degree programs — D. Design, D. Audiology, Ph.D. Nursing, and Ph.D. Counseling Psychology.

Executive Development Center: WSU Spokane will not be going forward with its proposed Executive Development Center.

Health Sciences Consortium: Work continues, on an informal basis, for the Health Sciences Consortium (HSC). Since the Legislature did not fund the HSC or the health related programs proposed for WSU Spokane during the 1999 session, further development of the plans outlined in the October 1998 WSU Spokane Plan will be delayed.

Market Research: WSU commissioned the MGT market research, including a review of previous studies on higher education in Spokane and extensive surveys, meetings, and focus groups. Here are the major MGT recommendations:

1. **Riverpoint should develop as a magnet higher education center** that is highly visible, collaborative, reputable, and attractive.
2. **WSU should provide research at Riverpoint** commensurate with its research university role, and offer practice-oriented doctoral degrees.
3. **Coordinated tuition and fees and student financial aid administration** is a necessity in a magnet center offering programs from different institutions. WSU should be given full authority to forge necessary agreements to ensure that students can take maximum advantage of different courses and programs.

Management Plan for Riverpoint: The July 1 facilities plan for Riverpoint Higher Education Park in Spokane provides for the logical management and development of a new urban “magnet” research and instructional campus that will draw students and research projects from areas outside Spokane, particularly in the Health Sciences. A key and thoughtful component of the plan is the commitment to prepare a new *comprehensive* master plan for the campus by the fall of 2000. WSU notes that this plan will look “beyond architectural considerations to the academic needs assessment studies developed by WSU and its partners.”

WSU’s current ten-year capital plan centers on the management and use of the existing Academic 1 and Support Services Buildings and the development of the new Health Sciences and Academic Center facilities. The facilities plan is consistent with earlier HECB budget recommendations and will clearly serve the goals of multiple institutions.

Specifically, the report concludes that “new construction (at Riverpoint) should be reserved for facilities that can be demonstrated to benefit university instruction, research, and public service.” This position is consistent with the HECB’s earliest policy (Resolution 89-05) concerning the acquisition and development of the Riverpoint campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approval is recommended for the new WSU Spokane mission statement. However, the reference to practice-oriented doctoral degrees should be eliminated.
2. Approval is recommended for the WSU Spokane 1999-2003 Program Plan. However, the proposed practice-oriented doctoral degrees should be eliminated.
3. Approval is recommended for the WSU Spokane Management Plan, effective immediately.

Spokane-area Higher Education Services Study: Washington State University Final Program Plan

July 1999

BACKGROUND

Substitute Senate Bill 6655 directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area and continue to provide the highest quality for students. This legislation directs responsibilities to the HECB, EWU, and WSU for refocusing public higher education in the greater Spokane area.

In December 1998, the HECB granted conditional approval for *WSU's Mission and Operating Plan* pending the June 1, 1999 completion of several activities. In May, at the request of WSU, the Board extended the deadline for that work to July 1, 1999 (HECB Resolution No. 99-18). The work to be completed by July 1 included the following:

- 1) A Riverpoint-specific mission statement that emphasizes the provision of graduate and research programs and reflects WSU's aspirations to become a destination campus for various areas of study;
- 2) Program delivery plans that include predominately on-site instruction;
- 3) Re-evaluation of the proposed Executive Development Center;
- 4) Continued development of the Health Sciences Consortium's organization and operating guidelines for implementation of core services and multi-institutional programs of study;
- 5) A market analysis/education needs assessment, to determine how WSU Spokane can help meet the demand for higher education statewide, as well as in the immediate Spokane area; and
- 6) A final management plan for the Riverpoint campus that incorporates findings from the additional assessments (described above) and final information about EWU Spokane programs.

The following report presents an overview and analysis of the WSU Spokane Addendum to the Final Program Plan and related HECB recommendations. Appendix A includes a copy of the Addendum.

OVERVIEW

Mission Statement: Following is the new mission statement for WSU Spokane:

“Washington State University at Spokane is the nucleus of a Spokane higher education magnet center. Its mission reflects the magnet center’s statewide and regional service area and its responsibilities as the fiscal agent, site manager, strategic planner, and coordinator for the Riverpoint campus, at which the physical core of the higher education magnet center is situated. The Spokane campus also represents Washington State University’s commitment to bring distinctive upper-division and graduate education services to Spokane and to the core of higher education’s magnet center’s program inventory. The academic emphasis is on programs in the Health Sciences, Engineering and Technology, and Design fields. Washington State University at Spokane provides practice-oriented doctoral programs and conducts research commensurate with the University’s responsibilities as a research institution, with its Spokane program inventory, and with the social and economic development need of the Spokane region. It also encourages and participates in interdisciplinary and inter-collegiate master’s programs and consortial alliances in the region. Through teaching, research, and outreach, Washington State University at Spokane provides a distinctive and distinctively responsive form of higher education experience for residents of the region and from throughout the state.”

