



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

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

**PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA**  
*Highline Community College, Bldg. 7 Auditorium*  
*2400 S. 240<sup>th</sup> Street, Des Moines 98198*  
*June 11, 2002*

*Approximate  
Times*

*Tab*

**8:30 a.m. Overview of Meeting Agenda** (Library Board Room)  
(No official business will be conducted.)

**9:00 a.m. Welcome and introductions**

- Bob Craves, HECB Chair
- President Priscilla Bell, Highline Community College

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

**Adoption of March 2002 HECB Meeting Minutes** 1

**Report on Fund for Innovation** 2  
*(Resolution 02-09)*

**New Degree Programs for Approval**

• M.S. in Genetic Epidemiology, UW 3  
*(Resolution 02-10)*

• Ph.D. in Public Health Genetics, UW 4  
*(Resolution 02-11)*

• LL.M. in Intellectual Property Law and Policy, UW 5  
*(Resolution 02-12)*

• M.S. in Computing and Software Systems, UWT 6  
*(Resolution 02-13)*

• Ph.D. in Communication, WSU 7  
*(Resolution 02-14)*

• D. of Physical Therapy, EWU 8  
*(Resolution 02-15)*

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

• **Status Report: Notification of Intent** (new public 9  
baccalaureate degree programs)

**9:15 a.m. Update on Transfer and Articulation Activities** 10

- HECB staff briefing

- Report from Earl Hale, executive director, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

**10:15 a.m.** Break

**10:30 a.m. Rules Change: Degree-granting Institutions Act (DAA) 11**

- HECB staff briefing

**Rules Change/Emergency Rules 12**  
 HECB staff briefing

- State Need Grant Program (*Resolution 02-16*)
- State Work Study Program (*Resolution 02-17*)
- Promise Scholarship (*Resolution 02-18*)

**11:15 a.m. 2004 Master Plan Development 13**

- HECB staff briefing
- Board discussion

PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURNMENT

**12:00 noon** Lunch (Bldg. 23, Room 111)  
*No official business will be conducted.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**1:30 p.m. Higher Education Forum with Pat Callan, president 14**  
**National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education**

- Co-sponsored by the Senate and House Higher Education committees, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and the HECB
- Moderated by Sen. Jeanne Kohl-Welles, Senate higher education chair and Rep. Phyllis Kenney, House higher education chair

**HECB 2002 Meeting Calendar**

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
<b>July 16, Tue</b>	Board Retreat	TBD – SeaTac/Seattle area
<b>July 31, Wed.</b> 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Regular meeting	Western Washington University Bellingham Old Main, 340 Board Room
<b>Sept. 25, Wed.</b> 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Regular meeting	Capitol Campus John A. Cherberg Bldg, SHR4
<b>Oct 29, Tue.</b> 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Regular meeting	Olympia
<b>Dec. 12, Thu.</b> 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Regular meeting	University of Washington, Seattle Walker Ames Room, Kane Hall

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

**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**March 27, 2002**

June 2002

**HECB Members Present**

Mr. Bob Craves, chair  
Dr. Gay Selby, vice chair  
Ms. Pat Stanford, secretary  
Mr. Jim Faulstich  
Ms. Roberta Greene  
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins  
Mr. Herb Simon  
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

HECB Chairman Bob Craves called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. He welcomed the members of the audience, including legislators who had come to participate in the discussion. Craves also gave a special welcome to Roberta (Bobbie) May, the State Board of Education's current liaison to the HECB, and also to Renton Technical College President Don Bressler, representing the community and technical colleges.

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS APPROVED**

**ACTION:** *Gay Selby moved for consideration of the minutes of the Board's Feb. 6<sup>th</sup> meeting and approval of two new degree programs:*

**Res. 02-06,** *Master of Architecture at WSU Pullman and Spokane*

**Res. 02-07,** *BA/BS in General Studies at CWU Ellensburg and Centers at Lynnwood, Seatac, Steilacoom, Wenatchee, and Yakima.*

**Roberta Greene** *seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.*

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT AND LEGISLATIVE SESSION UPDATES**

Marc Gaspard gave his report to the Board, including degree programs approved through the Notification of Intent process, and updates on the GET and GEAR UP programs.

Bruce Botka, HECB director of government relations, provided highlights of the legislative session and issues important to the HECB. He thanked Rep. Phyllis Kenney for sponsoring the bill that would allow holdover of unused financial aid funds, and called attention to Sen. Don Carlson's bill expanding higher education opportunities for residents in border counties.

HECB Deputy Director Ruta Fanning summarized the supplemental budgets, starting with the \$1.543 billion shortfall in the current biennium and the Legislature's solution, which is a combination of additional resources of \$858 million and reductions of \$685 million. Fanning described the impact of the supplemental budget cut of \$62.4 million from the higher education operating budget. Areas affected are enrollments, tuition, financial aid, salaries and benefits. She noted that the Governor had not yet signed the budget bill.

### **DISCUSSION WITH LEGISLATORS**

Craves welcomed the legislators present for a discussion on higher education and funding issues. Gaspard gave preliminary comments, referring to the HECB handout, which summarized higher education trends and opportunities. Legislators present were:

- Sen. Jeanne Kohl-Welles, chair, Senate Higher Education Committee
- Sen. Don Carlson, Senate Higher Education Committee
- Rep. Phyllis Kenney, chair, House Higher Education Committee
- Rep. Helen Sommers, chair, House Appropriations
- Rep. Maralyn Chase, House Higher Education Committee
- Rep. Fred Jarrett, House Higher Education Committee

Jim Faulstich thanked the Legislature for the good work it has done. State Need Grant has been increased, and the community college system has received worker retraining funds. He recalled that the HECB had projected in its 2000 Master Plan the increasing demand for enrollments, but commented that as a coordinating body, the HECB does not have the power of the Legislature (to ensure these students have access to higher education). He suggested that the Board and the legislators work together to look for funding solutions to accommodate the state's increased enrollments.

The main messages and themes discussed by both legislators and Board members included:

#### **There is no effective spokesperson for higher education.**

- There is a strong need to advocate, support, and define the importance of higher education. Legislators listen to their constituents. The plan must start with advocacy to the public so legislators hear it.
- The HECB should take the lead in developing a plan on educating the public.
- There is a need for serious examination of HECB's "coordination" function. HECB needs to advocate for higher education as a system.

#### **What's the message?**

- Constituents believe that higher education is not delivering something of value.
- Voters want to see connection between what they pay and what they get in return.
- Use Promise Scholarship as the vehicle to make the case for higher education. Tie it to the WASLs, make it a four-year scholarship, and provide more dollars per student.

**Everybody's tired of studies.**

- There is a need for an ongoing strategic plan with ongoing revisions and monitoring.

**Higher education funding is the “biggest challenge and the biggest disappointment.”**

- There is not enough money.
- Whose responsibility is it to pay for higher education. The state? Parents and individuals? Or is it higher education's responsibility to fund itself?
- The tax structure of the state must allow funding of K-16, not just K-12.
- HECB should be part of the discussion with former Govs. Evans and Gardner.

**Are the institutions delivering the right programs and degrees?**

- HECB approves new degree programs. Are we putting our money where the need is?
- There's a limit to what institutions will do themselves in high demand areas. If this is not true, we need to get the facts.
- Higher education needs to be more flexible, with results-oriented targets and competency-based outcomes.
- There is a need to consider the growth of non-traditional students, TANF reauthorization, and women returning to schools.

**Need to protect the needy and disadvantaged students**

- The number of students leaving higher education with more and more debt is growing.
- The choice that State Need Grant provides is critical.

**TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION**

Ruta Fanning provided background information and a summary of HECB activities on this issue. She commented that although a lot of the transfer currently happens at the local level, there is a need to determine statewide solutions.

Jan Yoshiwara and Loretta Seppanen from the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges summarized concerns about the current transfer system and proposed strategies for addressing those concerns.

Three key issues/concerns identified were:

- Ensuring that transfer students have access to upper division majors.
- Meeting student needs for lower division preparation for baccalaureate majors.
- Expanding opportunities for individuals with technical degrees to complete bachelor's degrees.

Fanning mentioned two other issues:

- Enrollment capacity at the baccalaureates; and
- Number of community and technical college students who don't transfer.

## **TWO-YEAR DEGREE PROGRAM PLAN**

HECB Associate Director Elaine Jones presented the report, including the statutory responsibility that gives the HECB authority. She reviewed the process of program planning and approval and the various action options the board can take. She added that quality assurance is guaranteed through a combination of external and internal reviewers, and staff recommendations.

The UW, WSU, CWU, and WWU requested that a sunset provision be applied to 58 proposed degree programs that currently have been granted permission to develop. Most of these programs are offered at branch campuses and learning centers. The Board responded by asking the institutions to report on the reasons for withdrawing programs that have been granted permission to be developed into proposal status.

***ACTION:** Jim Faulstich moved for consideration of Res. 02-08, to approve the two-year degree program plan. Roberta Greene seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.*

## **COMMENTS FROM REP. JARRETT**

Rep. Jarrett urged the Board to consider competency-based articulation, similar to the model used in Oregon. He would like to improve the system's ability to change and believes the institutions should be allowed to innovate.

**Meeting adjourned.**

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-06**

WHEREAS, Washington State University proposes to establish a Master of Architecture at WSU Pullman and Spokane, beginning fall 2002; and

WHEREAS, The program will provide advanced studies in architecture and serve the comprehensive needs of the profession; and

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

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

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University proposal to establish a Master of Architecture at WSU Pullman and Spokane, effective March 27, 2002.

Adopted:

March 27, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-07**

WHEREAS, Central Washington University has requested approval to establish a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Science in General Studies, beginning fall 2002, at the Ellensburg campus and CWU off-campus centers at Lynnwood, SeaTac, Steilacoom, Wenatchee, and Yakima; and

WHEREAS, Student interest and employer needs for the program are demonstrated; and

WHEREAS, The assessment plan and diversity initiatives are well suited for a program of this nature; and

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

WHEREAS, The program costs are negligible;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University request to establish a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Science in General Studies at the Ellensburg campus and CWU off-campus centers at Lynnwood, SeaTac, Steilacoom, Wenatchee, and Yakima, effective March 27, 2002.

Adopted:

March 27, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary



**RESOLUTION NO. 02-08**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board approves the staff report and recommendations included in the March 27, 2002 document entitled: *Report on Institutional Program Plans, Recently Approved Programs, and Program Review.*

Adopted:

March 27, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

## **FUND FOR INNOVATION AND QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

### *Final Report*

June 2002

### **BACKGROUND**

The Legislature appropriated \$600,000 in grants in the 1999-01 biennium for the Fund for Innovation and Quality to encourage higher education institutions to develop innovative and collaborative solutions to statewide educational challenges. The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) administered these two-year grants to the public four-year institutions.

The Higher Education Coordinating Board issued a request for proposals to the public four-year college and universities in July 1999 and received 23 proposals totaling \$2.2 million from six institutions.

A Review Committee met to consider and make recommendations on the proposals. The 11-member committee included five members of the HECB staff, representatives of two of Washington's public baccalaureate institutions, two staff members from the Western Interstate Cooperative for Higher Education, a representative from the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and a representative of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Committee members did not vote on proposals that originated from institutions they represented.

Consistent with the recommendations of the Review Committee, the Board authorized grant funding for seven proposals totaling \$593,000 in grant funds.

All work under these grants is now complete, and the grantee institutions have completed final reports on activities and lessons learned.

### **SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES AND LESSONS LEARNED**

Following is a description of each of the seven projects that were undertaken and the purpose, activities/outcomes, and lessons learned from each.

#### **1. Asynchronous, Community-Based Education for Registered Nurse Students in Washington State – Washington State University College of Nursing, Intercollegiate Center for Nursing Education – \$109,499**

Washington State University (WSU) successfully implemented a program of asynchronous (at different times) baccalaureate nursing instruction so that registered nurses in distant locations could obtain their degrees at home or at work. These students relied on e-learning for all of their

theory courses, while clinical work was arranged at distance sites. In addition, an online tutorial was developed to teach students how to navigate the nursing course Web site, and an online instructor evaluation system was implemented.

The specific outcomes of this project were:

1. The change in FTE enrollment from spring 2000 to spring 2001 was an increase of 31 percent, above the target increase of 25 percent.
2. One Native American student has graduated from the program, and three Hispanic students are currently enrolled, reflecting the goal of focusing on the needs of Native American and Hispanic students.
3. All ten theory courses have been redesigned to permit Web-based delivery.
4. All courses have evaluation criteria to measure course objectives, instructional methodology and student learning.

Student satisfaction surveys have documented the student learning and comfort level with Web-based instruction. Some students required a period of time to become familiar and comfortable with this approach, but a survey of 40 students enrolled in Nursing 400 indicated that 35 of the students would take another Web-based course.

Lessons learned include:

1. Re-engineering coursework to fit into a Web-based format is time-consuming for faculty and support staff. And, some faculty members are not totally receptive of technical staff input in the areas of presenting, questioning, and student evaluation.
2. Asynchronous courses are no less costly than traditional site-based courses. Some of the costs are different (software licenses, technical staff support, establishing contracted clinical sites), but end up about the same as site-based courses.
3. Substantial administrative oversight is required to promote and coordinate team efforts, and should be recognized as a cost of asynchronous courses.
4. Evaluation of course delivery and student learning is important to developing successful and cost-effective asynchronous courses, and the cost of these evaluations should be recognized.

The statewide lesson to be learned from this project is that asynchronous courses can be developed and implemented successfully with the appropriate level of planning, preparation, and ongoing review. Some courses may need to be re-designed to fit a Web-based approach, graphics need to be developed that support student interest and understanding, faculty and technical staff need to work together in new and sometimes unfamiliar ways, and student familiarity and comfort with Web-based coursework will improve over time. Also, ongoing communication/evaluation with students is important to understanding what is successful and

what can be improved. In summary, a rigorous and well-managed approach to Web-based education can provide a quality alternative to students who are limited by their distance from a site-based program.

## **2. Implementing A Critical Thinking Rubric For Assessment of Student Progress, For Diagnostic Use, and as a Teaching Tool – Washington State University – \$59,526**

WSU designed and implemented a new approach to course delivery and student evaluation that emphasizes critical thinking skills rather than the ability to memorize and retrieve information. This emphasis on developing critical thinking skills is applicable to virtually all programs and reflects a major goal of WSU educational efforts.

The specific outcomes of this project were:

1. A seven-dimension critical thinking framework was developed in a form that can be applied to many different kinds of courses and program areas.
2. Twenty-two faculty members were trained and incorporated an emphasis on critical thinking skills in the redesign and delivery of their courses.
3. The critical thinking rubric was also applied as an assessment and diagnostic tool to measure the development of critical thinking in students.
4. Faculty that integrated a critical thinking emphasis into their courses expressed satisfaction with the results in improved student reasoning skills, and most of them plan to continue using this approach.

The lessons learned include:

1. Development of critical thinking skills is not an integral part of many courses as they are currently designed and delivered.
2. Critical thinking skills can be developed systematically once courses are redesigned with this specific goal in mind.
3. Many faculty members are not trained or skilled in designing courses that explicitly emphasize critical thinking, although many of them are willing and able to integrate this aspect into their courses once they are given the tools to do so.

The statewide lesson learned from this project is that specific attention can successfully be paid to the development of critical thinking skills in students, and some traditional course designs and delivery methods are not very effective in building this skill. However, with some training and assistance it is possible for faculty members to successfully integrate the development of critical thinking into many different kinds of courses.

## **3. Multimedia Arts Program – Washington State University/Vancouver – \$77,995**

Washington State University/Vancouver, in conjunction with Clark Community College, Vancouver Heritage High School, Evergreen School District, Vancouver School District and the Vancouver School for Arts and Academics, worked together to create a computer-based multimedia arts curriculum. The new curriculum takes students from the high school level through programs at Clark College and WSU/Vancouver. A significant need exists for students with skills in Web design and related multi-media careers.

The specific activities/outcomes of this project were:

1. Area professionals in the Web and graphic arts industries were surveyed to build a curriculum that meets business needs and produces employable graduates.
2. Two certificate programs and an Associate in Applied Science degree were implemented at Clark College, and a baccalaureate degree in Electronic Media and Culture is undergoing the internal review process for implementation at WSU/Vancouver. Specific skill standards were developed for the Clark College certificate programs.
3. Training sessions in visual graphics for high school teachers were offered, which benefits students that will be moving from the high school programs into the Clark College programs.
4. Articulation agreements between Clark College and a number of high schools and districts have been implemented, with more expected.

The communication that has been fostered by this project among high school, community college, and WSU/Vancouver faculty is a very positive benefit. The eventual outcome of this communication and cooperation should be a progression of courses that builds skill levels that will enable students to choose entry into the workforce or continuing education.

Lessons learned include:

1. Organizational challenges are likely to arise when more than one public institution participates in a grant project, especially when a university branch campus is involved. Curriculum and class offering decisions at the WSU/Vancouver campus are often made in Pullman, which hampered the ability of Clark College to develop an articulation agreement with the Vancouver campus.
2. Creating new technology degrees presents two particular challenges: (1) the traditional academic structure of current degree programs does not always coincide with the types of skills necessary for the new technology degree, and (2) the new technology areas are constantly changing.
3. Maintaining contacts with industry to understand their changing needs should become an accepted part of faculty workload. This is usually not the case at the current time.

The statewide lesson to be learned from this project is that creating new technology skills and degrees that involve high schools, community and technical colleges, and baccalaureate institutions will test the capability of those institutions to be flexible and respond to changing needs. Traditional structures and academic organization may not always fit well with the multi-disciplinary skills that students may need for successful job preparation. Institutions will need to stress the focus on meeting student needs, maintain awareness of changing business needs, follow changes in technology, and be willing to adapt current structures to meet new demands.

#### **4. Co-located and Co-designed Academic and Student Services for the Transferring Student – Eastern Washington University – \$74,289**

Eastern Washington University (EWU), in collaboration with the Community Colleges of Spokane, established a Transfer Student Center to fill a gap in admissions, advising, and registration that exists as students exit the two-year college system and enter a baccalaureate program.

The specific outcomes of this project were:

1. Improved up-front academic advising for students intending to transfer.
2. Reduced student frustration that should lead to less attrition of transferring students.
3. An expectation of improved academic performance of transfer students.
4. Better tracking of transfer student success.
5. Expansion of the Transfer Center at EWU to assist students from other community colleges is under consideration.
6. The value of extending the transfer center model to other institutions was demonstrated.
7. An opportunity was identified to increase the diversity of EWU students through additional transfers of students from underrepresented groups that started their higher education in the community and technical colleges.

Based on student satisfaction surveys and anecdotal experiences with specific students, it seems this effort was successful. Transfers are up at EWU by about 100 over last year, and many of these students may have been more successful as a result of the Transfer Center.

Lessons learned include:

1. A knowledgeable transfer advisor can help students with many more issues than originally envisioned. Much assistance was provided with coursework selection at the community college as they relate to future planning. Other student non-transfer issues were addressed and resolved. The information conduit was helpful in many ways.

2. Having a Transfer Center focused more EWU attention on the needs of and challenges facing transfer students. Having a representative of these students to surface issues and promote discussion was very helpful.
3. Discussion with transfer students identified barriers they face so that the institutions can work together to remove them.

The full-time transfer coordinator position is not being maintained due to budget limitations, but all institutions agree on the benefits provided from this successful effort. Current EWU staff from the Admissions Office have now scheduled regular visits to both Spokane community college campuses; the community colleges have offered office space, telephone, and computer support for continuing efforts; and EWU is scrutinizing its budget to determine if some of these services can be offered in the future.

The statewide lesson learned from this project is that there is a need for, and interest in, more information for students who are navigating the transfer process. Although funding additional transfer centers or efforts will be difficult during tight budgetary times, it is important for institutions to continue to explore ways to get information into the hands of students as early and clearly as possible.

#### **5. Improving American Indian Student Reading Through Culturally Appropriate, Contextual Curriculum Units – The Evergreen State College – \$87,366**

The Evergreen Center for Educational Improvement at The Evergreen State College and the Office of Indian Education at OSPI collaborated with educators and cultural experts in the development of three reading units. These units are designed to present a culturally accurate view of Native American life that is relevant to Native American students. Originally, the plan was to develop curricular units including learning outcomes, classroom-tested activities, and performance assessments using commercially produced reading materials. However, the team quickly discovered a lack of culturally accurate reading materials upon which to base the units. So, a total of 22 fiction and non-fiction stories were developed that matched the essential questions and learning outcomes developed for each reading unit.

Enrolled tribal members wrote all but two of these 22 stories, and all the stories were thoroughly researched for cultural and historical accuracy. The units are designed to cover 23 weeks of instruction and reinforce the development of three cognitive learning skills: (1) **re-telling**, which includes participation by elders and other adults to present stories orally, (2) **now and then**, which requires analysis of issues from both historical and modern perspectives, and (3) **comparison and contrast**, which focuses on the similarities and difference among Native American tribes. Appropriate reading materials for Native American students are expected to boost reading performance and to improve their preparation for college.