The WSU Spokane mission statement, with the exception of including practice-oriented doctoral degrees, appears to meet HECB criteria and legislative intent. Due to their high cost and heavy demand on resources, since 1990 the HECB has limited doctoral programs to the two main campuses of the University of Washington and Washington State University. An exception to this policy may be granted in rare instances when extraordinary circumstances arise.

Program Delivery Plans: WSU Spokane proposes to initiate 20 new degree programs between fall 1999 and 2003. They plan to deliver these programs predominately through on-site instruction at Riverpoint. The 16, non-doctoral programs appear to meet HECB criteria and legislative intent, and show promise in attracting both Spokane residents and students statewide.

Little if any information, however, is presented on higher education and market need and demand for the four WSU Spokane proposed practice-oriented doctoral degree programs — D. Design, D. Audiology, Ph.D. Nursing, and Ph.D. Counseling Psychology. Further information is required to meet current HECB criteria of “rare instances” of “extraordinary circumstances” required for board approval.

Executive Development Center: WSU Spokane will not be going forward with its proposed Executive Development Center. Spokane residents already have access to the international business certificate programs proposed for the Executive Development Center. The other Spokane area higher education institutions are adequately responding to needs in this area.

Health Sciences Consortium: Work continues to develop, on an informal basis, for the Health Sciences Consortium (HSC). Since the 1999 Legislature did not fund the HSC or the health-related programs proposed for WSU Spokane, further development of the plans outlined in the

October 1998 WSU Spokane Plan will be delayed. Next year WSU will work on gaining the support of legislators and the Spokane health community, and move the collaboration forward with the other HSC institutions.

The health sciences consortium is vital to Riverpoint as a magnet center. Without additional funding, however, development of the health sciences consortium is delayed.

Market Research: WSU commissioned the MGT market research, which included a review of previous studies higher education in Spokane and extensive surveys, meetings, and focus groups. The MGT market research confirms unmet program needs that exist in the Spokane area, identifies burgeoning statewide occupational fields, and frames the Riverpoint magnet center response to meeting those needs. The MGT major findings are summarized below.

1. There is consensus regarding programs that are needed in the Spokane region. They include programs in engineering, business, health sciences, education, and the design disciplines, and complementary research activities.
2. WSU Spokane, with its current, limited mission and small number of program offerings, is not well known or highly attractive to Spokane residents or students outside the area. Spokane residents are most interested in business and education programs while potential west-side students are most interested in the health sciences.
3. There is strong support for a Spokane higher education “magnet” center, as well as support for an expanded mission for WSU Spokane, a broader array of program offerings, and an increased emphasis on research. The development and success of the magnet center will require extensive resources, marketing, collaboration with the Spokane area’s postsecondary institutions, and institutional partnerships with business, government, and community organizations.
4. Students want ease in transferring credit, centralized student services and cross-registration, coordinated tuition and fees, and all courses delivered at the same location. The Riverpoint campus is the location of choice for Spokane’s public upper-division and graduate offerings, including distance education programs.

In light of these findings, MGT presented 25 recommendations. They focus attention on the steps that need to be accomplished in order for Riverpoint to become a higher education magnet center that would have significant local, regional, and statewide appeal. The recommendations also recognize that all of the Spokane-area institutions should share in meeting the demand for higher education generated by the increasing numbers of college-age students in the state over the next ten years. The primary MGT recommendations are presented below.

- Riverpoint should develop as a magnet higher education center that is highly visible, reputable, and attractive. The magnet center should emphasize collaboration among Spokane area higher education institutions, and should maintain strong ties with the community. WSU, as the fiscal agent for Riverpoint, should be provided funds to support the magnet center.

- WSU should proceed with its plans to establish the programs proposed in its 1998 Plan for Spokane, continue to provide research at Riverpoint commensurate with its research university role and mission and regional economic development needs, and be authorized to offer practice-oriented doctoral degrees at Riverpoint.
- Spokane area higher education institutions should be encouraged to pursue health sciences programs and the proposed health sciences consortium within the concept of the magnet center.
- Coordinated tuition and fees and student financial aid administration is a necessity in a magnet center offering programs from different institutions. WSU should be given full authority to forge necessary agreements to ensure that students can take maximum advantage of different courses and programs.

Riverpoint Management Plan: The July 1 facilities plan for Riverpoint Higher Education Park in Spokane provides for the logical management and development of a new urban “magnet” research and instructional campus that will draw students and research projects from areas outside Spokane, particularly in the health sciences.

A key and thoughtful component of the plan is the commitment to prepare a new *comprehensive* master plan for the campus by the fall of 2000. WSU notes that this plan, while building on earlier physical development concepts, will look “beyond architectural considerations to the academic needs assessment studies developed by WSU and its partners...These studies provide the backbone for projected building requirements and facility relationships.”