The lessons learned include:

1. Most children's books depicting Native Americans depict a historical view of mostly Plains Indians, and are often culturally and historically inaccurate. These books are not relevant to past or present Pacific Northwest tribes.
2. The lack of relevance in these books to the lives and experiences of modern Native American students causes a disconnection between the students and their school experience.
3. Many members of the Native American community remain skeptical of how their history is portrayed in public schools, and there is a great need for historically and culturally accurate reading materials.

A CD-ROM is currently being produced that will contain the reading materials, curriculum elements, vocabulary and reading lists, a workshop on Culturally Responsive Teaching, and other cultural materials. The intent of the Evergreen Center is to make a CD-ROM available to all public and private schools in Washington.

This project has stirred great interest and support among the Native American community, and efforts continue to professionally publish the children's stories that were developed. The Washington State Tribes offered generous assistance in many areas throughout this project.

The statewide lesson learned from this project is to point out the value of reading materials that are relevant to the lives of students, which helps to foster a connection with their school experiences. The lack of accurate and culturally relevant children's stories is an impediment to the success of Native American students that can and should be addressed. This project was a necessary and successful start in that effort.

#### **6. Mutual Transcript Research Enterprise – University of Washington – \$57,167**

The University of Washington and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges created a database to share transcript and demographic information for research purposes. This database is called the Mutual Transcript Research Enterprise (MTRE). A common identifier supplied by a third-party matching process identifies students shared by the institutions. This masks personal identifiers and preserves student confidentiality while permitting the institutions to analyze student preparation and performance and demographic information, with the goal of improving the transfer articulation process.



The specific outcomes of this project were:

1. Development of training materials available on the Web, and a Web site for sharing data.
2. Ten to 15 training sessions provided for institutional researchers. Training has been offered at 32 separate sites.
3. Passwords were issued to representatives of each community and technical college according to security agreements.
4. A model process for sharing data was established between baccalaureate institutions and community and technical colleges for the purpose of improving transfer and articulation. Standardization of data formats has also been completed.

Based on a survey sent to community and technical colleges, and experience at the University of Washington, the data made available as a result of this project are being used for a number of purposes. These purposes include analysis of a variety of questions regarding transfer choices, demographics, grades, performance, completion, changing major requirements, and concurrent enrollment.

Lessons learned include:

1. The project demanded more technical staff effort than had been included in the budget. Software installation, connectivity, and training were more complicated than anticipated.
2. Staff at a number of institutions vary in their familiarity with individual software packages selected for use. Selection of software tools for multi-institution use may require more training than originally anticipated.
3. Continuing support of users is necessary. Staff turnover and hardware upgrades require continuing training and support.
4. The lack of standardized course names and numbers throughout the state makes analysis in some areas difficult. Inconsistency in reporting and changes to the data make analysis difficult and time-consuming.
5. Data from other baccalaureate institutions are needed to enhance the usefulness of the system. The project laid the foundation and the inclusion of more institutions will make it more useful.
6. Combining the community and technical college and four-year institution databases promotes valuable analysis and discussion. Additional data allows additional analysis.

The MTRE system continues in operation and is being developed and expanded as resources permit. The U.S. Department of Education points out the proportion of students attending more than one institution has been growing consistently over the last 30 years. Figuring out how to

meet the needs of these students requires accurate and current data that can be provided through a system such as MTRE.

The statewide lesson learned from this project is that there is a need by institutions for accurate and current information regarding the choices and performance of transfer students. Institutions can improve advising and other services if they fully understand the current trends, and can track the impact of any changes. Although direct funding for additional development of the MTRE system will be difficult during tight budgetary times, each institution that provides data to the system will be able to receive benefits from the analysis that becomes possible related to their students.

### **7. Program of Collaborative Science Resources for High School and College Students in Washington State – Central Washington University – \$98,359**

Central Washington University has enhanced its capability to offer science education and science-related academic advising resources to students and faculty in high schools and community colleges throughout the state. The particular focus is to improve communication and collaboration among science educators, and promote a better understanding of science opportunities and necessary preparation among potential science students. Many students and educators in rural central and eastern Washington are limited by time and distance from having direct contact with the science offerings of a baccalaureate institution.

The specific outcomes of this project were:

1. Workshops, discussions, and on-site visits by prospective high school and community college transfer students interested in science education were completed, including an opportunity for prospective students to see scientific instrumentation (e.g., a nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer) in operation.
2. CWU has expanded its on-line capability to provide information and advising to potential science students through an interactive Web site so that students from remote sites can learn about CWU programs and how to prepare for them.
3. Seven different digital videos on different elements of the organic chemistry laboratory course have been completed to provide off-site students with learning opportunities usually limited to a laboratory setting. More videos are in production.
4. Communication among science educators in high schools, community colleges, and public and private universities has been expanded to discuss science education and collaboration, and the preparation of students for successful programs of study.
5. Science lectures were delivered on a multi-link basis to three or more sites simultaneously on a regular basis, demonstrating a cost-effective means of delivering science education to distant locations.

Lessons learned include:

1. The concept of using a Web-based science education advising program for middle and high school students is effective, particularly for students in rural areas. Linking this advising information with site visits by students to prospective postsecondary institutions is even more effective.
2. A critical aspect of successful outreach efforts is to establish connections among faculty at the various institutions involved. Workshops with the participation of high school, community college, and university faculty are a good approach.
3. Major limitations to the growth of electronic distance science education are the lack of technical staff to implement and maintain the systems, and difficulties in organizing course registrations and financial aid among institutions.
4. Creating the necessary laboratory opportunities for students at remote sites is an organizational challenge, but can be accommodated if administrators are supportive.

The statewide lesson learned from this project is that opportunities for quality distance education exist in all academic areas, even in the laboratory sciences. Some additional creativity is required to make distance education in laboratory courses successful, but it is possible. Also, providing an electronic science outreach and advising capability is very helpful to rural middle and high school students to support their interest and motivation and aid in their preparation for college work in the sciences.

**FINANCIAL SUMMARY**

<u>Institution/Project</u>	<u>Grant Amount</u>	<u>Final Expenditure</u>	<u>Amount Returned</u>
Washington State University Asynchronous nursing education	\$109,499	\$109,499	0
Washington State University Critical thinking rubric	\$59,530	\$59,526	\$4
Washington State University Multimedia arts	\$91,600	\$77,995	\$13,605
Eastern Washington University Transfer student services	\$103,528	\$74,289	\$29,239
The Evergreen State College Improving American Indian student reading	\$87,366	\$87,366	0
University of Washington Mutual transcript research enterprise	\$57,167	\$57,167	0
Central Washington University Collaborative science resources	\$99,897	\$98,359	\$1,538

As of April 30, 2002, the Higher Education Coordinating Board Fund for Innovation and Quality Account had a balance of \$34,257.59. All current grants have been completed and closed out. The fund balance has been returned to the state general fund.

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-09**

WHEREAS, The 1999-2001 state operating budget provided \$600,000 in grant funds for the Fund for Innovation and Quality to encourage higher education institutions to develop innovative and collaborative solutions to statewide educational challenges; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board was directed to administer these grants through a competitive process for the public four-year college and universities; and

WHEREAS, The institutions receiving the grants have completed their projects and submitted final reports regarding the activities completed and the lessons learned; and

WHEREAS, A summary of these final reports was presented to the Higher Education Coordinating Board at its meeting on June 11, 2002; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board accepts the final reports of the grantee institutions and the summary report presented by HECB staff.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

# MASTER OF SCIENCE IN GENETIC EPIDEMIOLOGY

## University of Washington

June 2002

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### INTRODUCTION

The University of Washington (UW) is seeking approval from the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish a Master of Science in Genetic Epidemiology. The field of genetic epidemiology focuses on the study of genetics and inheritance of disease. The MS in Genetic Epidemiology would complement the UW's existing Master of Public Health in Public Health Genetics and proposed Ph.D. in Public Health Genetics.

#### PROGRAM NEED

There are no other degree programs in genetic epidemiology in Washington State or nationally. However, highly rated coursework is available at John Hopkins, University of Michigan, Harvard, University of Minnesota, and University of North Carolina.

According to the UW, the current demand for individuals with training in genetic epidemiology and statistical genetics is already great and is expected to continue to increase. For example, in the last few years, John Hopkins, University of North Carolina, and others have been unable to fill faculty positions associated with their programs in genetic epidemiology. With increasing numbers of research projects, there is also a growing demand for individuals with master's level training. The need for personnel who can serve as study coordinators, data managers, and analysts is high.

The UW anticipates that the program's graduates will be in high demand and could work in academia, biotechnology, or public health settings. Program graduates may also choose to pursue doctoral studies.

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

As stated in the proposal, *"The primary goal of the M.S. degree track is to provide in-depth training in genetic epidemiology. The degree requirements include course work in epidemiology, biostatistics, public health genetics, and human genetics, and completion of a research-based master's thesis. It is anticipated that students will complete the 60-credit program of study in 2 academic years (5-8 quarters)."*

Courses would be taught primarily through classroom instruction. At full enrollment, the program would serve 14 FTE students. The program would be supported essentially through existing resources.

## **DIVERSITY AND ASSESSMENT**

The proposal includes an exemplary assessment plan for evaluating program effectiveness, student performance, faculty teaching and service, graduates' career opportunities, and employer satisfaction. For example, the following criteria would be used to evaluate the quality of program graduates' training and work.

- Track job offers and employment
- Compare employment opportunities with findings from the workplace survey
- Track average GPA of graduates
- Evaluate the satisfaction of graduates and satisfaction of employers with graduates

The proposal also describes how program personnel will work closely with the UW Office of Student Services (OSS) to promote diversity among program participants. For example, program personnel will participate in the OSS Saturday Academy that introduces disadvantaged 8-12<sup>th</sup> graders in the Seattle area to health careers, and work closely with the BRIDGES program, providing mentoring and research training for minority undergraduates who want to pursue graduate studies in health sciences.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

Two external reviewers offered favorable remarks on the proposal: Professor Janice Dorman, Department of Epidemiology at the University of Pittsburgh; and Professor Patricia Peyser, School of Public Health at the University of Michigan. They noted that the faculty associated with the program are highly respected in their fields, are outstanding teachers, and their research productivity is excellent. The proposal was also sent to the other state public baccalaureate institutions. To date, staff have not received comments from them.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The program will be funded through internal reallocation. At full enrollment, annual costs would be about \$135,760 or \$9,697 per FTE student.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed MS in Genetic Epidemiology will be popular among students, academia, biotechnology firms, and public health industries. The program of study will provide students with high-quality education and research. And, it will feature a cadre of distinguished faculty.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposal for a Master of Science in Genetic Epidemiology at the University of Washington is recommended for approval, effective June 11, 2002.

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-10**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to offer a Master of Science in Genetic Epidemiology, beginning fall 2002; and

WHEREAS, The program will provide advanced studies in genetic epidemiology and address the critical need for highly trained individuals in academia, biotechnology, and public health settings; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the high quality of the program of study and faculty members; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are not excessive;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington request to establish a Master of Science in Genetic Epidemiology, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary



# **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN PUBLIC HEALTH GENETICS**

## **University of Washington**

June 2002

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The University of Washington (UW) is seeking approval from the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health Genetics. The field of public health genetics is defined as the application of advances in genetics and molecular biotechnology to improve public health and prevent disease. The Ph.D. program would complement the UW's existing Master of Public Health in Public Health Genetics and proposed Master of Science in Genetic Epidemiology. No other Ph.D. in Public Health Genetics exists in Washington or nationally.

#### **PROGRAM NEED**

As stated in the proposal, the graduate degrees offered by the Institute for Public Health Genetics address the need for trained professionals to contribute to research in public health genetics in both public institutions and the private sector, to participate in public and professional education, and to lead in the development of public health policies and infrastructure related to public health genetics. Evidence of this need is found in:

- Public funding initiatives relevant to public health genetics, such as the Cancer Genetics Network and the Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications research program within the Human Genome Project at the National Human Genome Research Institute.
- Creation of an Office of Genetics and Disease Prevention at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- A growing biotech industry and increasing importance in other industries of genetics research and social and policy questions related to genetics, particularly in the pharmaceutical industry.

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The program of study for the Ph. D. in Public Health Genetics is built around four areas: genetic epidemiology; ecogenetics and pharmacogenetics; public health policy; and the ethical, legal, and social implications of genetics. Course requirements include 40-50 credits in foundation courses, which include basics in human genetics, public health, and public health genetics; 16 credits in core courses from each of the core areas; and nine or more credits of elective courses chosen from a restricted list and approved by the thesis committee. In addition to these courses, students will need to pass preliminary written examinations, a candidacy exam, and write and defend his or her dissertation.

A distinguished cadre of faculty and staff will support the program. At full enrollment, it will serve 14 FTE students. Given the multidisciplinary nature of the program, the university expects students to complete the program in five years.

## **DIVERSITY AND ASSESSMENT**

The UW's Institute for Public Health Genetics will continue its efforts to recruit and retain underrepresented minorities and students with disabilities for the new program. Specifically, the Institute will participate in a variety of targeted outreach and support services sponsored by the UW's Office of Student Services.

The proposal includes an assessment plan that describes student learning outcomes and program goals and objectives, and how they will be measured. One unique feature of this assessment plan includes the use of internal and external advisory boards to help set program priorities, provide guidance on the academic aspects of the program, and offer a national perspective. Another highlight includes an evaluation of student demand, quality of applicants, and diversity using the following criteria:

- Number of applicants and trends, including underrepresented minorities and disadvantaged students;
- Number of applicants from Washington and from other areas of the country;
- Number of admission offers compared to number of acceptances;
- Number of admission offers with financial support;
- Quality of undergraduate or graduate education of applicants; and
- Student honors and awards.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

Two external reviewers evaluated the proposal: Dr. Muin J. Khoury, director of the Office of Genetics and Disease Prevention at the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta, and Dr. David Savitz, chair of the Department of Epidemiology at the University of North Carolina. Both reviewers were supportive of the proposed program. They noted that the strength and commitment of the program's faculty would elevate the program from being the first one offered in the country, to potentially being one of the leaders in the field. They also raised concerns that UW handled to their satisfaction. Washington's other public four-year institutions reviewed the proposal as well. Central and Eastern responded by offering good wishes to the UW for this new endeavor.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The program will be funded through internal reallocation. At full enrollment, annual costs would be about \$216,540 or \$15,467 per FTE student.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The Ph.D. in Public Health Genetics would be a welcome addition to the UW's Institute for Public Health Genetics. The program would address critical needs and have substantial impact on the national front. The outstanding faculty, strong student candidates, and emerging scientific arena work together to make this degree program very promising.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposal for a Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Washington is recommended for approval, effective June 11, 2002.

**RESOLUTION NO.02-11**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health Genetics, beginning fall 2002; and

WHEREAS, The program will address the critical need for scientists who can evaluate, communicate, apply, and further advance the broad aspects of genetics as they relate to human health and disease processes; and

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

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

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health Genetics, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted

June 11, 2002

Attest:

---

Bob Craves, Chair

---

Pat Stanford, Secretary

**MASTER OF LAWS IN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW AND POLICY**  
**University of Washington**

June 2002

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**INTRODUCTION**

The University of Washington is seeking approval to offer a Master of Laws in Intellectual Property Law and Policy (IP LL.M.). The LL.M. program will offer legal education in the rights and protections associated with intellectual property. It will focus on laws and policies in biomedical sciences, information technologies, computer sciences, and electronic commerce.

**PROGRAM NEED**

The proposal presents strong evidence of demand for the proposed program. As stated in the proposal:

- One clear measure of the demand for attorneys trained in patent law, and copyright and trademark protection is the vigorous recruiting efforts of law firms and other employers. Locally and nationally, law firms are actively recruiting candidates from intellectual property LL.M. degree programs.
- Demand for attorneys trained to handle technical matters is so great that, included with its most recent issue of graduate school rankings, *U.S. News and World Report* featured an article proclaiming, "Grads with a cyber law background have a decided edge in the market."

The UW's proposed program would be attractive to students currently enrolled in the UW's undergraduate J.D. program, practicing attorneys who seek to either refocus or enhance their careers, and students from abroad.

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The program of study will require students to complete 40 credits: 17 credits in core intellectual property law courses; 14 credits in approved elective courses; and a research and writing thesis requirement. The curriculum prepares students to understand and appreciate complex issues in patent protection, trademark, copyright, and licensing. Full-time students will be expected to complete the program in one academic year, while part-time students will be expected to complete the program in three academic years. At full enrollment, the program will serve 42 FTE students. The program would be supported primarily through existing means, with the addition of hiring one or more tenure track faculty members.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

Student learning outcomes will be assessed through exit interviews for graduates and surveys of current students and alumni. This feedback will be used to guide curricular revisions.

Assessment will be accomplished by:

- Preparing students to understand, appreciate, and apply the law to cutting-edge issues in patent protection, trademark, copyright, and licensing;
- Creating a learning environment where the knowledge base of the disciplines of intellectual property, bioscience, and information policy is valued, rigorously examined, and augmented;
- Monitoring required resources, student progress, and effectiveness of placement process;
- Actively recruiting a diverse student body;
- Conducting exit interviews of all graduating students and soliciting the opinions of students, alumni, academics, and employers about the program.

The composition of the student body is vital to the success of this program. The multidisciplinary, multicultural, transnational nature of intellectual property, bioscience, electronic commerce, and information policy calls for students with talents and skills derived from diverse backgrounds.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

Two external scholars favorably reviewed the proposal: Professor Paul Goldstein at Stanford Law School and Professor Pamela Samuelson at the Berkeley Center for Law and Technology. They offered suggestions to strengthen the proposal, and the UW incorporated them accordingly. The proposal also was shared with the other public four-year institutions. Central, Western, and Eastern extended their wishes for success with the new offering.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The LL.M. program will be offered on a self-sustaining basis with all expenses and costs paid from revenue generated by student tuition. The Law School proposes an initial tuition fee of \$600 per credit. Annual program costs would run about \$536,000 or \$13,400 per FTE student.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The Master of Laws in Intellectual Property Law and Policy would be an outstanding addition to the UW's School of Law. The program would be highly attractive to potential students and law firms around the world. It addresses the changing demands of law education and the practice of law.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposal for a Master of Laws in Intellectual Property Law and Policy degree at the University of Washington School of Law is recommended for approval, effective June 11, 2002.

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-12**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington proposes to establish a Master of Laws in Intellectual Property Law and Policy; and

WHEREAS, The program will provide specialized advanced studies in legal education in the rights and protections associated with intellectual property; and

WHEREAS, There is high demand for professionals with this training; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are well suited for the program; and

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Master of Laws in Intellectual Property Law and Policy degree, effective July 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

**MASTER OF SCIENCE IN COMPUTING AND SOFTWARE SYSTEMS**  
**University of Washington Tacoma**

June 2002

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**INTRODUCTION**

The University of Washington Tacoma (UWT) proposes to offer a Master of Science in Computing and Software Systems (MSCSS). UWT's new Institute of Technology will sponsor the program. The Institute recently was funded by a joint venture between the state of Washington and private donors to help address the critical personnel needs of the high-tech industry.

**PROGRAM NEED**

The proposed MSCSS is specifically designed to meet the increasing need for more workers with highly sophisticated skills and knowledge in software design. It is also designed to meet the needs of high-tech working professionals and bachelor's degree graduates from UWT and other four-year institutions who want to earn master's degrees and advance in their careers. Currently, there is no public or private four-year institution in the state offering an MSCSS to accommodate the needs of placebound residents in the South Puget Sound region.

For several years, the Washington Technical Alliance and the American Engineering Association have conducted studies documenting the high demand for more graduates with bachelor's and master's degrees to support Washington's software industry. In addition, national studies and occupational projections indicate there is a severe shortage of professionals to meet the current and emerging labor market needs of the high-tech industry across the nation.

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

There will be two tracks in the MSCSS program: one track for students who do not have a bachelor's degree in a computer science-related field, and another track for students who do.

**MSCSS PROGRAM OF STUDY**

<b>Track 1 Courses</b>	<b>Track 2 Courses</b>
Mathematical Principles of Computing 11 (5)	
Software Dev & Quality Assurance Techniques (5)	
Computer Operating Systems (5)	
Database System Design (5)	
Distributed Applied Programming (5)	Distributed Applied Programming (5)
Theory of Computing (5)	Theory of Computing (5)
Electives from 400 level courses (5)	Electives from 400 level courses (5)
Electives from 500 level courses (10)	Electives from 500 level courses (10)
Masters Seminar in CSS (5)	Masters Seminar in CSS (5)
Internship/Project/Thesis (10)	Internship/Project/Thesis (10)
<b>TOTAL CREDITS: 60</b>	<b>TOTAL CREDITS: 40</b>



Instructors would deliver the program via traditional lecture and lab classes. Students and faculty would have access to state-of-the-art technology equipment and infrastructure. Initially, the program would serve 30 FTE students and grow to a steady position of 90 FTE. It is expected that a significant proportion of students would enroll on a part-time basis. Those in Track 1 would be able to complete the program in six quarters, while those in Track 2 would be able to complete the program in four quarters. Faculty resources for the program would include existing faculty and four new faculty members.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The proposal presents the expected student learning outcomes and various methods the school would use to assess program effectiveness, student learning, alumni performance, and employer satisfaction. For example, to assess program effectiveness, the school would survey graduates and their employers to determine if graduates are:

- Proficient in identifying technological solutions to commonly encountered computing issues;
- Successfully applying critical thinking skills and knowledge in their work with computing and software systems; and
- Demonstrating effective leadership, communication, and team membership skills.