WSU’s current ten-year capital plan centers on the management and use of the existing Academic 1 and Support Services Buildings, and the development of the new Health Sciences and Academic Center facilities. Funding for both new facilities was recommended by the HECB in its 1999-2001 capital budget recommendations. The facilities plan is consistent with earlier HECB budget recommendations and will clearly serve the goals of multiple institutions. However, Washington State University accepts ultimate responsibility for the development and maintenance of the campus (excluding the Spokane Intercollegiate Research and Technology Institute, which currently is still managed under a separate state statute.)

As the report notes, WSU’s commitment to this campus was demonstrated by the university’s successful efforts to secure funding for the \$36.3 million Spokane Health Sciences Building by leveraging revenues from a century-old Land Grant trust account. Construction can now begin this year on the facility that will house EWU and WSU health sciences programs.

The report also recommends that the park development exclusively benefit higher education. Specifically, the report concludes that “new construction (at Riverpoint) should be reserved for facilities that can be demonstrated to benefit university instruction, research, and public service.” This position is consistent with the HECB’s earliest policy (Resolution 89-05) concerning the acquisition and development of the Riverpoint campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approval is recommended for the new WSU Spokane mission statement. However, the reference to practice-oriented doctoral degrees should be eliminated.
2. Approval is recommended for the WSU Spokane 1999-2003 Program Plan. However, the proposed practice-oriented doctoral degrees should be eliminated.
3. Approval is recommended for the WSU Spokane Management Plan, effective immediately.

APPENDIX A WSU Spokane Addendum to Final Program Plan

For a copy of the appendix, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-24

WHEREAS, In 1998, the Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area and continue to provide the highest quality education for students; and

WHEREAS, In December 1998, the HECB granted conditional approval for the *WSU Mission and Operating Plan*, pending the July 1, 1999, completion of:

1. A Riverpoint-specific mission statement that emphasizes the provision of graduate and research programs and reflects WSU's aspirations to become a destination campus for various areas of study;
2. Program delivery plans that include predominately on-site instruction;
3. Re-evaluation of the proposed Executive Development Center;
4. Continued development of the Health Sciences Consortium's organization and operating guidelines for implementation of core services and multi-institutional programs of study;
5. A market analysis/education needs assessment, to determine how WSU Spokane can help meet the demand for higher education statewide, as well as in the immediate Spokane area; and
6. A final management plan for the Riverpoint campus that incorporates findings from the additional assessments (described above) and final information about EWU Spokane programs; and

WHEREAS, The HECB has reviewed the addendum to the final program plan with WSU, and based on said review has prepared recommendations, dated July 15, 1999, for HECB consideration; and

WHEREAS, With the deletion of references to practice-oriented doctoral degrees in the mission statement and in the planned program inventory, WSU has satisfactorily met the conditions outlined above;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby approves Washington State University's final program plan and addendum, and facilities management plan, submitted April 1, 1999 and July 1, 1999 respectfully; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to the WSU higher education community. Program and facilities planning are critical and challenging assignments. WSU has taken positive steps to refocus higher education services in the Spokane area.

Adopted:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

**Central Washington University
Proposal to Establish a Master of Education
In Business and Marketing Education at the CWU SeaTac Center**

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Central Washington University proposes to offer a **Master of Education in Business and Marketing Education** at the **CWU SeaTac Center**. The program is an extension of the graduate program in business and marketing education offered on the CWU main campus in Ellensburg. It would be delivered via two-way interactive distance education classes, Internet (chat rooms), and seminars in which both CWU SeaTac and CWU Ellensburg students participate.

The graduate program is designed as a professional development program for practicing high school teachers and community and technical college faculty. It is enthusiastically supported at the state and local levels by leading business and vocational/technical constituencies.

The **diversity initiatives** for the proposed program reflect CWU's commitment to recruit and serve students of color. The **assessment initiatives** focus on evaluating the distance learning components of the program and the expected student learning outcomes.

The M.Ed. in Business and Marketing Education would be funded on a self-sustaining basis. It would be supported by a cadre of full-time faculty on the CWU main campus and a resident faculty member at the CWU SeaTac Center. The cost of this program would be about \$1,740 per FTE student.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Central Washington University proposal to establish a Master of Education in Business and Marketing Education at the CWU SeaTac Center is recommended for approval, effective summer 1999.

**Central Washington University
Proposal to Establish a Master of Education
In Business and Marketing Education at the CWU SeaTac Center**

July 1999

INTRODUCTION

The Master of Education in Business and Marketing Education is an existing program at Central Washington University in Ellensburg. That program, like the proposed program, is designed for practicing high school teachers and community and technical college faculty. The program is enthusiastically supported by Puget Sound school districts, vocational administrators, and community and technical colleges.