The proposal articulates UWT's commitment to recruiting and serving a diverse student population. It also presents a series of measures that UWT would use to promote diversity. In addition, the Institute of Technology has on staff a manager of diversity enhancement.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

Two external reviewers offered positive comments on the proposal: Professor Susan Horwitz at the University of Wisconsin – Madison and Professor J. Strother Moore at the University of Texas at Austin. Both reviewers noted that the proposed master's program addresses the need for more educated people to support the software development industry and to fuel further industry growth. Both reviewers also raised a number of concerns about the programs' 1) goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes; 2) curriculum; and 3) staffing levels. UWT addressed each of these concerns and revised its proposal accordingly. The proposal also was shared with the other public baccalaureate institutions. To date, staff have received no comments from them.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The university would fund the MSCSS program by internal reallocation and new state funds. Private donations would cover about \$250,000 in equipment costs. At full enrollment the annual program costs would be about \$2,019,000, or \$22,433 per FTE student.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The program would serve regional needs in the South Puget Sound region. It responds to the high-tech industry's escalating demand for professionals with master's degrees in the field. The program of study, faculty resources, and state-of-the-art equipment would provide a high-quality program.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposal for a Master of Science in Computing and Software Systems at the University of Washington Tacoma is recommended for approval, effective June 11, 2002.

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-13**

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

WHEREAS, UWT's Institute of Technology, which was recently created to address the critical personnel needs of the high-tech industry, will sponsor the program; and

WHEREAS, The resources dedicated to the program will provide students a high-quality teaching and learning; and

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

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable and will be supported through reallocation, new state funds, and private donations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington Tacoma request to establish a Master of Science in Computing and Software Systems, effective July 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

# DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN COMMUNICATION

## Washington State University

June 2002

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### INTRODUCTION

Washington State University is seeking approval from the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Communication at the Edward R. Murrow School of Communication on the Pullman campus. The proposed program will be built on the School's tradition of excellence in education.

#### PROGRAM NEED

WSU's proposal includes data that demonstrate the proposed program will help fill a need for communication Ph.D.s in higher education, both in Washington and nationally.

- The Edward R. Morrow School of Communication is the single largest academic unit at WSU with about 1,500 majors and pre-majors, and it expects significant enrollment increases in the next five years.
- A recent survey of Washington colleges and community colleges revealed that expertise in intercultural communication was the most frequently mentioned qualification for new or replacement faculty.
- In a recent issue of *SPECTRA*, a newsletter sponsored by the National Communication Association, 22 percent of the 111 advertised positions included intercultural communication as a primary or secondary job qualification.
- Melvin DeFleur of Boston University recently reported that of the 135 communication programs in a probability sample of more than 400 communication programs in the United States, 81 percent predicted increases in enrollment. With that premise, 71 percent of these institutions expect to hire 248 new faculty over the next five years.

The proposed Ph.D. in Communication differs from other programs in structure and content by linking traditional specialties (advertising, public communication, etc.) with a foundation in intercultural communication. In addition WSU's proposed program differs substantially from the University of Washington's Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Culture and Communication. The UW's program is designed to educate students about an area of inquiry associated with the communication discipline. WSU's program is designed to educate individuals about the intercultural forces shape and reshape relationships, organizations, and institutions.

## **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The field of communication focuses on the transmission of information in human interaction. WSU's proposed doctoral program links interpersonal, group, and rhetorical studies within the context of intercultural communication — the study of communicative exchanges between members of different cultures defined in terms of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic differences.

The program of study requires completion of 65-80 credits, including a communication emphasis, an intercultural component, research methods, a cognate area, teaching methods, and dissertation. It primarily will be supported by existing faculty and staff, and is expected to reach a full enrollment of 18 FTE students in its third year of operation. Courses will be delivered through classroom instruction and students will use new communication technologies such as digital and wireless communications, a computer-assisted laboratory, and a psycho-physiological research laboratory.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The proposal presents a strong assessment plan that includes student learning outcomes and evaluation methods for measuring student performance, program quality, and alumni performance and satisfaction. With respect to student learning outcomes, graduates of the program will:

- Be capable of writing a refereed convention or journal article;
- Demonstrate knowledge of theories and methods of inquiry in their areas of concentration orally and in writing; and
- Demonstrate effective teaching skills

The School of Communication reports that it has been quite successful in recruiting U.S. ethnic minorities. Currently, 26 percent of its U.S. students are ethnic minorities, and more than 50 percent are women. The school will use a series of strategies to attract ethnic minorities to the doctoral program as well.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

The Ph.D. in Communication was reviewed by: Dr. Dwight L. Teeter, Jr., professor and dean, College of Communication at the University of Tennessee; and Dr. Richard R. Barton, associate dean for graduate studies and research, College of Communications at Penn State. Both reviewers shared their support for the program and indicated that it could become one of the best programs in the field of communication. Both reviewers also shared suggestions to enhance the proposal, and WSU has considered those suggestions appropriately. In addition, the proposal was sent to the other public baccalaureate institutions for review and comment. Staff received favorable responses were received from Central and Western.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

No new state funds would be required for this program. All costs will be covered by reallocation. Annual costs would be about \$285,709 or \$11,388 per FTE student.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The program will address higher education needs locally and nationally for communication faculty. It reflects the wise allocation of resources to respond to changes in the marketplace and diversity of society. The curriculum's intercultural communication framework will add to students' marketability.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposal for a Doctor of Philosophy in Communication at Washington State University is recommended for approval, effective June 11, 2002.

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-14**

WHEREAS, Washington State University has requested approval to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Communication; and

WHEREAS, The program will prepare individuals with a specialty in intercultural communication to assume faculty positions in communication across the nation; and

WHEREAS, The program reflects the wise reallocation of resources to respond to marketplace needs; and

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University request to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Communication, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

# DOCTOR OF PHYSICAL THERAPY

## Eastern Washington University

June 2002

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### INTRODUCTION

Responding to encouragement from the American Physical Therapy Association and changes in the health care industry, Eastern Washington University proposes to offer a Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree. It would replace the university's existing Master of Physical Therapy. During the 2001 legislative session, Eastern was granted statutory authority to offer this applied doctorate degree. Eastern is the first public comprehensive four-year institution in Washington to be granted such authority.

#### PROGRAM NEED

Current and future needs call for an increased supply of physical therapists with advanced skills and knowledge. Existing entry-level doctoral programs in physical therapy at the University of Puget Sound and in neighboring states (Idaho, Montana, and Oregon) are filled to capacity and consistently turn away many qualified applicants. Graduates of these programs typically receive numerous job offers when they complete their programs. According to 2002 survey results from the American Physical Therapy Association, 98.9 percent of all physical therapists are employed. Recent studies indicate that physical therapists with doctoral degrees are more engaged in assuming leadership roles in rehabilitation, prevention of disease, and programs that promote health and wellness. They are also more engaged in developing standards for physical therapy practice and developing health care policy to ensure adequate access to physical therapy services for those who need such health care.

#### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The goal of the DPT is to ... *“educate a doctorally prepared graduate who is able to develop and manage the physical therapy care process for the client/patient and carry out the professional roles of: a) delivery of physical therapy services, b) evidence-based practice, c) education of the client/patient, colleagues and community, d) advocacy, e) consultation and f) contribution to the profession.”*

The program of study is 161 quarter credits. Students would take basic science courses and physical therapist skill courses in the first academic year, followed by a summer internship. In the second academic year, they would take clinical science courses that integrate medical science knowledge through increasingly complex client scenarios, three professional seminars, and courses in evidence-based research practice and clinical research. At the end of the second year, students would take comprehensive examinations that they must pass to advance to the final clinical internships.



In the fall of each year, a student cohort of 30 students will be admitted to the DPT program. At full enrollment, the program will serve 90 FTE students. Those enrolled on a full-time basis would complete the program in about three years.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The program will be encompassed under Eastern's current accreditation status with the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE). The association will review it again in 2006.

The proposal outlines the assessment methods for evaluating the curriculum, program, and faculty. Students will complete course and faculty-teaching evaluations each term. The school will conduct student outcomes assessments in accordance with CAPTE standards.

With respect to diversity, the DPT program is committed to recruiting, retaining, and graduating students who are persons of color or disability. EWU's Office of Disability Support Services helps students with special needs and offers a variety of academic support services. In addition, to help nontraditional students, EWU offers on campus daycare services.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

Reviewers of the DPT proposal included Susan Deusinger, P.T., Ph. D., director of the Program in Physical Therapy at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri; Carl De Rosa, P.T., Ph.D., chair of the Physical Therapy Department at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, Ariz.; and Daiva Banaitis, P.T., Ph.D., director of the School of Physical Therapy at Pacific University in Forest Grove, Ore. All three reviewers wholeheartedly support the initiation of the DPT. Washington's other public four-year institutions received a copy of the proposal as well. Central Washington University and The Evergreen State College commented positively.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The university will support the DPT program, for the most part, by existing personnel and institutional resources. It will be located in the newly completed Health Sciences Building at the Riverpoint Higher Education Campus in Spokane. The program will be funded through internal reallocation. The estimated cost to offer the program is about \$650,998 per year, or \$7,233 per FTE student at full enrollment.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The following features of the proposed DPT argue for Board support of the proposal:

1. Providing doctoral-level education and research opportunities for individuals who want to pursue careers in physical therapy;
2. Producing graduates and research that can contribute to the health care industry and the academy;
3. Support by professional and accrediting associations, and external reviewers; and
4. Exemplary student-learning outcomes and program effectiveness assessment methodologies.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Eastern Washington University proposal to establish a Doctor of Physical Therapy degree is recommended for approval, effective June 11, 2002.

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-15**

WHEREAS, Eastern Washington University has requested to establish a Doctor of Physical Therapy; and

WHEREAS, There appears to be strong need for the doctoral-level physical therapy program in the Northwest; and

WHEREAS, The program is expected to make important contributions to the health care industry and the academy; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the quality of the instruction; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are exemplary;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Eastern Washington University proposal to establish a Doctor of Physical Therapy degree, effective June 11, 2002.