PROGRAM NEED

Definition

The M.Ed. in Business and Marketing Education prepares teachers and faculty in the advanced curriculum areas typically taught in business-related programs at the high school and two-year college levels. These areas include, but are not limited to, education and information technology, accounting, business, communications, and administrative support.

Relationship to Institutional Mission

The proposed program contributes to CWU's role and mission. The university mission statement indicates that "through its professional programs, Central is committed to serve the needs of Washington citizens." Furthermore, the proposed program would support and complement an array of existing programs offered at the CWU SeaTac Center.

Relationship to Program Plan

In April 1998, the Board granted "pre-approval" status to the proposed program.

Relationship to Other Institutions

No other public or private institution in the state offers a master's degree in business and marketing education.

Occupational Demand and Student Interest

As illustrated below, there is keen interest and demand for this type of graduate program.

- The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Puget Sound school districts, and Puget Sound community and technical colleges have requested that the M.Ed. in Business and Marketing Education be offered at the CWU SeaTac Center. They are aware of the preference for business teachers and faculty who possess a graduate degree in this specialty area.
- There are about 700 business teachers in the state, the majority of whom teach in western Washington and the Puget Sound area. In addition, there are approximately 300 Puget Sound community and technical college faculty who teach in business-related fields, and most persons teaching at those two-year colleges are expected to have a master's degree.
- According to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, between 50 and 60 percent of the state's business teachers are eligible to retire within the next five years, and will need to be replaced. Many teachers in the soon-to-be-retired group want to earn a master's degree for advancement and to increase their retirement benefits. And, their replacements ultimately may want to earn a master's degree for the same reasons.
- Since 1995, Central has offered an undergraduate program in business teacher education at the CWU SeaTac Center. To date, 45 people have completed that program. Many of these graduates are placebound, and specifically have asked the university to offer a graduate program in business and marketing education at its CWU SeaTac Center.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Goals

The Master of Education in Business and Marketing Education has the following goals:

1. Offer a graduate degree that meets the needs of the state for master-level professionals in business and marketing education;
2. Serve placebound adults in the Puget Sound region; and
3. Provide students advanced curriculum and technical competence in business and marketing education.

Curriculum

The curriculum would be the same as that for students in the corresponding main campus program. The program would be delivered via two-way interactive distance education classes, Internet (chat rooms), and seminars in which both CWU SeaTac and CWU Ellensburg students participate.

Appendix A displays the program of study. Students would be required to complete a minimum of 45 quarter-credits. As a culminating experience, students would write a thesis, complete a project, or complete a comprehensive written and oral examination.

Students

It is expected that the proposed program initially would serve 20 FTE students, 10 FTE at the CWU SeaTac Center and 10 FTE at the CWU Ellensburg campus. CWU anticipates that the program would grow to serve 25 FTE students, 15 at the CWU SeaTac Center and 10 FTE at the CWU Ellensburg campus at full enrollment. The program would be offered primarily during summer sessions, allowing students to complete the program in three to four years.

Resources

Full-time CWU Ellensburg faculty as well as one full-time faculty member based at the CWU SeaTac Center would participate in the program. The Department Chair located at the main campus would provide program administration.

Diversity Plan

CWU representatives believe that offering the business and marketing education program in the Puget Sound region would attract additional persons of color into teaching leadership and administration positions. The CWU SeaTac faculty member for the program would establish linkages with ethnic minority practicing teachers and community and technical college faculty and develop marketing materials designed to encourage them to pursue graduate studies in business and marketing education.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Assessment Plan

Appendix B provides an overview of the assessment plan. It reflects the same assessment methods used for the main campus program. Assessment data and recommendations from the Business Education Advisory Committee are used continually for program revisions and refinements. With the addition of distance education courses, special attention would be given to the outcomes of these courses. In addition, student progress and achievement of expected outcomes would be measured in each course. Special emphasis would be placed on students' abilities to successfully conduct team projects and research related to topics in the distance education courses.

External Reviews

Because this is an existing program, an external review was not required. Eastern Washington University, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the North Thurston School District submitted letters of support for the proposed program.

COST OF PROGRAM

Appendix C provides an estimated cost of the M.Ed. in Business and Marketing Education. It would be offered on a self-sustaining basis, with students paying \$113 per credit. In the first year, the cost-per-FTE student in the program is estimated to be \$1,998. At full enrollment, the cost would drop to \$1,740. These costs compare quite favorably with the annual average cost for a student enrolled in a graduate-level teacher education program at CWU.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposal is based on demonstrated need in the K-12 schools and community and technical system. Additionally, leading business and vocational/technical constituencies support the proposal at the state and local levels. Furthermore, the program addresses the need to provide greater professional development opportunities for placebound populations in the Puget Sound region.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Central Washington University proposal to offer a Master of Education in Business and Marketing Education at CWU's SeaTac Center is recommended for approval, effective summer 1999.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Program of Study
APPENDIX B	Assessment Plan
APPENDIX C	Program Costs

For a copy of the appendices, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-19

WHEREAS, Central Washington University has requested approval to establish a Master of Education in Business and Marketing Education at the CWU SeaTac Center; and

WHEREAS, The program would provide greater graduate-level education opportunities for placebound people in the Puget Sound region; and

WHEREAS, The program addresses the growing need for high school and community and technical college faculty with advanced knowledge and skills; and

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

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable for delivering this distance learning program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University request to establish a Master of Education in Business and Marketing Education at the CWU SeaTac Center, effective summer 1999.

Adopted:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Washington State University Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Washington State University is partnering with the University of Idaho, Oregon State University, and Eastern Oregon University to offer an upper-division **Bachelor of Science in Agriculture**. For many years, each institution has offered this program on an individual basis. Each institution will deliver portions of the program to numerous community colleges, branch campuses, and research and extension centers throughout the three states via **distance e-learning technologies**. To date, about \$740,000 in grant funding has been leveraged to support the development of courses for the Tri-State Agriculture Distance Degree Alliance, TADDA.

The extended degree program is designed for students who want to pursue careers in agriculture and other natural resource-based professions. It is anticipated that most program participants will be community college transfer students who have completed an associate's degree.

The **diversity plan** supports the desire of the state and the universities to increase the participation rates of people of color in higher education and in the agriculture and natural resource-based fields. The **assessment plan** is well designed to measure student performance and program vitality.

The BS in Agriculture would be funded by a combination of **internal reallocation** and **TADDA grant funds**. It would be supported by permanent faculty at WSU Pullman and at WSU Learning Centers. At full enrollment, the cost would be about **\$10,240** per FTE student.

RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho is recommended for approval, effective fall term 1999. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WSU will submit actual costs for the distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, at the end of the second year of the program, WSU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Washington State University Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho

July 1999

INTRODUCTION

The College of Agriculture and Home Economics at Washington State University is partnering with its counterparts at the University of Idaho, Oregon State University, and Eastern Oregon University to deliver an upper-division Bachelor of Science in Agriculture. For many years, each institution has offered the program on an individual basis. Each institution will deliver portions of the program via distance e-learning technologies to numerous community colleges, branch campuses, and research and extension centers throughout the three states. As such, students will not be required to relocate or stop employment while completing their studies. To date, about \$740,000 in grant funding has been leveraged to support the development of courses for the Tri-State Agriculture Distance Degree Alliance, TADDA.

PROGRAM NEED

Definition

The BS in Agriculture is designed for students who want to pursue careers in agriculture and other natural resource-based professions. They will acquire broad training in several curriculum areas: Agriculture and Resource Economics, Agriculture in Society, Agricultural Technology, Animal/Veterinary Science, Natural and Environmental Sciences, Plant Protection, and Plant/Soil Science.

Relationship to Institutional Mission

As eloquently stated in the proposal, “*WSU serves as a knowledge base and resource for the citizens of the state and the region. The College of Agriculture and Home Economics serves its clientele in a like manner. The mission of the Agriculture Program is to be a knowledge resource in technology, education, and engineering for agriculture and other biological systems, with the goals of: quality teaching to impart knowledge to new professionals and practitioners; quality research to enhance the knowledge resource; and quality extension to disseminate knowledge to clientele.*”

Relationship to Program Plan

In April 1998 the Board granted “pre-approval” status to the proposed program.

Relationship to Other Institutions

WSU is the only institution in the state that offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in agriculture.

Occupational Demand and Student Interest

A number of independent studies conducted in Washington and around the region concerning distance education and specifically concerning needs for education in agriculture support demand for the type of program WSU is proposing. Here are a few examples.

- According to the comprehensive review of the North Dakota Interactive Video Network, North Dakota State University offers a very popular distance education program in agriculture. Based on the population differences between North Dakota and Washington (North Dakota's population base is about one-eighth of that of Washington State), and the graduation rates in the North Dakota program, it is expected that WSU's proposed BS in Agriculture would graduate at least 22 students per year.
- According to two recent surveys conducted by Agriculture Education Faculty of Washington Agricultural Educators, there are approximately 7,500 students enrolled in secondary agriculture programs and 500,000 nationally. There are about 21,000 transfer-prepared students enrolled in two-year institutions in Washington. Of these, 250-300 students indicated an interest in transferring to Washington State University in some area of agriculture.
- According to the surveys above, it is also estimated that a total of 180-220 students annually complete agriculture degree programs at community colleges throughout the state. About a quarter of these graduates are a potential market for the proposed program.
- Recent market research conducted by MGT of America, Elway Research, Inc., and the WSU Economic Sciences Research Center indicate the escalating need for worker retraining and greater access to higher education opportunities. These needs will need to be addressed, at least in part, through increased utilization of distance education technologies.