Adopted

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

## STATUS REPORT NOTIFICATION OF INTENT

June 2002

### INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

## **STATUS REPORT**

From March 27, 2002 through June 11, 2002 the HECB Executive Director has approved the following existing degree program in accordance with the NOI process.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Degree Title</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>
<b>CWU</b>	B.Ed. Elementary Education	Green River CC	April 22, 2002
<b>WSU</b>	MS Exercise Science	WSU - Spokane	May 6, 2002

## Transfer and Articulation Issues and Strategies

June 2002

### Background

At the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) meeting on March 27, members heard about three key transfer and articulation issues that both the HECB and State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) staff agree are important to address:

- (a) enrollment constraints at public baccalaureate institutions that threaten placement of transfer students;
- (b) inadequate student coursework at community and technical colleges for particular majors at the four-year institutions; and
- (c) insufficient pathways for professional/technical students to complete their bachelor's degrees.

HECB staff also identified a fourth issue — many seemingly well-prepared community college students do not transfer to four-year institutions. The Board directed staff to continue to work more comprehensively and aggressively with the higher education institutions and stakeholders to determine the strategies that will make transfer work better as a system for students.

### Update on Ongoing Activities

HECB staff continue to identify the most pressing transfer and articulation priorities from a statewide perspective. Staff are to convene a second meeting of the “Transfer and Articulation Action Group” on June 5, 2002. (This document was written before the meeting occurred.) The agenda features brief presentations followed by group discussions of the key issues. HECB staff will facilitate the group discussions to focus on the state's role and interest in each issue. The group will discuss which issues affect the greatest number of students and which solutions have the broadest potential reach.

The group also plans to discuss the status of the Bachelor of Applied Science degree. This will include a discussion of the implications of the decision by the University of Washington to withdraw its proposal to develop a bachelor's degree in applied technology at its Tacoma campus in collaboration with a number of community and technical colleges.

### Board Discussion on June 11

At the June 11 Board meeting, HECB staff will discuss with the Board the outcomes of the June 5 Action Group meeting. Staff will present the top three issues that have the most far-reaching consequences, and will ask Board members for guidance on next steps.

## REVIEW OF RULES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS ACT

June 2001

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### BACKGROUND

The Washington Legislature enacted the Degree-Granting Institutions Act, 28B.85 RCW, in 1986. This Act requires degree-granting institutions operating in Washington to get authorization from the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) unless specifically exempted from the authorization requirement. The Legislature directed the HECB to establish minimum standards for colleges and universities that cover the granting of degrees, educational quality, business practices, and financial stability, as well as other standards necessary to protect citizens against fraudulent or deceptive institutional practices. The Board has adopted rules to implement the Act (WAC 250-61).

#### REVIEW PROCESS AND OBJECTIVES

The agency is required to review its regulations periodically, and it appears that several changes are required. The proposed changes are designed to:

- 1) Clarify the regulations;
- 2) Address inconsistencies that have hampered day-to-day administration of the law;
- 3) Tighten authorization requirements;
- 4) Improve protections for students in case an authorized institution closes;
- 5) Ensure the HECB meets the statutory requirement that fees approximately recover the staffing costs of degree authorization; and
- 6) Improve communication between the agency and the community about degree authorization requirements and the authorization process.

#### OUTLINE OF PROPOSED CHANGES

- 1) ***Clarification, consistency, and simplification.*** The current rules are highly detailed and specify requirements (e.g., for the contents of institutions' catalogs and the elements of an application for authorization or reauthorization) that should be defined in administrative procedures rather than regulations. Staff propose deleting much of this detail from the WACs, and propose other changes intended to make the regulations easier to read and more user-friendly.
- 2) ***Addressing inconsistencies.*** The current WACs have multiple definitions of "accrediting association" and references to a "tuition recovery fund" that does not exist. The proposed changes adopt a single definition of "accrediting association" (those recognized by the federal government) and eliminate references to the "tuition recovery fund."

3) ***Tightening authorization requirements:***

***Accreditation requirement.*** The agency must establish minimum standards for institutional quality, and the Degree Authorization Agency monitors faculty qualifications, curriculum, credit requirements, and library resources. As an additional quality check, staff propose that institutions authorized to operate in the state be *accredited or moving toward accreditation*. Non-accredited institutions would be required to submit plans to gain accreditation, including a timetable. They would be required to show progress toward accreditation at each renewal of authorization, and failure to hold to their plans would be grounds to deny reauthorization.

Along with this requirement, staff propose to slightly ease reauthorization requirements for established, accredited institutions. Currently *each* authorized school must apply for a renewal of authorization every two years. Under the proposed rule, new schools and unaccredited schools would (as they do now) have to apply for renewal of authorization every two years. More established schools — accredited institutions operating in the state for more than 10 years — would move to a four-year renewal cycle.

**Proposed renewal cycles**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Renewal every...</b>
Operating for 10 years or fewer	2 years
All unaccredited institutions	2 years
Accredited, operating more than 10 years	4 years

***New technologies.*** Distance learning technologies raise questions about what it means for an institution to be “operating” in the state. Staff propose that all institutions “originating” degree programs in the state, including those that maintain an Internet server in Washington to deliver degree programs outside the state, be subject to authorization requirements.

4) ***Improving protections for students in the event of an authorized institution’s closure or the loss of tuition and fees resulting from unfair business practices.*** Authorized institutions must post a bond to operate in the state. For new institutions, the current requirement is \$25,000. Subsequently, the size of the bond is 10 percent of the preceding year’s tuition, but not less than \$25,000 and not more than \$250,000. These figures were established in 1993, and since that time tuition rates have increased substantially. Staff propose to require institutions to post larger bonds, with the increase reflecting the increase in tuition levels among private, exempt four-year institutions in Washington since 1994.



**Proposed changes in bond**

	<b>Current bond</b>	<b>Bond size based on tuition increase at exempt 4-year independents, 1994 to 2002 (31%)</b>	<b>Proposed new bond amounts</b>
New institutions	\$25,000	\$32,750	\$30,000
Other institutions, 10% of preceding year's tuition but...			
not less than	\$25,000	\$32,750	\$30,000
not more than	\$250,000	\$327,500	\$300,000

- 5) ***Ensure that the agency approximately recovers the staffing costs of degree authorization.*** RCW 28B.85 requires that fees charged to authorized institutions cover the staffing costs of the degree authorization program. HECB staff propose changes that would help the agency meet this statutory requirement.

First, under current rules, agency staff may (a) make site visits to learn about institutions as part of the authorization process, and (b) hire outside experts to evaluate institutions' programs. Currently, the HECB pays the costs of site visits, and charges for these experts are limited to \$500 each for a maximum of three reviewers. Staff propose making institutions responsible for the full cost of site visits and the full cost of peer reviews.

**Proposed charges**

	<b>Current rule</b>	<b>Proposed rule</b>
Site visits	HECB pays full costs	Institutions pay full costs
Peer reviews	Maximum of 3 experts @\$500	Institutions pay full costs

Second, under current rules institutions are required to pay fees of \$2,000 at the time of a new application for authorization and \$1,000 for renewals. These fees have not changed for many years. Staff propose adjusting these amounts for inflation, adding the fiscal growth factor annually.

- 6) ***Improving communication.*** In November the agency initiated a "Notice of Intent" procedure. The Degree Authorization Agency now provides notice of applications and authorization decisions to inform interested parties throughout the state about these actions.

## **EMERGENCY RULES**

### **State Need Grant, State Work Study, Promise Scholarship**

June 2002

#### **BACKGROUND**

Legislation adopted during the 2002 Legislative Session requires that the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for the State Need Grant, State Work Study, and Promise Scholarship programs be amended. At its June 11 meeting, the Board will be asked to adopt emergency rules so that the statutory amendments can be implemented for the 2002-2003 academic year.

Following is a summary of the changes needed to comply with those adopted by the Legislature.

#### **STATE NEED GRANT**

Substitute Senate Bill 5166 expands the definition of “institutions of higher education” to include branches of out-of-state institutions that meet the following criteria:

- The parent institution must be a member institution of an accrediting association recognized by rule of the Board;
- It must be eligible to participate in federal financial aid programs;
- The institution must have operated as a nonprofit college or university delivering on-site classroom instruction in Washington for a minimum of 20 years;
- It must have an annual enrollment of at least 700 full-time-equivalent students; and
- Like all other institutions, it must agree to, and comply with, all program rules and regulations.

It appears that only one institution, Antioch University – Seattle, currently meets the amended statutory requirements. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools has accredited Antioch.

State Need Grant rules currently recognize one of the six regional accrediting associations (the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges), and all of the specialized associations that accredit career colleges in Washington. To extend State Need Grant eligibility to students attending Antioch – Seattle, the agency must modify its rules to recognize the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

However, because institutions accredited by other regional associations may become eligible in the future to participate in the State Need Grant program, staff propose that the State Need Grant rules be amended to recognize all six regional accrediting associations. There is little to distinguish one regional association from another, and referencing each in the rules eliminates the need to make future amendments on a case-by-case basis.

## STATE WORK STUDY

Substitute Senate Bill 5166 also amends “eligible institution” for purposes of the State Work Study program. The amendatory language is essentially the same as in the revision to the State Need Grant statute, except that it does not specify that institutions qualifying under this amendment must enroll a minimum of 700 full-time-equivalent students to participate in the State Work Study program.

For the reasons cited above, staff propose that the State Work Study rules be amended to recognize each of the six regional accrediting associations.

## PROMISE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Prior to the 2002 Legislative Session, language authorizing the Promise Scholarship program had been included in the 1999-01 and 2001-03 biennial budget bills, but the program had not been created in statute. The HECB adopted administrative rules implementing program provisions as specified in the budget bills.

House Bill 2807, enacted by the 2002 Legislature, established the Promise Scholarship program in statute and modified some program features. Staff propose the following changes to bring the Promise Scholarship rules into compliance with the new statute:

- **Academic Eligibility Criteria.** Program rules should be amended to indicate that, to be considered for a Promise Scholarship, an otherwise eligible student must have:
  - Graduated from a public or private high school in Washington in the top 15 percent of his or her graduating class;
  - Attained a cumulative score of 1,200 or better on the Scholastic Achievement Test I (SAT I) on the first attempt; or
  - Attained a cumulative score of 27 or better on the American College Test (ACT) on the first attempt.
  