Furthermore, since March 1999, WSU has turned away 32 individuals who wanted to enroll in the BS in Agriculture through TADDA. Because distance delivery of the BS in Agriculture was not an approved program at WSU at that time, these students were directed to another university partner in the TADDA project to pursue their studies.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

As reported in the proposal, *“The overall goal of the program is to prepare students for professional and practitioner opportunities in agriculture and natural resources, so that they can provide leadership and dissemination of knowledge in this ever more intricate and complex field. The objectives are that each student will be able to:*

- *Integrate research and scholarship into the workplace;*
- *Demonstrate technical skills and competencies in the agricultural industry;*
- *Synthesize the latest model for the transfer of knowledge;*
- *Integrate technology, agriculture, and science;*
- *Demonstrate communication skills;*
- *Apply leadership, knowledge and skills to professional and citizen roles; and*
- *Integrate these capabilities into their professional and practitioner positions in agricultural and allied industries.”*

Curriculum

The BS in Agriculture will be offered in partnership with community and technical colleges in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho in a 2+2 format. Students will complete the first two years of the program at the community or technical colleges and the last two years at the baccalaureate institutions. The program, in its entirety, is comprised of 121 credits. The proposed program of study and course inventory is presented in Appendix A.

Students

It is anticipated that the program will serve 12 FTE students (30 headcount) in its first year and 35 FTE students (85 headcount) at full enrollment. It is expected that most students will enroll on a part-time basis and complete the program in three to six years (about six to 12 semesters).

Resources

Initially, permanent faculty at WSU Pullman and at WSU Learning Centers will support the extended BS in Agriculture. New faculty will be added to the program as student enrollments increase and demand for courses increase. Program administration will be provided through the WSU Biological Systems Engineering Department. The WSU Office of Extended Degree Programs will provide support for all courses, including course production, delivery, and monitoring.

Students will have access to an array of library resources, including college and university online catalogs that list books, journals, and government documents; computer programs to multiple periodical and journal indexes; and local libraries in their respective communities. In addition, students can contact an extended degree library technician on the WSU Pullman campus via toll-free phone or e-mail.

Specific details of coordination, academic affairs, and student affairs, amongst the participating institutions are outlined in the TADDA agreement. This agreement appears in Appendix B.

Diversity

WSU believes that offering the BS in Agriculture under the auspice of the Tri-State Distance Delivery Alliance should attract and promote additional persons of color into the agriculture and natural resources field. While students on WSU's campuses tend to be younger and Caucasian, students enrolled in WSU's existing extended degree programs tend to be older and more ethnically diverse.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Assessment Plan

Appendix C displays the assessment plan. It includes elements and strategies for evaluating the program's effectiveness and student learning outcomes. They are consistent with the Board's standards and expectations in this important area.

External Reviews

Because this is an existing program, an external review was not required. All of the other public baccalaureate institutions in Washington received a copy of the proposal and were invited to comment. To date, the University of Washington, Eastern Washington University, and Central Washington University have shared their support for the proposal. Members of the Inter-institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning received a copy of the proposal as well. They too support WSU's proposal.

COST OF PROGRAM

Appendix D displays the projected costs associated with the BS in Agriculture. It will be funded through internal reallocation and TADDA grant funds. The estimated \$10,240 cost per FTE student compares favorably with other undergraduate and extended degree programs offered by WSU.

STAFF ANALYSIS

1. The proposed BS in Agriculture Extended Degree Program has the potential to contribute significantly to greater higher education access in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, and to the evolution of best practices in multi-media instruction.
2. The program supports the Board's initiatives for higher education in numerous ways, including expanded use of instructional technologies, increased partnerships with other colleges and universities in the delivery of the program, and greater participation of under-represented groups in higher education.
3. Student interest and occupational demand have been well documented.
4. Resources are adequate to support quality instruction and support services for students and faculty alike.
5. The assessment plan is well suited for the extended degree program, and should ensure student success and program enhancements.
6. The costs are reasonable for a program of this nature.

RECOMMENDATION

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Program of Study
Appendix B	Tri-State Distance Delivery Alliance Agreement
Appendix C	Assessment Plan
Appendix D	Program Costs

For a copy of the appendices, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-20

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

WHEREAS, The program has the potential to enhance higher education opportunities in all areas of the state of Washington and the region; and

WHEREAS, The program will respond to the steady demand for professionals in the agriculture and natural resources-based fields; and

WHEREAS, The program will be offered in collaboration with the University of Idaho, Oregon State University, and Eastern Oregon University; and

WHEREAS, The program supports the Board's initiatives for higher education, including expanded use of instructional technologies, increased partnerships with two- and four- year institutions, and greater participation of people of color in higher education; and

WHEREAS, The assessment plan is well suited for a distance education program and should facilitate on-going program enhancements; and