- **Eligible Institutions.** Staff propose amending the rules to address two issues:
  - HB 2807 authorizes use of the scholarship by recipients attending Oregon institutions that are part of the border county higher education opportunity project when those institutions offer programs not available at accredited institutions of higher education in Washington.
    - The border county legislation does not identify institutions that are eligible for that project. However, it does list counties in Oregon whose residents may attend college in Washington at reduced tuition rates. Staff have contacted policymakers to confirm that the intent of HB 2807 is to allow Promise Scholarship recipients to use the award at accredited colleges, universities and career schools in the Oregon counties that border Washington and whose residents are eligible for the border county tuition discount. The proposed rules will list those counties.

- Staff have contacted policymakers to confirm the following approach will be used to determine whether a program is not offered in Washington:
  - Students who wish to use their Promise Scholarships to attend college in Oregon will be required to make an application to the HECB for this purpose. These applications will be judged on a case-by-case basis, and students will have the opportunity to appeal the administrative decisions to the executive director of the HECB.
  - A program offered by an Oregon institution located in a county that borders Washington will be deemed to be “not available” if such a program is not offered by any accredited higher education institution in Washington.
- For consistency with the State Need Grant and State Work Study programs, staff propose that Promise Scholarship rules be amended to recognize all six regional accrediting associations.
- **Standard for Satisfactory Progress.** SHB 2807 allows the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish satisfactory progress standards for scholarship renewal. Staff propose that Promise Scholarship rules require recipients to be in good standing at the institution they attend, in order to renew their scholarships.

Proposed amendatory language for the State Need Grant and State Work Study programs is attached. Proposed revisions to Promise Scholarship program regulations will be drafted following guidance from policymakers on the issues noted above. Proposed language will be sent to Board members and posted on the agency’s Website prior to the June 11 meeting.

## **PROPOSED RULEMAKING PROCESS**

Staff will file the required forms with the State Code Reviser’s office to authorize adoption of emergency rules after the Board’s approval and to begin the process to adopt permanent rules at the Board’s September meeting.

Adoption of the proposed emergency rules, which are effective for up to 120 days, will authorize immediate implementation of statutory changes. In the case of the State Need Grant and State Work Study programs, adopting emergency rules will authorize staff to determine which institutions are eligible and allow newly eligible institutions to apply to participate in the program(s), and to make awards to their students for the upcoming academic year.

Adopting emergency rules will allow Promise Scholarships to be awarded to students who meet the expanded eligibility criteria, as awards are processed this summer. As a result, scholarship recipients and college administrators can take the award into account in planning financial resources for the new academic year.

The Board will be asked to adopt permanent rules at its meeting in September. Before that meeting, the public will be invited to comment on the proposed permanent rules, in writing, and at a formal hearing convened to solicit public comment on the proposed rules.

**Chapter 250-80 WAC**  
**WASHINGTON PROMISE SCHOLARSHIP RULES**

**WAC 250-80-010 Purpose.**

The Washington promise scholarship program recognizes and encourages the aspiration for superior academic achievement of high school students who attend and graduate from Washington high schools. The program offers a two-year scholarship for eligible students that may be used at any accredited institution within the borders of the state. The scholarship may also be used at certain Oregon institutions offering programs not offered in Washington.

[Statutory Authority: Chapter 28B.80 RCW and 1999 c 309 § 611(6). 00-08-082, § 250-80-010, filed 4/4/00, effective 5/5/00.]

**WAC 250-80-020 Definitions.** (1) "Board" means the higher education coordinating board.

(2) "OSPI" means the office of the superintendent of public instruction.

(3) "High school" means a secondary institution in Washington state identified by the office of the superintendent of public instruction as qualified to confer high school diplomas to a graduating senior class.

(4) "Parent(s)" mean the biological or adoptive parent of the student applicant and the spouse of a biological or adoptive parent. In cases of divorce or separation the parent for purposes of reporting income and family size is the biological or adoptive parent who provided more than one-half of the applicant's support in the previous twelve months. The term parent does not include either foster parents or legal guardians.

(5) "Family size" is the number of people for whom the applicant's parent(s) provided more than one-half of the support in the previous twelve months.

(6) "Income," in most cases means the applicant parent's adjusted gross income (AGI) as reported on the previous calendar year's federal tax return. For the independent student, income means the student's adjusted gross income as reported on the previous calendar year's federal tax return.

(7) "Independent student" means a student whose biological parents are both deceased and there is no adoptive parent, or the student is a "ward of the court," or the student has been legally emancipated by court order. The board may also recognize a student as independent due to exceptional circumstances as recognized by the appeal committee.

(8) "Appeals committee" means a committee convened by the board to review petitions and requests by students for consideration of individual exceptional circumstances.

(9) "Median family income (MFI)" means the median income for the state of Washington, by family size, as compiled by the federal Bureau of the Census and reported annually in the Federal Register.

(10) "Income cutoff" means one hundred thirty-five percent of the median family income.

(11) "Academic year" means the fall, winter, and spring quarters or the fall and spring semesters between July 1st and June 30th.

- (12) "Eligible student" means a person who:
- (a) Graduates from a public or private high school located in the state of Washington; and
  - ~~(b) (Is in the top ten percent of his or her 1999 graduating class; or~~
  - ~~(c) (Is in the top fifteen percent of his or her (2000) graduating class; or~~
  - (c) Attained a cumulative score of 1200 or better on the Scholastic Assessment Test I (SATI) on the first attempt; or
  - (d) Attained a cumulative score of 27 or better on the American College Test (ACT) on the first attempt; and
  - ~~(e) Has a family income less than one hundred thirty-five percent of the state's median; and~~
  - ~~(f) Enrolls at least half time in an eligible postsecondary institution in the state of Washington; and~~
  - ~~(g) Is not pursuing a degree in theology.~~
- (13) "Eligible postsecondary institution" means:
- (a) A public institution authorized by the Washington legislature and receiving operating support through the state general fund; or
  - (b) A postsecondary institution, whose campus or branch campus is physically located in the state of Washington, and who is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting body. The recognized accrediting bodies are:
    - (i) The Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges or a similar regional accrediting body as determined by the board;
    - (ii) The Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools;
    - (iii) The Accrediting Council for Continuing Education and Training;
    - (iv) The Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges of Technology;
    - (v) The Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools;
    - ~~(vi) The National Accrediting Commission of Cosmetology Arts and Sciences; (and)~~
    - vii. The Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education;
    - viii. The New England Association of Schools and Colleges;
    - ix. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools;
    - x. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
    - xi. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges; or
  - (c) An accredited Oregon postsecondary institution that offers a program not offered in Washington and is located in either Columbia, Gilliam, Hood River, Multnomah, Clatsop, Clackamas, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wasco or Washington county. The institution must be accredited by one of the accrediting bodies listed above. And,
  - (d) Agrees to administer the program in accordance with the applicable rules and program guidelines.
- (14) "Authorized use period" means 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.

**WAC 250-80-060 Grant disbursement.** (1) Eligible students must enroll on at least a half-time status and be in good academic standing with the institution in order to receive a scholarship disbursement.

(2) Grants to students will be disbursed in equal payments, once per term, across the three quarter or two semester academic year.

(3) State of Washington public colleges and universities may request payment for funds up to the limit of the per term award for each enrolled eligible student. The state public college or university may apply the proceeds of the scholarship to any outstanding debt owed by the student to the institution. The institution must disburse any remainder directly to the eligible student.

(4) Nonstate institutions may request that checks be written to eligible students attending their schools. The board will write individual warrants payable to each eligible student and delivered to the school for disbursement.

(5) The independent university and the private vocational school must disburse the warrant once the student's half-time or greater enrollment has been verified. The school may not withhold or delay disbursement for any reason other than for less than half-time enrollment. The school has thirty days to either disburse the warrant or return it to the board.

[Statutory Authority: Chapter 28B.80 RCW and 1999 c 309 § 611(6). 00-08-082, § 250-80-060, filed 4/4/00, effective 5/5/00.]

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-16**

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is directed by RCW 28B.10 to administer the State Need Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is authorized by RCW 28B.80 to adopt rules as necessary to implement the program; and

WHEREAS, Substitute Senate Bill 5166 adopted by the 2002 Legislature expands the definition of "institutions of higher education" to include branches of out-of-state institutions that meet specified criteria and that are members of accrediting associations recognized by rule of the Board; and

WHEREAS, State Need Grant rules do not currently recognize five of the six regional associations that accredit institutions which may potentially be eligible to participate in the State Need Grant program; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend Chapter 250-20 WAC to implement this statutory change; and

WHEREAS, It is the Board's intention that students attending institutions incorporated into the State Need Grant program as a result of this change be eligible for grants for the 2002-2003 academic year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt emergency rules recognizing all six regional accrediting associations for purposes of establishing potential institutional eligibility to participate in the State Need Grant program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board directs staff to initiate the process required to adopt permanent rules at the Board's September 2002 meeting.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary



**RESOLUTION NO. 02-17**

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is directed by RCW 28B.12 to administer the State Work Study Program; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is authorized by RCW 28B.80 to adopt rules as necessary to implement the program; and

WHEREAS, Substitute Senate Bill 5166 adopted by the 2002 Legislature expands the definition of "institutions of higher education" to include branches of out-of-state institutions that meet specified criteria and that are members of accrediting associations recognized by rule of the Board; and

WHEREAS, State Work Study rules do not currently recognize five of the six regional associations that accredit institutions which may potentially be eligible to participate in the State Work Study program; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend Chapter 250-40 WAC to implement this statutory change; and

WHEREAS, It is the Board's intention that students attending institutions incorporated into the State Work Study program as a result of this change be eligible for work study for the 2002-2003 academic year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt emergency rules recognizing all six regional accrediting associations for purposes of establishing potential institutional eligibility to participate in the State Work Study program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board directs staff to initiate the process required to adopt permanent rules at the Board's September 2002 meeting.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

---

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-18**

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is directed by House Bill 2807 to administer the Washington Promise Scholarship Program and to adopt rules as necessary to implement the program; and

WHEREAS, Prior to the 2002 Legislative Session, language authorizing the Promise Scholarship program had been included in the 1999-01 and 2001-03 biennial budget bills; and

WHEREAS, House Bill 2807 established the Washington Promise Scholarship program in statute and modified some features of the program; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend Chapter 250-80 WAC to bring the Promise Scholarship program into compliance with the new statute by including reference to expanded academic eligibility criteria, use of the scholarship at certain Oregon institutions providing programs not offered in Washington, recognition of all six regional accrediting associations, and the satisfactory progress requirement for scholarship renewal; and

WHEREAS, It is the Board's intention that the expanded eligibility criteria be used to determine awards for the 2002-2003 academic year;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board adopt emergency rules implementing these changes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board directs the staff to initiate the process required to adopt permanent rules at the Board's September 2002 meeting.

Adopted:

June 11, 2002

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pat Stanford, Secretary

## 2004 MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

June 2002

### Background

One of the Higher Education Coordinating Board's primary duties as outlined in statute is the development every four years of a "master plan" for higher education in Washington State. The plan represents an expression of the state's long-term vision for its higher education system and the strategies necessary to achieve that vision.

Under the statute, each master plan is to include an assessment of the state's higher education needs and recommendations on enrollment and other policies to meet those needs, and may address a variety of other higher education issues. The first plan was due to the Legislature and Governor on December 1, 1987, with updates scheduled every four years thereafter. The most recent plan was submitted to the Legislature and Governor for consideration during the 2000 legislative session.

Once the master plan is adopted by the Legislature, it becomes state higher education policy unless legislation is enacted to alter its policies. In 2000, the Legislature adopted the master plan and directed the HECB to re-examine some of its enrollment and capital forecasts, the role of the community and technical college system, and other elements. A report on the re-examination, which was conducted in collaboration with the state's higher education institutions, was received by the Legislature in February 2001.

The next plan will be submitted to the Legislature and Governor in December 2003 and will be reviewed by lawmakers during the 2004 session.

### Initial activities – April and May 2002

Development of the master plan has begun with the following activities:

- HECB members have provided specific direction to the staff regarding the outline and elements of the plan.
- Board members have directed the staff to provide master plan updates and issue discussions as appropriate at each regular HECB meeting between now and the adoption of the plan in December 2003.
- Outreach has begun to higher education constituents to receive initial input. Staff have met with several leaders of the state's public and private colleges and universities to help identify key issues from the perspective of the higher education institutions.

- Legislative input is being sought at the outset of the project. Preliminary discussions have taken place with several legislators and legislative staff about their expectations for the Master Plan. More meetings involving Board members, staff and legislators will take place through the summer.
- A “core group” of HECB staff, led by Government Relations Director Bruce Botka and Associate Director Jim Reed, will oversee the Master Plan development process. A larger “working group” of staff will work with the core group to develop specific issues.

### **Issues identified to date**

In the preliminary conversations conducted to date, HECB members, education leaders and legislators have agreed the master plan should focus on a limited number of fundamental issues and develop a solid foundation of research and policy background to support the Board’s ultimate recommendations.

Key issues raised to date include:

- Higher education finance, including operating and capital budget needs and the adequacy of current state funding mechanisms;
- Tuition and financial aid policies and practices;
- Enrollment needs by 2010, including an examination of the higher education system’s response to the state’s economic agenda; and
- Transfer and articulation, including the progress of students from K-12 to college and the movement of students within the higher education system.

In addition, the HECB has been encouraged to link its budget recommendations for the 2003-05 biennium to the priorities that will be addressed in the Master Plan. This will require the HECB to make biennial budget recommendations in October 2002 with an eye toward the components of a Master Plan that will not be officially adopted until December 2003.

### **Goals of HECB members in the development of the Master Plan**

Documents attached to this overview describe the preliminary Master Plan development timeline and the process the Board plans to use to develop policy options and recommendations.

---

The Board's three committees – Fiscal, Policy and Financial Aid – recently discussed the development of the plan and offered specific directions for the development of the 2004 Master Plan. They said it should:

- Describe the “current condition” of higher education in Washington, including the perspective of the state’s colleges and universities.
- Evaluate progress toward the goals and recommendations of the 2000 Master Plan, including an assessment of the Board’s “continuing commitments” to enrollment opportunity for citizens, affordable tuition for all students, and financial assistance to low-income students.
- Address changes since 2000 in the state’s economic and budgetary environment and discuss the implications of the new environment for higher education.
- Focus on developing funding alternatives for higher education in the future, reflecting the likelihood that the state will face serious financial constraints in the next several years.
- Identify “what’s at stake” for Washington State if higher education resources do not keep pace with the state’s economic, social and educational needs.
- Establish clear priorities and alternatives in recommendations to state policy-makers on such policies as funding, enrollment, tuition, transfer and articulation.
- Examine other states’ approaches to higher education challenges.

### **Purpose of Board discussion on June 11**

The Board’s discussion of the 2004 Master Plan offers an opportunity to review the issues raised to date; clarify the Board’s expectations for the staff’s work on its behalf; and review and, if necessary, amend the timeline and issue development process leading to publication of the plan in December 2004.





## DRAFT SCHEMATIC OF 2004 MASTER PLAN PROCESS

**The issues/areas to be addressed in the plan are determined**



**Board adopts Master Plan Scope**



**"Policy Context" papers on the adopted MP issues are prepared**



**The Board holds a series of "roundtable" discussions about the issues**



**"Policy Planning" papers on the MP issues are presented to the Board reflecting the themes and direction gathered from the panel briefings**



**"Policy & Action Recommendation" papers are prepared**



**The Board adopts/modifies the "Policy & Action Recommendations"**



**The text of the 2004 Master Plan is prepared and presented to the Board for approval**

focus on critical areas ...  
with buy-in of partners and contacts ...

with opportunity for public comment

provide the policy history & context of each issue and a framework for....

panel discussions of policies, approaches, solutions to problems and needs which lead to...

policy planning papers which define current problems and offer a variety of conceptual options and alternatives for their solution

the recommendations are for specific actions and assign responsibilities and a basis to measure performance

these reflect the direction provided from the Board and the input from the partners and key-contacts

Board action follows from public & stakeholder comment

Board approval of the plan follows from public & stakeholder comment

the document is then published



**SEQUENCING OF 2004 MASTER PLAN BRIEFINGS AND ACTIONS**  
(using an example of four issues being addressed in the plan)

<i>Board Meeting</i>	<i>Master Plan Agenda Item</i>	<i>Staff Report</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>July 02</i>	Preliminary Master Plan Scope Recommendation	Draft Scope Recommendation	Possible Action
<i>September 02</i>	Master Plan Scope Recommendation	Scope Recommendation	Action
	Roundtable Discussion: Issue 1 Roundtable Discussion: Issue 2	Policy Context Paper: Issue 1 Policy Context Paper: Issue 2	Information Information
<i>October 02</i>	Roundtable Discussion: Issue 3 Roundtable Discussion: Issue 4	Policy Context Paper: Issue 3 Policy Context Paper: Issue 4	Information Information
<i>December 02</i>	Master Plan Staff Report: Issue 1 Master Plan Staff Report: Issue 2	Policy Planning Paper: Issue 1 Policy Planning Paper: Issue 2	Information Information
<i>February 03</i>	Master Plan Staff Report: Issue 3 Master Plan Staff Report: Issue 4	Policy Planning Paper: Issue 3 Policy Planning Paper: Issue 4	Information Information
<i>March 03</i>	Master Plan Recommendations: Issue 1 Master Plan Recommendations: Issue 2	Policy & Action Paper: Issue 1 Policy & Action Paper: Issue 2	Action Action
<i>May 03</i>	Master Plan Recommendations: Issue 3 Master Plan Recommendations: Issue 4	Policy & Action Paper: Issue 3 Policy & Action Paper: Issue 4	Action Action
<i>September 03</i>	Public Hearing: 2004 Master Plan Preliminary Draft	Draft of Master Plan	Information
<i>October 03</i>	Adoption of 2004 Master Plan	Master Plan Final	Action

# **Losing Ground: A National Status Report on the Affordability of Higher Education**

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education

June 2002

## **Background**

At the suggestion of the leaders of the legislative higher education committees, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) have invited the president of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Pat Callan, to participate in a forum to discuss the implications for Washington State of the Center's recent report, "*Losing Ground*." The report examines trends in state support for public colleges and universities, tuition trends and practices, and the extent of financial aid for students. The report may be downloaded from the Policy Center's web site [www.highereducation.org](http://www.highereducation.org).

The forum will be co-sponsored by the HECB, the SBCTC, and the Senate and House Higher Education committees, and moderated by the legislative committee chairs, Sen. Jeanne Kohl-Welles and Rep. Phyllis Kenney. The members of the Senate Ways and Means Committee and House Appropriations, as well as the presidents of 4- and 2-year colleges and universities have also been invited to join this discussion.

Prior to forming the Public Policy Center in 1998, Pat Callan served as executive director of higher education commissions in Washington, California and Montana, and has advised many education boards, legislative committees and governor's offices. He has provided input during the development of the HECB's 2000 master plan for higher education, and worked with Governor Locke's 2020 Commission on the Future of Higher Education. In the mid-1980s he was the vice president of the Education Commission of the States.

## **Summary of Report**

*Losing Ground* summarizes crucial national trends in higher education financing and affordability. The paper's core argument is that states must act to break the "cycle of erosion," in which good economic times yield growing state support for higher education and modest tuition increases while recessions result in substantial budget cuts and rapid tuition increases. This cycle negatively affects both higher education institutions and families. The institutions face significant instability in their budgetary environments; families whose budgets are stretched by recessions confront rapid tuition increases as well.

*Losing Ground* suggests that states adopt higher education budget policies that would end this cycle, arguing for strategic thinking about programs at the colleges and universities, moderate and gradual tuition increases tied to changes in family income, and the importance of need-based aid programs that protect low-income students from rising educational costs.

## Summary of national trends

- *Tuition increases have made higher education less affordable for most families.*
- *Federal and state financial aid to students has not kept pace with inflation.* Pell Grants and state grants cover a smaller share of tuition costs than they did in the 1980s.
- *Debt burdens are increasing for most students and their families.* More students are borrowing, and students at all income levels are increasing the amounts they borrow.
- *Tuition at public colleges tends to increase most during economic recessions.* During good economic times tuitions rise slowly if at all, and state appropriations for higher education tend to increase rapidly. In recessions, tuitions rise sharply and state appropriations are cut. Families confront rising tuitions at the very moment that they face growing economic hardships.
- *State support for higher education has grown, but tuition has grown faster.* Between 1990 and 1998 state appropriations to public colleges and universities increased by 13 percent while tuition revenues increased by 107 percent.

## Policy suggestions

### 1. Breaking the "cycle of erosion"

#### *During economic expansions:*

- Explore value of new information technologies to improve educational effectiveness and control costs.
- Expand programs that yield college credit for high school students.
- Expand capacity in undergraduate education; avoid creating new capacity in expensive graduate programs.

#### *During economic recessions*

- Avoid dramatic higher education budget cuts that will yield large tuition increases.
- Impact of cuts should be shared by students and institutions.
- Augment need-based financial aid programs to protect needy students from tuition hikes.

### 2. Emphasize need-based aid and tie tuition increases to changes in family income

- Emphasize need-based aid over aid programs that will serve mainly higher-income students.
- Tuition increases should be moderate, gradual, and predictable.
- Tuition increases should reflect changes in family income in the state.
- States should increase need-based financial aid to offset tuition hikes for low-income students.