WHEREAS, Resources are adequate to support a quality program and support services; and

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the High Education Coordinating Board approves Washington State University's request to establish a Bachelor of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, effective fall term 1999. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WSU will submit actual costs for the distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, at the end of the second year of the program, WSU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Approved:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Washington State University Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering at Spokane

July 1999

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Washington State University proposes to offer a **Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering** at its Spokane branch campus. The program is an extension of the undergraduate program in computer engineering on the WSU Pullman campus. The program would be offered in partnership with the community colleges and baccalaureate institutions in the Spokane area and the University of Idaho. Students would choose to earn their degree from either WSU, Gonzaga, or the University of Idaho. Courses would be delivered by resident faculty in the Spokane area, live TV, and videotape.

The program responds to recent calls for greater collaboration among local colleges and universities, business, and community organizations to satisfy educational needs. And this proposal responds to a community desire for WSU to establish a greater physical presence in the Spokane area and initiate programs that would contribute to economic development in that region.

WSU expects program participants to be time- and place-bound adults in the region. They would acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the escalating needs of the information technology industry.

The diversity initiatives for the proposed program reflect WSU's commitment to serve students of color, women, and those with disabilities. The **assessment initiatives** reflect the expected student learning outcomes articulated by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology.

The BS in Computer Engineering would be funded by new state funds. It would be supported, in the long term, by a core of resident faculty. At full enrollment, the cost of this program should be about **\$19,916 per FTE student**. This is considerably higher than other WSU engineering related undergraduate programs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering at its Spokane branch campus is recommended for approval, effective fall 1999.

Washington State University Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering at Spokane

July 1999

INTRODUCTION

Washington State University proposes to offer a **Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering** at its Spokane branch campus. The program is an extension of the undergraduate program in computer engineering on the WSU Pullman campus. The program would be offered in partnership with the community colleges and baccalaureate institutions in the Spokane area and the University of Idaho. It responds to recent requests for greater collaboration among the local colleges and universities, business, and community organizations to satisfy education needs.

PROGRAM NEED

Definition: Computer engineering deals with the design and practical application of computer hardware and software systems to the solution of technological, economic, and societal problems. The computer engineer analyzes a problem and selects from a variety of tools and technologies those most appropriate for its solution. The computer engineer is involved in hardware design, software creation, and systems integration.

Relationship to Institutional Mission: WSU, as a Land Grant university, emphasizes the development of programs in engineering, applied sciences, agriculture, and veterinary medicine. The discipline of computer engineering, whose origins are linked to electrical engineering and computer science, has evolved over the past 50 years. It has become an established area on its own.

Relationship to Program Plan: The proposed program was not included in WSU's program plan. However, it was included in the WSU program plan related to the Board's *Spokane Higher Education Services Study*.

Relationship to Other Institutions: Both WSU Pullman and the University of Idaho offer degrees in computer engineering while Gonzaga University offers courses in computer engineering as an option within its electrical engineering degree program. Eastern Washington University and Whitworth College offer degrees in computer science, but not in computer engineering. The proposed program would create a program specifically for the non-traditional, part-time student in the Spokane-Coeur d'Alene area. The uniqueness of the program and its location would not overlap with similar offerings in other parts of the state and region.

Occupational Demand and Student Interest: Computer engineering is one of the fastest growing fields throughout the state and nation, according to the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers and the American Association of Engineering Societies (*The Institute*, March 1996, Vol. 20, No. 3):

1. *“Computer engineering would grow much faster than any engineering discipline and by 2005 would pass mechanical engineering according to a new forecast of employment trends prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.”*
2. *“Demand is already strong for people with skills in computer applications, including hardware and software development. Demand for computer engineers would not only rise in obvious employment sectors, such as computer and data processing service firms, but also in traditional engineering services, financial organizations, and management and accounting companies.”*

In the state of Washington the situation is even more serious. Governor Gary Locke made this point clearly in a December 1998 Policy Brief, *“Investing in Our Technical Workforce,”*:

“It is absolutely outrageous that Washington residents are not being educated and trained for the thousands of high-paying jobs that the software industry is creating. My aim is to triple the number of people who get degrees in information technology programs.... “In the general information technology area, about 17 percent of demand is currently met by Washington public and private post-secondary institutions.”

In order to address this critical shortage, the Legislature has appropriated competitive grant funds and 500 new, targeted student FTEs to expand post-secondary information technology programs at the public two- and four-year institutions.

Because computer engineers are in high demand, it is expected that there would be a high level of student interest as well. In its initial semester of operation, the BS in Computer Engineering at WSU Pullman attracted 60 students. This occurred without any attempt to publicize the program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Student Learning Outcomes

The specific student learning outcomes for this program are to graduate computer engineers who possess the following competencies:

1. Understand the essential concepts of computer systems, including both hardware and software components;
2. Understand the science foundations of computer science and engineering;
3. Are proficient in using mathematical concepts and engineering tools to analyze, develop, and refine computer systems;
4. Can apply creative engineering processes to computer system design and development; and
5. Are proficient in carrying out, in a team environment, a design/development task in the computer engineering arena.

Program of Study

Appendix A presents the program of study for the BS in Computer Engineering. The program identifies a “common” schedule of studies acceptable to the three sponsoring institutions: Washington State University, Gonzaga University, and the University of Idaho. It is expected that each institution would deliver approximately one-third of the junior and senior level courses. These courses would be delivered and/or originate primarily at Gonzaga University, WSU Spokane, and the University of Idaho Riverbend Research and Training Park. Lower-division courses, electives, and support courses would be delivered, in part, by Eastern Washington University, Whitworth College, and the community colleges of Spokane.

Students

It is anticipated that the program would serve a total of 12 FTE (36 headcount) students in its first year and 30 (60 headcount) FTE students at full enrollment. It is expected that these part-time students would complete the program in three to four years. It is also assumed that approximately one-third of the students would seek degrees from each of the three sponsoring institutions.

Resources

In the start-up phase, the program would be delivered by a combination of live TV and videotaped courses, and existing faculty from the three degree-granting institutions. In the long term, it would be delivered primarily by resident faculty. Each institution expects to have two faculty members resident in the Spokane/Coeur d’Alene area. WSU has already begun a search for a new resident faculty member in computer engineering. Administration and support services would be provided on a part-time basis.

Students would have access to the library collections at WSU Spokane and Gonzaga University. They also would be able to access library resources from all of WSU’s other campuses through WSU’s Extended Campus Library Services.

For the most part, existing facilities and equipment are adequate to accommodate program needs. However, about \$10,000 is budgeted for laboratory computer stations at WSU Spokane.

Diversity

WSU has made an institution-wide commitment to increasing diversity amongst its personnel and student body. The School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science is fully supportive of the university’s many diversity initiatives. Faculty and staff at WSU Spokane would be expected to work aggressively to recruit and retain a diverse group of majors in computer engineering.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Accreditation

The proposed BS in Computer Engineering at WSU Spokane would seek accreditation with the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). In the case of new programs, this cannot occur until the program has produced its first graduating class.

Assessment

In addition to meeting the assessment standards established by ABET, the following program assessments would be employed:

1. Transcript evaluation;
2. Written assessment of performance in key courses;
3. Portfolios of student work;
4. Focus group exit interviews with graduating seniors;
5. Alumni and employer satisfaction surveys; and
6. Tracking performance of students who go on to graduate school.

The objective and subjective data gathered above would be routinely evaluated and used to determine how to improve the educational process for the students pursuing the BS in Computer Engineering.

External Review

Since the proposed program represents a slight modification of WSU's existing BS in Computer Engineering, an external review was not required. However, the proposal was shared with the other public baccalaureate institutions. To date, Central Washington University and the University of Washington have shared their support for the proposal.

COST OF PROGRAM

New state funds would support the BS in Computer Engineering. Appendix B summarizes the estimated program costs. The start-up costs are high due to one-time expenditures for equipment and faculty, and initial enrollment projections. These projections assume a long start-up period because of the part-time nature of the students. The demand for computer engineers across Washington State and nationally could, of course, contribute to higher enrollments in the Spokane area, which would decrease the per FTE student cost. The costs at full enrollment are \$19,916 per FTE student.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

The proposal is based on regional and national workforce needs that WSU Spokane has documented. It has the potential to increase WSU's physical presence in Spokane and contribute to economic development in that region. Additionally, the program addresses the need to provide computer engineering educational opportunities for time-and-placebound individuals. Furthermore, the program is a unique partnership among all of the Spokane area higher education institutions and the University of Idaho. Last, but not least, the program of study and related assessments are modeled after the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology standards, thus assuring quality instruction.

RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering at its branch campus in Spokane is recommended for approval, effective fall 1999.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Program of Study

APPENDIX B Program Costs

For a copy of the appendices, please call the HECB, at (360) 753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-21

WHEREAS, Washington State University is proposing to establish a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering at its Spokane branch campus; and

WHEREAS, The proposal is based on regional workforce needs that WSU has documented; and

WHEREAS, The program has the potential to increase WSU's physical presence in Spokane and contribute to economic development in the region; and

WHEREAS, The program addresses the need to provide more computer engineering educational opportunities for time- and place-bound individuals; and

WHEREAS, The program would be offered in partnership with all of the higher education institutions in the Spokane area and the University of Idaho; and

WHEREAS, The program of study, faculty resources, support services, and assessment methodologies are modeled after the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology standards;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University request to establish a Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering at its Spokane branch campus, effective fall term 1999.

Adopted:

July 15, 1999

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary