

W A S H I N G T O N  
**H I G H E R**  
**E D U C A T I O N**  
C O O R D I N A T I N G   B O A R D

**BOARD MEETING AGENDA**

*University of Washington Tacoma  
Cherry Parkes, Room 108  
1900 Commerce, Tacoma 98402  
December 15, 2005*

**8:15** Continental Breakfast – HECB members  
*(Cherry Parkes, Room 206C - no official business)*

**9:00** Welcome and Introductions

- Bob Craves, Board Chair
- Dr. Patricia Spakes, Chancellor, UW Tacoma

**Approval of the October 27, 2005 Meeting Minutes**

**1**

Executive Policy Committee

Bob Craves, chair

**9:15** **Access and Persistence and the Reauthorization of the 1965 Higher Education Act: A Presentation by the Federal Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance**

**2**

The committee serves as an independent source of advice and counsel on student financial aid policy to Congress and the Secretary of Education. Staff of the Advisory Committee will brief the board on the current condition of access and persistence for low- and moderate-income students. In addition, they will provide an update on the committee's HEA reauthorization recommendations to Congress, with a special focus on the recommendations that may impact the programs and duties of the board.

**10:15** **Annual Progress Report – Strategic Master Plan Implementation**

**3**

State law requires the HECB to report annually on its progress in implementing the 2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education. This document identifies the progress of the HECB and the state through November 2005 in achieving the goals and implementing the specific strategic initiatives of the plan.

**10:45 Adoption of the HECB's 2006 Legislative Agenda**

The Board will discuss and adopt its higher education priorities for the 2006 legislative session.

- *Resolution 05-21*

**4****11:15 Morning Break****11:30 Consent Items****Adoption of Operating and Capital Budget Guidelines for the 2007-09 Biennium****5**

The 2007-09 operating and capital budget guidelines were presented to the board for information and discussion during its last meeting in October.

- *Resolution 05-22*

**New Degree Program Approval****6**

Central Washington University seeks Higher Education Coordinating Board approval to offer **Bachelor of Applied Science in Food Service Management** at the main campus in Ellensburg and centers in Des Moines, Lynnwood, and Pierce County.

- *Resolution 05-25*

**11:35 Report of the Executive Director**

Dr. James Sulton, Jr. will report on the status of various programs and activities.

**Status Report on Previously Approved Degrees (NOIs)****7**

From September 2005 through November 2005, the HECB executive director approved the expansion of two degree programs. Eastern Washington University received approval to offer the Master in Social Work to students at WSU Vancouver effective October 31, 2005. Central Washington University received approval to expand the BS in Flight Technology – Aviation Management Specialization to students at their Moses Lake teaching site effective November 15, 2005.

**12:00** The board will recess for lunch.  
(*Cherry Parkes, Room 206C - no official business*)

**1:00 Financial Aid Committee**

Jesus Hernandez, chair

**The Scholarship Coalition: A Proposal to Establish a Statewide Scholarship Clearinghouse****8**

The Scholarship Coalition is proposing the development of a statewide scholarship clearinghouse, which would be administered by the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). Coalition members will present details of the proposed scholarship clearinghouse to the board and discuss next steps.

- *Resolution 05-26*

**1:45** Fiscal Committee

Mike Worthy, chair

**Adoption of 2006 Supplemental Operating and Capital Budget Recommendations (tied to needs assessment)****9**

RCW 28B.76.210(5) directs the HECB to make recommendations to the state Office of Financial Management (OFM) on the 2006 supplemental budget requests submitted by the state's public four-year institutions. The recommendations are due to OFM November 1 and to the Legislature by January 1. The recommendations to OFM were adopted at the October 2005 board meeting.

- *Resolution 05-23*

Education Committee

Sam Smith, chair

**2:15** **Accountability Update****10**

The baccalaureate institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, along with the Office of Financial Management and the HECB, are required to determine performance targets (or goals) in relation to specific performance indicators identified in both the budget and the accountability framework adopted by the HECB in April 2005. Staff will provide information on the proposed targets for the HECB's review, discussion and input. Action by the board to adopt the performance targets is anticipated at the January 2006, board meeting.

**2:45** **Report on the Health Care Personnel Shortages Task Force****11**

Madeline Thompson, policy analyst for the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (WTECB) will present information from the Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force to update the board on progress in meeting the demand for Registered Nurses. The WTECB work is required under ESHB 1852 passed in 2003.

**3:15** **Competency-based Transfer****12**

House Bill 1909 mandated that the HECB identify two-year and four-year institutions to participate in a competency-based transfer pilot project. The goal of the pilot was to explore how competencies could be developed for lower division coursework in specific disciplines that would then be used as the basis for transfer evaluation and admission. This is the final report of the pilot project to the Washington State Legislature.

- *Resolution 05-24*

Public Comment**3:45** Adjournment

**Public Comment:** A sign-in sheet is provided for public comment on any of the items presented above.

**Meeting Accommodation:** Persons who require special accommodation for attendance must call the HECB at 360.753.7800 as soon as possible before the meeting.

## HECB 2006 Meeting Calendar

Regular Board Meeting	Advisory Council Meeting	Location
January 26, Thursday		<b>University of Puget Sound</b> Wheelock Student Center Rotunda 1500 N. Warner, Tacoma
February 23, Thursday		<b>Everett Community College</b> Jackson Center Auditorium 2000 Tower St, Everett
March 30, Thursday		<b>Western Washington University</b> Old Main 340 516 High St, Bellingham
	April 20, Thursday	<b>Highline Community College</b> Student Union Bldg (#8), Mt. Skokomish 2400 S 240 <sup>th</sup> , Des Moines
May 25, Thursday		<b>Whitman College</b> Reid Campus Center, Ballroom B 345 Boyer Avenue, Walla Walla
	June 22, Thursday	<b>Pierce College, Puyallup</b> College Center Bldg., Multi-Purpose Rm 1601 39 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE, Puyallup
July 27, Thursday		<b>Grays Harbor Community College</b> Building 200, Room 220 1620 Edward P. Smith Drive, Aberdeen
	August 24, Thursday	<b>Tacoma Community College</b> Senate Room, Opgaard Student Center 6501 S. 19 <sup>th</sup> , Tacoma
September 28, Thursday		<b>State Investment Board</b> Board Room 2700 Evergreen Parkway NW, Olympia
October 26, Thursday		<b>Yakima Valley Community College</b> Deccio Higher Education Ctr, Parker Room 16 <sup>th</sup> Avenue & Nob Hill Blvd, Yakima
	November 16, Thursday	<b>Highline Community College</b> Student Union Bldg (#8), Mt. Skokomish 2400 S 240 <sup>th</sup> , Des Moines
December 14, Thursday		<b>University of Washington</b> Walker Ames Room Seattle

W A S H I N G T O N  
**H I G H E R**  
**EDUCATION**  
C O O R D I N A T I N G   B O A R D

**December 2005**

## **Minutes of October 27 Meeting**

### **HECB Members Present**

Ms. Roberta Greene, vice chair  
Ms. Ethelda Burke  
Mr. Bill Grinstein  
Mr. Lance Kissler  
Sen. Betti Sheldon  
Mr. Mike Worthy

### **Board introductions**

Roberta Greene, vice chair, welcomed those in attendance to Central Washington University. Bob Craves, chair; Jesus Hernandez; and Sam Smith were absent and excused from the meeting.

Greene introduced Dr. Jerilyn McIntyre, president of Central Washington University. McIntyre provided a history of the campus and described recent efforts to rebuild student enrollment. In fall 2000, CWU experienced a decline approaching 600 full-time equivalent students. Central has reversed that downturn with the largest enrollment in history. In addition, the student body has taken on new characteristics since 2000. Students are better prepared, and Central has seen an increase in both retention rates and diversity.

Sen. Betti Sheldon asked McIntyre to explain why the quality of the student body has improved. McIntyre explained Central is attracting a different market segment, and that the university now requires students to submit application materials earlier in the year. Entering students are expected to be better prepared.

### **Executive Policy Committee Report**

Greene announced the retirement of Gary Benson, HECB director of fiscal policy. Mike Worthy recognized Benson's service to higher education, reading Resolution 05-18.

Greene announced the upcoming November 17 Advisory Council meeting at Tacoma Community College. The next board meeting is scheduled for December 15, and will be held at the UW Tacoma campus.

Greene, who serves as chair of the governor's Washington Learns Higher Education Advisory Committee, provided an update on upcoming committee events. The Steering Committee is scheduled to meet on November 14 at REI Headquarters in Kent. The Higher Education Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet November 29, 2005, at the Hilton Seatac Conference Center.

Greene encouraged board members and meeting attendees to visit the Washington Learns web site: <http://www.washingtonlearns.wa.gov>

### **2006 Legislative Preview**

Bruce Botka, director of government relations, presented a preview of the 2006 legislative session. The board will adopt its 2006 legislative agenda during the December meeting.

The regular 2006 Legislative session will convene Monday, January 9, 2006, and will adjourn no later than March 9.

Botka said tax collections are outpacing the projections used to develop the original 2005-07 spending plan, so lawmakers will have more money available for the 2006 supplemental budget than they originally anticipated.

The governor has indicated that she will present a Washington Learns legislative package during the 2006 session, but it is expected to focus primarily on early learning issues. An interim progress report for Washington Learns is due November 15, 2005.

The Snohomish, Island and Skagit counties (SIS) initiative also may come before the 2006 Legislature. Last session, lawmakers directed Everett Community College to develop a new management plan for SIS and make recommendations by December 2005. The new management plan is expected to focus on a university center model.

In addition, the HECB was appropriated \$500,000 in the 2005-07 capital budget to conduct a higher education needs assessment in the three-county area and recommend strategies to address those needs. The SIS local advisory committee will meet for the second time on October 28<sup>th</sup> in Everett. The HECB will submit an interim report to the Legislature by January 15, 2006, and a final report and recommendation by December 1, 2006.

Sheldon asked about legislative discussions regarding the creation of a four-year institution in the SIS area. Botka said that Senator Haugen was a primary supporter of the SIS initiative. During the 2005 legislative session, three of the state's four branch campuses were given the authority to admit freshman and sophomore students, while the WSU Tri-Cities branch was given limited authority. Currently, the HECB's needs assessment for the Snohomish, Island, Skagit County area is in the preliminary stages, while local efforts to determine higher education needs the Tri-Cities are continuing in that part of the state. Both efforts are expected to dominate higher education discussions during the 2006 legislative session.

Botka said the HECB has been working closely with the Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC), which includes Columbia Basin College, WSU Tri-Cities, Pacific Northwest

National Laboratories, and local community and business leaders. The group is expected to release its higher education proposal on November 9 in Kennewick.

The House Higher Education Committee is studying teacher preparation, specifically for math and science disciplines. Botka said that Rep. Kenney is focusing attention on efficiency issues through HB 1434, which is being revised for the 2006 session. The bill is sponsored by Reps. Fred Jarrett, Skip Priest, and Don Cox.

The sudden shutdown of Business Career Training Institute (BCTI) earlier this year prompted the development of legislation to tighten up controls and requirements to better protect students. The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (WTECB) maintains oversight for the career and technical colleges and has developed a bill for consideration in 2006 to improve state oversight of private career colleges.

The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) is expected to include incremental faculty pay increases in their supplemental budget request.

Mike Worthy asked if the Legislature had begun reviewing the revised agency budget recommendations. Botka said that HECB staff have had preliminary meetings with staff of the Senate Ways and Means Committee and the Office of Financial Management (OFM).

### Board Action on Consent Agenda Items

**ACTION:** Lance Kissler moved to approve the minutes of the September meeting. Mike Worthy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### Needs Assessment

HECB Associate Director Randy Spaulding spoke about key changes in the state's current assessment of higher education needs:

- By 2010, the public colleges must grow to accommodate an additional 45,000 FTE students to meet demand resulting from population pressure and increased demand for degrees.
- The state's higher education system must increase the number of graduates with the skills required to meet employer needs in a number of key occupational areas.
- Existing strategies in health care must be expanded and new programs and/or delivery mechanisms developed to meet employer and student demand.
- The state higher education system must develop strategies to increase the number of qualified K-12 teachers and administrators in key subject areas that are experiencing shortages.
- Additional study is recommended to better understand the apparent mismatch between supply and demand for trained workers in key occupational areas.
- Further analysis of college participation in several regions is necessary.

- Improvements to the methodology and data elements used in the needs assessment are recommended.

Greene asked Spaulding about the next steps in implementing the needs assessment. Spaulding said the report will be used in academic program planning and as a reference for reviewing new program proposals.

Grinstein said this report, based on the definition of supply and demand, was restrained by focusing only on a primary market area without considering secondary or tertiary markets. Grinstein recommended that future work should assign coefficients to secondary and tertiary markets.

Spaulding replied that staff did not revise the employment projections, but rather assumed that graduates at the baccalaureate and graduate levels would be somewhat mobile. In observing student enrollment patterns, staff tried to recognize that students from every region were attending colleges and universities throughout the state in different ratios. There was also an assumption that students in Eastern Washington most often enrolled at EWU or WSU.

Sulton discussed the board's responsibility regarding the needs assessment, which is to look at the statewide array of programs and consider such issues as the number and location of programs and the quality of instruction. Sulton also said that Chairman Craves would like staff to investigate and review the discipline of nursing. This document will help the HECB in its deliberations.

Greene suggested that the state's Chambers of Commerce may be interested in the needs assessment report because the general public is interested in the economy, and the chambers provide a venue for business leaders and the community to come together.

Grinstein said the needs assessment provides a solid foundation, and is a statement about the role of the HECB.

**ACTION: Mike Worthy** moved to approve the needs assessment report (**Res. 05-19**). **Bill Grinstein** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **Director's Report**

### Announcements

After 30 years of service – including 25 years as president, South Puget Sound Community College President Kenneth J. Minnaert has announced plans to retire from the college at the end of the academic year.

Gov. Gregoire has appointed former HECB member Herb Simon as a regent for the University of Washington.

Accountability and Performance Indicators

Sulton said that HECB associate director Chris Thompson will take the lead on accountability issues for the agency, succeeding former staff member Nina Oman. HECB staff are working with the public four-year college and universities to implement two sets of performance indicators. The first are the measures developed by the HECB in collaboration with the universities as part of the state's long-term effort to assess higher education accountability improvements. The second set was developed by the Office of Financial Management and included in the state operating budget by the Legislature and Gov. Gregoire. Future HECB reports and analyses will address both sets of measurements.

National Collaborative for Postsecondary Education

Washington is one of five states that have been participating in a national effort to improve postsecondary education. The National Collaborative is comprised of the Education Commission of the States (ECS), the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. These organizations have been working with Washington and four other states (Missouri, Rhode Island, Virginia, and, West Virginia) to define a public agenda for higher education.

Sulton posed a number of questions that he said should form the core of the strategic master plan and help focus institutional collaboration: "How do we utilize our role to make higher education a more prominent policy agenda in the state? How do we emphasize the need for higher education? What does the state really want for higher education?" While the National Collaborative has confirmed that our state is in good standing, Sulton said that much can be learned from other states.

Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Sulton said he recently attended a meeting held by the Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (WACTE) at Seattle Pacific University, which provided an opportunity for the HECB to join the deans of education in discussing implementation of the P-16 initiative.

Hurricane Katrina

HECB staff have been tracking the temporary enrollment status of students affected by Hurricane Katrina. Washington institutions have received a total of 93 evacuee students: 23 graduate students, eight professional students, and 62 graduate students.

Proportionality Agreements

Legislation signed into law earlier this year granted authority for WSU Vancouver to offer lower-division courses to freshman and sophomore students, in accordance with proportionally agreements that ensure that access to transfer students will not diminish as a result.

Sulton said that Steve Olswang, interim chancellor for UW Bothell, is now proposing that proportionality agreements be established between UWB and local community colleges.

Four-Year Degrees at Two-Year Colleges

The 2005 Legislature approved a pilot program that will allow four community colleges to offer four-year degrees, beginning in fall 2007. The colleges will be chosen in spring 2006.

**Fiscal Committee Report and the 2006 Supplemental Budget**

Mike Worthy, chair of the fiscal committee, provided information discussed during the October 6 committee meeting at Highline Community College. Those in attendance were Greene, Smith, Burke, Kissler, and Worthy.

The fiscal committee discussed the HECB's proposed 2007-09 operating and capital budget guidelines, as well as the possibility of considering the needs assessment in developing the agency's 2007-09 operating and capital budget proposals.

In December, the HECB will make supplemental budget recommendations to the 2006 Legislature.

Gary Benson described the process used by the HECB in responding to supplemental budget requests submitted by the state's colleges and universities. OFM asked institutions to submit their supplemental budget requests – which totaled approximately \$60 million -- by October 17. A number of institutions requested funding for utility rate increases and funding to accommodate students with disabilities. While the HECB is expected to respond to these institutional requests by November 1, staff believe this deadline provides insufficient time to thoroughly review all requests. To that end, staff are seeking board approval of Resolution 05-20, stating that the board did not have sufficient time to respond to the OFM request. The resolution also reiterates support for the board's previously stated fiscal priorities, as outlined in the 2004 Strategic Master Plan regarding college and university supplemental budget requests.

**ACTION:** Mike Worthy moved to approve a resolution (**Res 05-20**) stating that the board stands behind the fiscal priorities outlined in its 2004 Strategic Master Plan, as they relate to the college and university supplemental budget requests presented to OFM. Betti Sheldon seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Grinstein questioned when the board would be able to consider the institutional budget requests. Benson responded that the review would likely be presented at the December meeting, after the next fiscal committee meeting. Benson also explained that tying the needs assessment to the budget request will likely have a positive effect on legislative discussions.

Worthy believes it is the board's role to be the primary voice calling for sufficient resources for higher education in the state. The needs assessment is a perfect tool to emphasize those needs.

**2007-09 Operating and Capital Budget Priorities and Guidelines**Operating Budget

Benson reviewed the HECB draft 2007-09 operating budget guidelines. State statute requires the HECB to "review and evaluate" the operating and capital budget requests of the public colleges and universities. Prior to this review, evaluation and development of recommendations, the

HECB is to adopt and distribute budget guidelines in December of each odd-numbered year. These guidelines outline the HECB's fiscal priorities and reflect the goals and strategies of the strategic master plan. Grinstein noted that the 2005 Legislature funded additional FTE student enrollments and questioned whether additional slots should be viewed as incoming lower-division enrollments. Benson confirmed that to be the case in both the 2- and 4-yr systems.

### Capital Budget

HECB Associate Director Jim Reed reviewed the capital budget guidelines and discussed House Bill 2151 – enacted by the 2003 Legislature – that calls for clear priorities for capital project expenditures.

The law requires the state's four-year public institutions to prepare a single prioritized individual ranking of institutional capital projects, using guidelines developed by the HECB. The SBCTC is directed to continue to submit a single prioritized ranking of proposed projects for the state's two-year system.

The board's 2005-07 guidelines include common definitions and a framework for prioritizing four-year projects, as required in ESHB 2151. During the 2005 legislative session, legislators made recommendations to improve the process through Section 908 of the 2005-07 capital appropriations act (ESSB 6094).

Reed said the HECB has begun to refine the process and meetings are underway with representatives of the four-year schools and the Council of Presidents. A third meeting will be held November 8.

Worthy asked Reed to define minor-works projects. Reed said that according to OFM's budget instructions, any project valued at less than \$1 million is considered a minor-works project. An institution or state agency can combine all of its minor-works projects into one item.

### **Education Committee Report**

Sheldon provided the education committee report in the absence of committee chair Sam Smith. The committee met by teleconference on Oct. 17.

The committee discussed the regional needs assessment proposal that was presented during the September board meeting. Discussion included Chairman Craves' request that staff review nursing education in the state. The executive committee has agreed to consider the issue. In addition, the committee discussed the board's proposal to revise minimum college admission standards and agreed to further review at a later date.

Staff advised the committee about several efforts related to articulation and transfer, including House Bill 2382, which was enacted during the 2005 session. HB 2382 required the HECB to convene a statewide workgroup to investigate different options and costs for an online advising system. The workgroup evaluated existing systems in Washington, identified features of an ideal system, and then considered systems in use by other states. Based on this research, three options were identified and implementation costs were identified. The result of the group's work is

available in a report submitted to the Legislature in January 2005. The HECB supports one particular option, as used in Maryland and New Jersey, because it provides the best selection of features identified as “ideal” by the workgroup and, more importantly, is the easiest for students to use and understand.

In October, the HECB submitted a supplementary budget request for \$1.64 million for a statewide online student advising system. The system would help students plan their college curriculum -- particularly community college students hoping to transfer to a four-year school.

### **College Readiness Project**

HECB Associate Director Ricardo Sanchez briefed the board on efforts to improve college readiness. The 2004 Strategic Master Plan calls for educators to collaboratively define college readiness in several core subjects, including math, science, English and social studies. The Legislature and governor earmarked \$600,000 in the 2005-07 operating budget for the HECB to define college readiness in science and English. The board has convened a project coordination team – including representatives of K-12, the community and technical colleges, and four-year universities -- to help direct the project.

Worthy asked why the Legislature limited the project to English and science. Sulton said he believes the Legislature reviewed the strategic master plan prior to recommending that the state fund an effort to define college readiness. The “Transitions” math project has been underway for some time, and is showing progress. The college readiness project provides a step-by-step approach to defining all core disciplines.

### **Financial Aid Committee Report**

Sulton introduced John Klacik, HECB director for student financial assistance. Klacik provided an update on the pending reauthorization of the federal Higher Education Act of 1965. The Act is ongoing, but is reconsidered every six years – most recently in September 2003. The deadline was extended to December 31, 2005, and Klacik expects that a further delay will push reauthorization into spring 2006.

Major activities include:

- (1) Student financial assistance (generally known as Title IV) is provided by Congress through the Act. In Washington State, students receive approximately \$1 billion annually in federal student aid, grants, work assistance, and loans. Eighty percent of that funding is in loans.
- (2) Early awareness and early outreach projects, such as the Trio and GEAR UP programs throughout the state.
- (3) Aid to institutions, such as libraries.
- (4) Teacher training.

Reauthorization also would revise a portion of the Leveraging Education Assistance Program (LEAP). LEAP is the only program that provides federal matching funds for state aid programs (currently about \$1.8 million). The U.S. Senate proposal would reformulate 60 percent of the funding into a program called Grants for Access and Persistence (GAP). GAP is a federally-mandated partnership between the state, business, philanthropies, and colleges. Klacik said that a student aid advisory committee has been created to advise Congress on reauthorization issues. The committee is scheduled to address the board during its regular December meeting.

Public Comment

EWU science professor Jeff Corkill (and HECB Advisory Council member) asked Sanchez about the committee that was selected to define college readiness for the English and science disciplines, and urged that faculty be included. Corkill said that more coordination between the high schools and universities, both at the administrative and the faculty levels, would increase efficiency and use of funding.

The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.



December 2005

## **Access and Persistence and the Reauthorization of the 1965 Higher Education Act**

*A Presentation by the Federal Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance*

Work now underway in Congress to reauthorize the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 has significant ramifications for the board and the thousands of Washington students who rely on financial assistance to pay for college.

Staff of the federal Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance will brief the board on the current condition of access and persistence for low- and moderate-income students. In addition, they will provide an update on the committee's HEA reauthorization recommendations to Congress, with a special focus on the recommendations that may impact the programs and duties of the board. The presenters will be Nicole Barry, deputy director, and Erin Renner, assistant director. (Biographies of the presenters are attached.)

### **The Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance**

The federal Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance was created in 1986 as an independent source of advice and counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Education on student financial aid policy. Heritage University president Sister Kathleen Ross has served on the committee since 2002.

The committee's statutory mandate is to:

- Provide extensive knowledge and understanding of federal, state, and institutional programs of postsecondary student assistance;
- Provide technical expertise with regard to systems of need analysis and application forms; and
- Make recommendations that will result in the maintenance of access to postsecondary education for low- and middle-income students.

The committee is especially concerned about the difficulties that students from low-income and disadvantaged families face when trying to access higher education. It has published several reports that have influenced the reauthorization discussion, including the following:

- *Access Denied: Restoring the Nation's Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity (2001)*
- *Empty Promises: The Myth of College Access in America (2002)*
- *The Student Aid Gauntlet (2005)*

### **Committee's Recommendations to Congress**

The committee has made ten recommendations to Congress related to the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act; three of these recommendations may specifically impact the programs and duties of the board. These recommendations are:

- Creating a system of early financial aid information to low-income 7th-12th graders;
- Simplifying the federal financial aid application; and
- Creating a national access and persistence partnership.

**Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance***Biographies of the Presenters*

**Ms. Nicole A. Barry** is the advisory committee's deputy director. Prior to joining the committee in September 2003, Ms. Barry worked as a high school social studies teacher in the Baltimore City Public Schools and as the librarian at the International School of Trieste in Trieste, Italy. She is an alumnus of the Teach for America program and a current participant in the associates program of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Ms. Barry has presented nationally on a broad range of issues related to access and persistence for low- and moderate-income students. She received an M.A. in teaching from Johns Hopkins University in 2002 and a B.A. in social studies from Harvard University in 1998.

**Ms. Erin B. Renner** joined the committee as an assistant director in June 2005. She previously worked as the assistant to the chief of staff for Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr. Ms. Renner received her Ed.M from Harvard Graduate School of Education in 2005 and her B.A. in political science and communication from the University of Massachusetts Amherst in 2002.



**December 2005**

## **2004 Statewide Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education: *Update on Implementation***

In December 2004, the Higher Education Coordination Board submitted its 2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education to the governor and legislature. State law requires the board to report annually on its progress in implementing the master plan. This document identifies the progress of the HECB and the state through November 2005 toward achieving the goals and implementing the specific strategic initiatives of the plan.

This report will be presented as an information item at the HECB meeting on December 15, 2005, and will be forwarded to the legislature and governor following the meeting.



**2004 Statewide Strategic Master Plan  
for Higher Education**

*Update on Implementation*

**December 2005**

# Table of Contents

**Goals** ..... 1

## **Policy Initiatives**

1. Funding for Student Success ..... 5

2. Allocating Student Enrollments ..... 7

3. Increasing the Number of Degrees in High-demand Fields ..... 9

4. Keeping College Tuition Affordable and Predictable .....11

5. Promoting Opportunity through Student Financial Assistance .....13

6. Meeting Regional Higher Education Needs .....17

7. Helping Transfer Students Earn Bachelor’s Degrees .....19

8. Helping Students Make the Transition to College .....21

9. Reducing Barriers for Non-traditional Students .....25

10. Promoting Student Success through Greater Accountability .....27

11. Measuring Student Success with an Improved Data System .....29

# Goals

## Helping students succeed; helping the state prosper

Washington must open the doors of higher education to a record number of students, and the state should do everything possible to help those students succeed. Students who earn college degrees, complete job training programs or improve their basic skills earn higher incomes, enjoy a better quality of life, and are less likely to be unemployed. A better-educated and more highly skilled workforce translates into higher tax revenue, greater civic participation, and stronger state economy.

### *Goal 1: Increase opportunities for students to earn degrees*

The 2004 Strategic Master Plan called for a 12 percent increase in the total number of students who earn college degrees per year at public and private colleges and universities by 2010.

If this goal is attained, by 2010:

- The total number of students who earn college degrees will increase by 7,200 to reach 68,500 per year.
- The number of students who earn associate degrees will increase by 3,300 to reach 27,000 per year.
- The number of students who earn bachelor's degrees will increase by 2,800 to reach 30,000 per year.
- The number of students who earn graduate degrees will increase by 1,100 to reach 11,500 per year.

### *Goal 2: Respond to the state's economic needs*

- The number of students who earn degrees and are prepared for work in high-demand fields will increase by 300 per year compared with current totals to reach 1,500 per year by 2010.
- The number of students who complete job training programs will increase by 12 percent to reach 25,000 per year.<sup>1</sup>
- The number of students in adult basic education and English as a Second Language programs who demonstrate improved literacy skills will grow by 19 percent to reach 20,525 by 2010.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The HECB adopted the goals of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges for job training and adult literacy.

<b>State progress in reaching the targets in the 2004 Strategic Master Plan</b>				
	2003-04 (Actual)	2004-05 (Actual)	2009-10 (Targets)	Increase Required to Reach Target
<b>Goal 1</b>				
Associate Degrees	23,976	22,247	27,000	4,753
Bachelor's Degrees	27,240	28,265	30,000	1,735
Graduate Degrees	10,389	10,940	11,500	560
Total Degrees	61,605	61,452	68,500	7,048
<b>Goal 2</b>				
High-demand			Base + 1,500	1,500
Job Training	23,700	23,394	25,000	1,606
Improved Literacy	17,300	20,572	20,525	Exceed Target

### ***Goal 1: Increase opportunities for students to earn degrees***

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) set targets for the number of associate, bachelor's, and graduate degrees to be conferred by Washington's public and private colleges and universities in 2009-10. The board also adopted the targets of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges for the number of students completing job training programs and the number of students in adult basic education and English as a Second Language programs who demonstrate measurable skill gains.

#### **Associate Degrees**

In December 2004, the board revised the associate degree target in response to faster than expected progress toward the target. In 2003-2004, Washington exceeded by 176 the board's original 2010 target of 23,500 degrees. As a result, the target was revised upward by 3,500 degrees to reach 27,000 associate degrees per year by 2010. However, community and technical college enrollment has fallen since 2003-04, and there has been a concurrent reduction in the number of degrees awarded. Unless this trend is reversed, it is unlikely that the state will meet the revised AA target. However, the state can expect to exceed the original target of 23,500 degrees by 2010.

#### **Bachelor's Degrees**

Progress toward the bachelor's degree target is outpacing the original master plan projections, and the state can now expect to surpass the 2010 degree target of 30,000 bachelor's degrees. It appears that the baccalaureate colleges and universities are becoming more efficient, because the average number of full-time enrollments per bachelor's degree fell from 3.75 to 3.55 between 2000-2001 and 2003-2004. While it is unclear whether this trend will continue, the HECB now projects the state will attain the master plan target of 30,000 bachelor's degrees per year by 2008.

## **Graduate Degrees**

The growth in the number of graduate degrees has closely tracked the projections of the 2004 plan, and the state can expect to surpass the graduate degree target of 11,500 per year by 360 degrees in 2010.

### ***Goal 2: Respond to the state's economic needs***

The HECB also has adopted targets for students earning degrees in high-demand fields, students completing job training programs, and students who demonstrate improved literacy skills. The high-demand target was tied to specific high-demand grant programs operated by the HECB and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC). Since these programs were not funded in the 2005-07 biennium, the HECB may need to revise these targets. The last two targets on job training and improved literacy were initially adopted by the SBCTC and then accepted by the HECB.

## **High-Demand Enrollment**

This target was established during a biennium in which the governor and legislature provided funding for competitive grant programs to expand the availability of “high-demand enrollment” opportunities for students at public two-year and four-year colleges and universities. The program was designed to increase student access to programs in which student enrollment pressure exceeded available capacity, and whose graduates were in demand by Washington employers. Since then, however, the state has discontinued its competitive high-demand funding, and this target will need to be re-evaluated.

## **Job Training**

The decline in community and technical college enrollment – attributed largely to the state’s relatively strong economy and job growth – appears to have been the primary cause of the reduction in the number of students who earned job training credentials from 2003-04 to 2004-05. In the current economic environment, it is unclear whether the state will meet this target by 2010.

## **Improved Literacy**

The community and technical college system has exceeded the SBCTC target for improved literacy among adult basic education and English as a Second Language students. One especially promising development is the two-year college system’s effort to integrate basic skills and English instruction into job training programs.



## Policy Initiatives

### 1. Funding for Student Success

#### Overview

The 2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education identified clear and measurable goals that focused on outcomes rather than inputs alone. To reinforce this outcomes-based approach, the plan proposed that the state develop a new funding method to reward public colleges and universities for student success. Specifically, it proposed that the state allocate higher education funding based on enrollment in the 2005-07 biennium and then transform the funding system beginning with the 2007-09 biennium.

The board outlined four potential approaches to implementing the new system:

- **Performance contracts that involve a formal pact between the state and an institution that spell out the obligations of both parties.** Specifically, the contract would detail the outcomes that would be delivered by the college or university and the resources that would be provided by the state to help achieve those outcomes.
- **Budget provisos that would define legislative expectations for a college or university in terms of degrees and performance targets rather than enrollment levels.** Currently, the most important performance measure of a college or university is whether it met or exceeded the full-time student equivalent enrollment target set by the legislature.
- **Calculating enrollment levels at the time of course completion rather than on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of classes.** Under this approach, student enrollment would be counted for state funding purposes only if students completed the courses, not if they just enrolled in them.
- **Changing the criteria for selecting high-demand programs for funding from delivering enrollments to producing results.** While the HECB's high-demand budget request was presented in terms of expanding enrollments, the strategic master plan goal for high-demand was stated in terms of program completions.

#### Implementation

- **In December 2004, the HECB** submitted its final 2005-07 higher education budget recommendations to the governor and legislature. The board's recommendations were based on how well the institutions' requests aligned with the board's budget priorities, the missions of the institutions, and the goals of the 2004 strategic master plan. The recommendations also addressed the first biennium objectives of the master plan.

- **In December 2004, the public research universities and several comprehensive universities** completed prototype performance contracts in collaboration with the Office of Financial Management (OFM).
- **The final 2005-07 operating budget** included budget provisos for each public four-year college and university and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. In return for increases in core funding, the budget directed the colleges and universities to show “demonstrable progress” toward achieving identified six-year programmatic goals by June 30, 2007.
- **By January 2006, each public four-year college and university**, in cooperation with the Office of Financial Management and the HECB, will establish six-year targets for these programmatic goals based on the per student funding level. The SBCTC and OFM will establish six-year targets for the goals outlined for the public two-year college system based on the per student funding level. The HECB also will participate in the approval of performance targets for the two-year system, since each of the two-year system performance indicators are already part of the accountability framework previously adopted by the HECB.
- **In December 2005, the HECB** will adopt final budget guidelines for the public colleges and universities that reflect the goals identified in the 2005-07 operating budget and the 2004 strategic master plan.
- **By October 1, 2006, each public four-year college and university** will report to the HECB on its progress and ongoing efforts to meet the six-year targets.
- **By October 31, 2006, the HECB and the SBCTC** will provide summaries to the governor and legislature of the progress and efforts of the public two-year and four-year colleges and universities to meet the six-year targets.
- **By November 15, 2006, the Washington Learns steering committee** will complete an 18-month comprehensive study of Washington’s education system and submit a final report, including recommendations, to the legislature. (The steering committee will submit interim reports by November 15, 2005, and June 16, 2006.)

As directed in Senate Bill 5441, the steering committee will recommend options for creating a new funding system for higher education. The HECB will be working closely with the Washington Learns steering committee and higher education advisory committee as they examine various options and develop their final recommendations.

## 2. Allocating Student Enrollments

### Overview

The Higher Education Coordinating Board needs to make specific enrollment allocation recommendations to carry out the intent of the 2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education. The size and shape of the state's higher education system is of primary concern for decision-makers looking to optimize state resources.

Issues that will influence discussions of the "size and shape" of the system and the board's specific enrollment recommendations include:

- The division of resources among the public two-year and four-year colleges and universities;
- The allocation of new resources and enrollments among the main campuses, branch campuses, and off-site learning centers;
- The role of private colleges and universities in meeting the state's need for additional higher education capacity;
- The regional economic, educational, and programmatic needs; and
- The methods of program delivery, such as traditional instruction, 2+2 programs for transfer students, and technology-enhanced distance learning.

Allocating student enrollment to meet the board's goals requires answering the following questions:

- How many degrees will students earn in the public and private sectors?
- How many public sector enrollments are needed to meet the public sector goals?
- How does this differ from current enrollments?
- What is the current physical capacity of the public colleges and universities?
- What is the regional demand for additional student enrollments?
- What are the funding needs for the additional student enrollments?

### Implementation Plan

- **In December 2004, the HECB** submitted its final 2005-07 higher education budget recommendations to the governor and legislature. The board recommended that the state fund 12,900 additional full-time equivalent enrollments, including 6,300 at the public two-year colleges and 6,600 at the public four-year colleges and universities, in order to make incremental progress toward the goals articulated in the 2004 master plan.

- **The final 2005-07 operating budget** provided funding for 7,900 additional full-time equivalent enrollments, including 4,185 at the public two-year colleges and 3,695 at the public four-year colleges and universities.
- **In spring 2005, the HECB** completed a simulation model to help policymakers analyze the impacts and costs of higher education enrollment and funding options. In addition, the model will help the HECB develop options for the size and shape of the state higher education system.
- **In July 2006, the HECB** will release draft higher education enrollment management options for discussion. The options will address opportunities to expand student enrollment; assess the need to revise the roles and missions of existing institutions; and determine whether new colleges and universities are needed to meet regional and statewide needs. The board will use the enrollment management options, in conjunction with the simulation model, to develop its enrollment allocation recommendations.
- **In September 2006, the HECB** will present a final enrollment management plan to the governor and legislature, the higher education community, and other interested parties.
- **By November 15, 2006, the Washington Learns steering committee** will submit a final report to the legislature. Senate Bill 5441, which established the program, calls for the report to address the number and distribution of enrollments at two-year and four-year colleges needed to meet demographic and workforce training needs; methods for determining the cost of instruction in various program areas; strategies to increase opportunity for access to bachelor's degrees at public colleges and universities; and options for using existing capacity in independent colleges and universities. The HECB will continue to work with the Washington Learns steering committee and higher education advisory committee as they develop their recommendations.
- **In November 2006, and every two years thereafter, the HECB** will include enrollment allocation and funding proposals in its biennial higher education budget recommendations to the governor and legislature.

### 3. Increasing the Number of Degrees in High-demand Fields

#### Overview

The Higher Education Coordinating Board believes it is critical that the state align its limited resources for public higher education with the needs of the economy. Traditional liberal arts education must remain a core component of the state's higher education system, because the skills it imparts are central to business and career success. However, the state also must respond to student and employer demands in fields where current or projected job creation outpaces the capacity of the higher education system to produce trained graduates.

The 2004 Strategic Master Plan proposed that the state increase the number of students who earn degrees and are prepared for work in high-demand fields by 300 per year to reach a cumulative total of 1,500 by 2010. Reaching this goal requires adding about 1,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students to the higher education system each year. These degrees and enrollments are in addition to existing degrees and enrollments in the higher education system.

High-demand programs have two primary elements: (1) instructional programs or fields in which student enrollment applications exceed available slots, and (2) career fields in which employers are unable to find enough skilled graduates to fill available jobs. This definition recognizes both excess student demand for a program and strong economic requirements for graduates in particular fields.

#### Identifying high-demand fields and programs

To help meet the state's economic needs and respond to employer and student demand, the board will develop an ongoing method to identify high-demand fields and programs based on student, employer and community needs. The board believes the state should regularly identify high-demand fields and programs within the statewide and regional higher education needs assessment process that began in 2005, and should provide funding that recognizes the significantly higher-than-average cost of most high-demand enrollment programs, such as those in computer science and health care.

#### Implementation Plan

##### 1. Identify high-demand fields

- **In October 2005, the HECB** completed a state and regional higher education needs assessment, which examined the needs of students, employers, and communities for higher education at the statewide and regional levels. The report also showed a decline in the number of graduates in certain high-demand fields, such as computer science.

- **By June 2006, a work group** convened by the HECB will identify high-demand fields for the 2007-09 biennium.
- **In November 2006 and every two years thereafter**, the HECB will include a list of eligible high-demand programs in its biennial higher education budget recommendations to the governor and legislature.

## **2. Fund high-demand enrollment slots**

- **In December 2004, the HECB** submitted its final 2005-07 higher education budget recommendations to the governor and legislature. The board recommended that the state fund 2,300 high-demand full-time enrollments, including 1,300 at the two-year colleges and 1,000 at the four-year colleges and universities. The final 2005-2007 operating budget did not specify funding for high-demand enrollments.
- **In October 2006, the HECB** plans to request state funding in the 2007-09 operating budget to distribute competitive enrollment grants based in part on the projected number of degrees produced in high-demand fields. Every two years thereafter, the HECB will address high-demand enrollment funding issues in its biennial higher education budget recommendations to the governor and legislature.

## 4. Keeping College Tuition Affordable and Predictable

### Overview

Washington, like many states, does not have a comprehensive tuition policy for resident undergraduate education. As a result, tuition increases generally have fluctuated in a cyclical pattern: increasing moderately when state revenue is high and increasing sharply when state revenue is low. The absence of a tuition policy has made it difficult for students and parents to anticipate college costs and for Washington's Guaranteed Education Tuition program, the state's prepaid college tuition plan, to plan for long-term affordability. It also has potentially devastating consequences for thousands of financially needy families who often do not have the financial reserves to respond to unexpected spikes in tuition.

Washington needs a state tuition policy that keeps tuition predictable and affordable for students and families while maintaining the high quality of education at the state's public colleges and universities. In addition, it needs to integrate its tuition policy with student financial assistance and state appropriations to colleges and universities – a key recommendation of the National Collaborative for Postsecondary Education Policy. The 2004 Strategic Master Plan called for the state to adopt the following tuition policies for resident undergraduate tuition and fees at Washington public two-year and four-year colleges and universities.

#### *Short-term Tuition Policy*

- Tuition and fees would not increase by more than 31 percent during any consecutive four-year period (average increases of 7 percent compounded).
- Annual tuition increases would be spread as evenly as possible over this four-year period and no annual increase should exceed 10 percent.

#### *Long-term Tuition Policy*

- The HECB planned to examine alternative tuition policies and make recommendations to the governor and legislature for consideration during the 2006 legislative session.

### Implementation Plan

#### 1. Adopt the recommended short-term tuition policy.

- **In December 2004, the HECB** recommended to the legislature and governor that the state adopt the proposed short-term tuition policy, beginning with the 2005-06 academic year.
- **The final 2005-07 operating budget** limited increases in resident undergraduate tuition in each year of the biennium to 7 percent at the research universities, 6 percent at the comprehensive institutions, and 5 percent at the community and technical colleges.

**2. Recommend a long-term tuition policy to the legislature and governor.**

- **By November 15, 2006, the Washington Learns steering committee** will submit a final report to the legislature. In recognition of that process, the HECB has not developed tuition recommendations, as originally contemplated, for the 2006 legislative session.

As directed in Senate Bill 5441, the report will recommend the appropriate share of the cost of instruction that should be funded through tuition, general fund-state, and financial aid. The HECB will work with the Washington Learns participants as they examine various tuition policy options and develop recommendations.

- **In November 2006, the HECB** will submit to the governor and legislature its 2007-09 operating budget recommendations, including tuition recommendations for resident undergraduate students.

## 5. Promoting Opportunity through Student Financial Assistance

### Overview

State law declares that “financial need shall not be a barrier to participation in higher education” (RCW 28B.10.786). The Higher Education Coordinating Board believes the state must maintain its longstanding commitment to higher education opportunity for all students, regardless of income.

To help economically disadvantaged students meet the rising costs of a college education, the 2004 Strategic Master Plan called on the state to expand several state financial aid and scholarship programs and create a new pilot program to aid adults who attend college part-time while working full-time.

### Implementation Plan

- 1. State Need Grant – Serve the state’s neediest students.** The state should provide grants equal to 100 percent of tuition to students with family incomes at 65 percent of the state’s median and serve all students eligible for the grant.
  - **In December 2004, the HECB** requested an additional \$75.2 million in the 2005-07 state operating budget to ensure that the need grants keep pace with tuition increases and that sufficient funds are available for currently eligible students.
  - **The final 2005-07 operating budget** provided an additional \$69.7 million in funding to increase the income service level from the current 55 percent of median family income to 65 percent, adjust awards to keep pace with tuition increases, and cover the impact of new state-funded enrollments.
- 2. State Work Study – Provide placement opportunities in high-demand fields and restore the number of students served to the program’s historic service level.** The state should increase funding for the State Work Study program to provide students with additional job opportunities in targeted high-demand fields and to restore the number of students served to the program’s historic level of one in 14 needy students. The board also recommended increases to maintain the student award at approximately 15 percent of each student’s financial need throughout the next three biennia.
  - **In December 2004, the HECB** requested an additional \$3.9 million in the 2005-07 state operating budget to adjust for increased costs and partially restore the program’s historic service level.
  - **The final 2005-07 operating budget** provided a \$2.9 million increase in funding to allow student awards to keep pace with tuition increases and higher enrollments.

- 3. Educational Opportunity Grant – Increase student participation.** The state should increase funding for the Educational Opportunity Grant program, the state’s only targeted financial aid initiative specifically designed to increase the number of students who earn bachelor’s degrees.

  - **In December 2004, the HECB** requested \$0.5 million to increase the number of participating students.
  - **The final 2005-07 operating budget** did not include any increase in funding.
- 4. Washington Promise Scholarship – Promote academic excellence.** To motivate middle and high school students to excel and prepare for college, the state should fund the Washington Promise Scholarship award at the statutory maximum of two-year college tuition.

  - **In December 2004, the HECB** requested an additional \$3.5 million to increase annual awards from \$1,176 to \$1,400. However, the 2005-07 state operating budget eliminated the program, beginning with the high school graduating class of 2005. The budget provided funding to provide final second-year grants to students from the high school graduating class of 2004.
- 5. Washington Scholars and Washington Award for Vocational Excellence – Maintain the value of awards.** The state should fund these programs to maintain scholarship awards at the value of public tuition and fees.

  - **In December 2004, the HECB** requested an additional \$0.7 million to maintain scholarship awards at the value of public resident undergraduate tuition and fees.
  - **The final 2005-07 operating budget** provided a net increase of \$0.4 million. The funding maintained scholarship awards at the value of public resident undergraduate tuition and fees, while also reducing the number of Washington scholars in each legislative district from three students to two students in fiscal year 2007.
- 6. Financial Aid for Low-income Full-time Workers – Create a new pilot program.** The state should develop a pilot grant program for low-income, full-time workers who attend college for five or fewer credits per term. Participating students would receive grants equal to tuition, plus an allowance for books.

  - **In December 2004, the HECB** requested \$2 million in the state operating budget to fund the pilot project during the 2005-07 biennium. This specific funding was not provided, but the state significantly increased funding for the State Need Grant and authorized the board to use some of this money for the pilot project.

- **House Bill 1345**, enacted in 2005, authorizes the HECB to develop a pilot project within the State Need Grant program to help students enrolled in college less than half-time. Students whose colleges participate in the project may qualify for the need grant if they are enrolled for four or five credits per term, down from the previous minimum of six credits. **Note:** The four- and five-credit limit applies *only* at colleges that participate in the pilot project.
- **In fall 2005, the HECB** selected eight colleges and universities to begin providing need grants to eligible students. Participating colleges include The Evergreen State College, Pacific Lutheran University, Clark College, Columbia Basin College, Highline Community College, Peninsula College, South Puget Sound Community College, and Spokane Falls Community College.
- **By December 2006, the HECB** will report the results of the first year of the pilot project to the governor and legislature.



## 6. Meeting Regional Higher Education Needs

### Overview

Washington's current higher education system has evolved largely in response to changing student demographics, employer demand, community needs, and geographic disparities in students' college attendance. It has not always been planned or implemented in a conscientious or prioritized manner.

To improve the responsiveness and effectiveness of the current system, the 2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education called for the development of a resource allocation framework to respond to local, regional, and state needs with clearly stated priorities. Specifically, this framework would do the following:

- Clearly identify the existing distribution of higher education resources;
- Explain the purpose and inter-relationship of these resources;
- Establish the criteria and authorities by which these resources could change in response to emerging and changing student and regional needs; and
- Use existing and new resources in a coordinated and flexible manner.

### Implementation Plan

#### 1. **Develop a simulation model that helps state policymakers analyze the impact and costs of higher education enrollment and funding options.**

- **In December 2004, the HECB** completed the simulation model. The model will help the develop options for the size and shape of higher education. The HECB recently used the model in developing its recommendations on the future of Washington's branch campuses. The model will be a critical tool in developing and analyzing options for the future size and shape of the state higher education system.

#### 2. **Complete the needs assessment process, as outlined in House Bill 3103.**

- **In January 2005, the HECB**, with assistance from stakeholders, identified the regions of the state that should be the focus of future data collection and planning initiatives. The HECB has been involved in ongoing planning and needs assessments in Snohomish, Island, and Skagit counties at the legislature's directive and in the Tri-Cities region at the community's initiative.
- **In May 2005, a work group**, appointed by the HECB, developed criteria for the evaluation of state and regional needs. The work group included representatives of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (WTECB).

- **In October 2005, the HECB** completed a report on state and regional needs assessments, with additional updates every two years. The report projects a need to accommodate an additional 45,000 student enrollments in the public colleges and universities by 2010. In addition, it identifies academic and professional program areas and geographic areas where growth should be targeted in order to respond to student, employer, and community needs.
  - **In December 2006, the HECB** will deliver a final report to the legislature and governor on the higher education needs in Snohomish, Island, and Skagit counties, as directed in the 2005-07 capital budget.
- 3. Revise the approval processes for new degree programs at the four-year and two-year colleges and universities.**
- **In September 2005, the HECB** adopt updated guidelines for program approval and facility leases and purchases at public colleges and universities. These guidelines are outlined in *Program and Facility Approval Policy and Procedures*. The HECB developed the guidelines, in close consultation with the public four-year colleges and universities.
- 4. Develop and present an enrollment management plan to state policymakers and higher education administrators.** The plan will address opportunities to expand student enrollment; assess the need to revise the roles and missions of existing colleges and universities, and determine whether new colleges and universities are needed to meet regional and statewide needs.
- **By February 2006, the HECB** will complete a review of the roles and missions of existing public colleges and universities.
  - **In April 2006, the HECB** will complete a statewide inventory of higher education resources, including locations and programs of public and private colleges and universities.
  - **In July 2006, the HECB** will present higher education enrollment management options for discussion.
  - **In September 2006, the HECB** will present an enrollment management plan to the governor and legislature, college and university governing boards, and other interested parties.

## 7. Helping Transfer Students Earn Bachelor's Degrees

### Overview

The state needs a barrier-free transfer system to help community college transfer students earn bachelor's degrees at four-year colleges and universities as efficiently as possible.

The 2004 Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board to assume a leadership role in working with Washington's colleges and universities to ensure efficient and seamless articulation and transfer across the state. Developing a statewide on-line student advising system was a key assignment, along with developing transfer associate degrees for specific academic majors. Both of these efforts focus on better preparing students before they enter four-year colleges.

In addition to these legislatively mandated efforts, the 2004 Strategic Master Plan called for the elimination of a requirement that community college students who are transferring with associate degrees complete an additional 90 quarter-based credits at a public four-year college or university in order to earn a bachelor's degree. Eliminating this policy would allow students who complete associate degree pathways to graduate with exactly the credit they need to complete their bachelor's degrees.

### Implementation Plan

#### 1. Develop new associate degree pathways that focus on readiness for academic majors at four-year colleges and universities, as required by House Bill 2382.

- **In January 2005, the HECB** submitted to the legislature and governor a report, *Articulation and Student Transfer*, which summarized the progress of the work groups in developing associate degree pathways.
- **In June 2005, a two-year/four-year college work group** completed a new associate degree pathway for nursing. In addition, it identified three additional associate degree pathways to be developed or revisited: (1) business, (2) engineering technology, and (3) earth science (geography) secondary education. The work group, known as the Joint Access Oversight Group, is composed of leaders from the public two-year and four-year colleges and universities.
- **In September 2005, the HECB** adopted revised academic degree program approval guidelines for bachelor's degrees, which require colleges and universities to identify a corresponding associate degree pathway when they propose a new major.
- **By December 2005, the work group** will complete new associate degree pathways for elementary education and engineering. In January 2006, the work group will present the new associate degree pathways to the HECB.

- **By June 2006, the work group** will revise the existing associate degree pathways in business and complete new pathways in engineering technology and earth science secondary education.
- **By fall 2006, the HECB** will complete an inventory of existing associate degree pathways that prepare students for bachelor's degrees and identify the number of transfer students earning bachelor's degrees by major.
- **By June 2007,** all four-year degrees that are in high-demand by transfer students will be matched to corresponding associate degree pathways.

## 2. Eliminate the current 90-credit requirement for transfer students.

- **In November 2004, the HECB** eliminated the 90-credit requirement from the statewide transfer policy and notified Washington colleges and universities.

## 3. Develop a statewide online student advising system to facilitate transfer and degree planning.

- **In December 2004, the HECB** requested \$1.6 million in the 2005-07 operating budget to implement and begin operation of the statewide on-line student advising system. The 2005-07 operating budget did not include any funding for the system.
- **In January 2005, HECB staff and a work group** formed through House Bill 2382 submitted a report, *Articulation and Student Transfer*. The report outlined options and prospective operating and maintenance costs for a statewide online student advising system.
- **In October 2005, the HECB** requested \$1.6 million in the 2006 supplemental operating budget to begin development of the system.
- **By January 2007, HECB and college/university staff** will work with the vendor to ensure that course equivalency data is integrated into the statewide system, a student feedback tool is developed, and electronic transcripts are available.
- **By June 2007,** the statewide online student advising system will be fully operational and available to students statewide.

## 8. Helping Students Make the Transition to College

### Overview

Every year, large numbers of Washington students graduate from high school unprepared for college study or, many would argue, the workplace. Fifty-six percent of students who graduated from high school in 2002 enrolled in a Washington public two-year or four-year college or university within one year of graduation. Of those students, 38 percent required remedial mathematics or English courses.

Inadequate preparation in high schools takes a disproportionately greater toll on African American, Hispanic, and Native American students. Students from these groups in the high school class of 2002 were significantly less likely than their White or Asian peers to go on to college within a year of graduation and more likely to require remedial instruction when they enrolled. In addition, students from low-income families are significantly less likely to be enrolled in college preparatory programs than their higher-income peers. Higher education shoulders much of the cost of this lack of preparation.

Leadership at the state level is essential to developing a systemic solution to the problem of inadequate academic preparation. The Higher Education Coordinating Board proposes to collaborate with state K-12 and higher education systems to accomplish the following key initiatives:

- Develop a comprehensive definition of college readiness;
- Establish statewide student learning outcomes for grades 11 and 12 that are required for success in postsecondary study;
- Expand effective models that promote K-12/higher education collaboration and prepare students for college success; and
- Communicate with students, families, and schools the requirements of a rigorous high school education that will lead to successful postsecondary study and careers.

These initiatives will help students prepare for higher education with a clear understanding of the knowledge and abilities required for success and the confidence that their high school coursework will be enough to gain them admission and prepare them for the rigors of college work.

Key outcomes of this proposal include (1) an increase in the number of students who are ready for postsecondary study and (2) the establishment of the critical groundwork to improve instruction, teacher training and development, and guidance counseling; reduce remediation at state colleges and universities; and narrow the achievement gap.

## Implementation Plan

1. **Define college readiness in the key subject areas of mathematics, science, English, social studies, world languages, and the arts.**
  - **The 2005-07 operating budget** provided \$600,000 to the HECB to develop college readiness definitions for English and science.
  - **In fall 2005, the HECB** developed an 18-month project timeline, in collaboration with representatives of K-12 education, two-year and four-year colleges and universities, and the private sector.
  - **In October 2006, the HECB** will review draft definitions of college readiness for English and science.
  - **In December 2006, the HECB** will adopt final definitions of college readiness for English and science, following extensive public review.
  - **The HECB** may request funding in the 2007-09 operating budget to develop college readiness definitions for social studies, world languages, and the arts, with final board adoption in December 2008.
  - **The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, HECB, and Council of Presidents** will continue to work together to develop college readiness mathematics standards through the Transition Mathematics Project. The HECB will review the mathematics standards in spring 2005.
  
2. **Support the efforts of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to develop guidelines that identify the knowledge and abilities high school students must gain in grades 11 and 12 to be ready for college.**
  - **In January 2006, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction**, in collaboration with the Transition Mathematics Project, will release and begin public discussions of draft Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) in mathematics for students in grades 11 and 12.

**3. Document the variety of college preparation programs administered in Washington state.** The HECB will publish its research findings with analysis and options for expanding the reach of these efforts.

- **In February 2005, the HECB** submitted to the legislature a report, *Collaborative Efforts to Improve Student Transitions*, which summarized dual-credit opportunities, as directed in House Bill 3103.
- **By November 15, 2006, the Washington Learns steering committee** will submit a final report to the legislature. As directed in Senate Bill 5441, the committee will examine ways to provide smooth transitions from high school to college, including dual credit options and adequate preparation for college-level coursework. The HECB will be working closely with the Washington Learns steering committee and higher education advisory committee as they develop their final recommendations.
- **Beginning in January 2007, the HECB** will provide biennial progress reports on increasing dual-credit opportunities.

**4. Educate students, parents, and educators about the new college preparation requirements.**

- **In August 2005, the HECB** began work with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to make college and career planning materials available to all Washington high school students. The HECB and OSPI will team up again in August 2006 to make materials available to all middle school students.
- **Following the 2005-06 academic year, the HECB** will collaborate with colleges, universities, and state agencies to consider strategies to improve feedback to high schools about the performance of their recent graduates in postsecondary education. Data to be developed could inform school districts and the public about the percentage of students from each high school who enroll in postsecondary programs, persist in their studies, and require remedial instruction.
- **By summer 2006, the HECB** will develop and implement a communications strategy to inform students, parents, educators, and the public about the need for and the development of college readiness definitions in English, science and mathematics.



## 9. Reducing Barriers for Non-traditional Students

### Overview

Washington's higher education system works well for traditional students – the recent high school graduates who go from high school to college and continuously enroll until they receive their degrees. It works less well for “non-traditional” students, although the community and technical colleges in particular have made significant advancements in programs and services during the past decade. “Non-traditional” students include, but are not limited to, unemployed adults, students whose first language is not English, and those who need to balance college, work, and family obligations.

It is imperative for the higher education system to recognize and respond to the educational and training needs of non-traditional students. By increasing the skills and knowledge of these students through education and training, we will be increasing their opportunities to better serve themselves and the state's economic development needs.

### Implementation Plan

#### 1. Assess and address the need for educational and training programs for targeted non-traditional students.

- **In summer 2006, HECB staff** will present a draft report to the HECB for review and discussion. The report will include the following components:
  - Identified target groups of non-traditional students, including the numbers of people affected;
  - Statewide assessment of the students' education and training needs;
  - Types and number of programs available in the state to meet those needs;
  - A national and state review of best practices; and
  - Recommendations to the governor and legislature to address the identified needs and gaps, including potential legislation.

HECB partners include public and private colleges, universities and career schools, and state K-12, workforce training and higher education agencies.

- **In fall 2006, the HECB** will adopt the final report, including recommendations to the legislature and governor.

#### 2. Publicize best practices to meet the education and training needs of non-traditional students.

- **In spring 2006, the HECB and its partners** will complete a national and state review of best practices in serving targeted non-traditional students.
- **In summer 2006, the HECB and its partners** will begin distributing this information statewide.

**3. Strengthen the coordination of current efforts to provide education and training programs for non-traditional students.**

- **In October 2005, the HECB** convened a team of partners representing community colleges, public and private four-year colleges and universities, private career schools, and statewide workforce development organizations. The team will identify programs that serve non-traditional students, gaps in these services, and/or potential areas for expansion. The team then will develop strategies to close the identified gaps through more effective leveraging of existing resources.
- **On an ongoing basis, the HECB** is working with its partners to coordinate efforts to address the needs of non-traditional students through the approval of new degree programs at the public four-year colleges and universities, development of a statewide higher education needs assessment, and authorization of out-of-state colleges and universities to offer instruction and degree programs in Washington.

**4. Support and promote financial aid policies and programs targeted to non-traditional students.**

- **In December 2004**, the HECB requested \$2 million in the state operating budget to fund the pilot program during the 2005-07 biennium.
- **House Bill 1345**, as enacted in 2005, authorizes the HECB to develop a pilot project within the State Need Grant program to help students enrolled in college less than-half-time. The legislation reduces the enrollment threshold to at least four credits from the current six-credit minimum.
- **In fall 2005, the HECB** selected eight participating colleges and universities and began serving eligible students. Participating colleges include The Evergreen State College, Pacific Lutheran University, Clark College, Columbia Basin College, Highline Community College, Peninsula College, South Puget Sound Community College and Spokane Falls Community College.
- **By December 2006, the HECB** will report to the governor and legislature on the results of the project. The report will evaluate the number of students who might be eligible if the pilot project were expanded statewide, the demographic characteristics and college-going behavior of the students, and the costs to fund it.

## 10. Promoting Student Success through Greater Accountability

### Overview

Accountability is the backbone of a successful educational system. Redesigning the state's higher education accountability system will help the state reach its goals and promote student success at the institution, sector, and state levels.

Currently, the purpose of higher education accountability is unclear and its performance indicators have little relation to institutional or state goals. The board has begun to redesign Washington's accountability system based on the following principles:

- Priorities of Washington colleges and universities are aligned with state goals as defined in legislation and the 2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education;
- Targets are set for the state and each college and university;
- Annual reports detail both significant achievements and areas to strengthen for the state and each college and university; and
- Based on accountability data, statewide and institutional policies are developed to help students succeed in completing their education efficiently, equitably, and effectively.

### Implementation Plan

#### 1. Develop and implement a higher education accountability model that measures progress toward statewide goals.

- **In April 2005, the HECB** adopted a new accountability model and a set of common and institution-specific measures for the public four-year and two-year colleges and universities.
- **The final 2005-07 operating budget** included budget provisos with additional performance measures for each public four-year college and university and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges.
- **By January 2006, the SBCTC and each public four-year college and university**, in cooperation with the Office of Financial Management and HECB, will establish performance targets for these measures.
- **The HECB** will monitor the performance of the colleges and universities in meeting these performance targets annually and will continue to issue biennial statewide and institution-specific progress reports to the governor and legislature.



## 11. Measuring Student Success with an Improved Data System

### Overview

Detailed information about student success is essential to understanding current trends and planning for future improvements. However, unlike many other states, Washington lacks the coordinated data system needed by state policy makers.

The 2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education called for a student unit record data system to evaluate progress toward state goals and to identify and eliminate barriers to student success. The new statewide student-level database would include data about all students at every stage of college – from submitting the college application and deciding where to enroll to choosing a major and earning a degree. A few data sources currently exist, but none are sufficient to meet state needs.

In a 2003 review of other state record systems, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems reported the following:

- Thirty-seven states have established operational student-level databases, which are managed by either a state university system or state higher education coordinating/governing board;
- Twelve states include some information on private colleges and universities in their databases; and
- About one-half of states also link to other state-level databases, including high school records and wage records.

### Implementation Plan

#### 1. Develop a statewide unit record data system for four-year college students

This data system will be similar to the data system used by the state's community and technical colleges and developed in many other states. The Office of Financial Management (OFM) has agreed to collect the data, in consultation with the Council of Presidents (COP) and HECB staff.

- **In December 2004, the HECB** requested \$500,000 for the student-focused data system in the 2005-07 operating budget. The final 2005-07 operating budget did not include any funding for the data system.
- **In March 2005**, staff from the HECB, COP, and OFM completed a drafted Memorandum of Understanding for sharing, protecting, and accessing data.

- **In October 2005**, the HECB requested \$152,000 in the 2006 supplemental operating budget to begin development of the student-focused data system.
- **By December 2005, HECB, COP, and OFM staff** will reach final agreement with the public four-year colleges and universities on a Memorandum of Understanding.
- **By January 2006, HECB staff**, in consultation with OFM staff and the Data Advisory Group, will select a model for collecting and standardizing data.

The Data Advisory Group, required by House Bill 3103, is composed of representatives from public and independent colleges and universities and other state agencies. The staff and advisory group also will identify policy questions and research projects to be completed during the following two years and submit the prioritized list to the HECB for approval. Some of the priorities will address routine information requests by the legislature, while others will focus on long-term projects that, for example, could track student progress over time and analyze how various factors affect their success.

- **By October 2006, the public four-year colleges and universities** will begin submitting outcomes data to OFM.
  - **By December 2006, OFM and HECB staff** will have tested the data and developed prototype reports, ongoing routines, and standards for continuing to collect data on a regular basis.
  - **By February 2007, HECB staff** will begin using the data on a regular basis to answer routine questions and to conduct research and produce reports according to the priorities set in June 2005. HECB staff will develop a report schedule for long-term research projects and a survey to determine whether users find the reports and data useful.
  - **By March 2007, HECB and OFM staff** will revise the prioritized project list, seeking HECB approval as necessary.
- 2. Link data between four-year colleges and other sources to conduct research for use in policy and improving programs.** For example, links would enable the tracking and analysis of data regarding student academic performance and employment.
- **By June 2007, HECB staff and the Data Advisory Group** will identify potential data linkages, develop a list of prioritized policy questions and research projects to be completed during the following two years and revise or develop agreements for sharing, protecting, and accessing linked data.
  - **By September 2007, HECB staff** will submit the list of prioritized projects to the HECB for approval. The Data Advisory Group will assist in developing protocols, standards, and routines for regularly linking data between agencies and schools. HECB staff will begin linking and testing the new data.

- **By December 2007, HECB staff, in consultation with the Data Advisory Group,** will develop a reporting schedule and user survey. The group will review and discuss any draft reports produced by the HECB staff and resolve any data problems.
  - **By March 2008, HECB** will begin regularly producing reports using the linked data. The Data Advisory Group will discuss user feedback, prioritize future projects, and resolve data problems.
-



December 2005

## **2007-09 Final Operating and Capital Budget Priorities and Guidelines**

### **Purpose of the Operating and Capital Budget Guidelines**

The board reviewed draft operating and capital budget guidelines for the 2007-09 biennium in October. Following are the final budget guidelines for board review and adoption.

State statute (RCW 28B.76.210) requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to “review and evaluate” the operating and capital budget requests of the public colleges and universities. This review and evaluation is to be based on how the requests align with the following:

- HECB’s budget priorities;
- The missions of the institutions; and
- The statewide *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*.

The HECB is also to submit recommendations on the proposed budgets and the HECB’s budget priorities to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the legislature.

Prior to this review, evaluation, and development of recommendations, the HECB is to adopt and distribute budget guidelines in December of each odd-numbered year. These guidelines outline the HECB’s fiscal priorities.

The board’s fiscal committee has reviewed the operating and capital budget guidelines presented below and is recommending board approval.

## I. Operating Budget Guidelines

### Integrating the 2007-09 Operating Budget Priorities and Guidelines with the 2004 Strategic Master Plan

#### Operating Budget Fiscal Priorities

The statewide *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* has two essential goals:

- Goal 1: Increase opportunities for students to earn degrees; and
- Goal 2: Respond to the state's economic needs.

#### State Progress in Achieving Targets in the 2004 Strategic Master Plan

Targets				
	2003-04 (Actual)	2004-05 (Actual)	2009-10 (Goals)	Increase Required to Reach Goals
<b>Goal 1</b>				
Associate Degrees	23,976	22,247	27,000	4,753
Bachelor's Degrees	27,240	28,265	30,000	1,735
Graduate Degrees	10,389	10,940	11,500	560
Total Degrees	61,605	61,452	68,500	7,048
<b>Goal 2</b>				
High-Demand			Base + 1,500	1,500
Job Training	23,700	23,394	25,000	1,606
Improved Literacy	17,300	20,572	20,525	Exceed Goal

The HECB has set targets for the number of associate, bachelor's, and graduate degrees to be conferred by Washington's public and private colleges and universities in 2009-10. The HECB reviews these targets annually and adjusts them if necessary.

The HECB also has adopted targets for students earning degrees in high-demand fields, students completing job training programs, and students who demonstrate improved literacy skills. The high-demand target was tied to specific high-demand programs operated by the HECB and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC). Since these programs were not funded in the 2005-07 biennium, the HECB may need to revise these targets in the future. The last two targets on job training and improved literacy were initially adopted by the SBCTC and then accepted by the HECB.

The basic fiscal priorities of the HECB are programs and initiatives that support the board's goals. In the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*, the board identified 11 strategic policy initiatives to support the goals.

## 1. Funding for Student Success

Funding should reward public colleges and universities based on the number of their students who earn degrees, certificates, or other credentials of success rather than only the number who enroll. The current funding methodology does not channel appropriations toward the results identified by the state and HECB. The *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* identified clear and measurable goals that focused on outcomes rather than inputs alone. Previous and current higher education budgets identify enrollments as the only measure for which institutions are truly held accountable.

RCW 28B.76.270 directs the HECB to establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress toward the achievement of long-term performance goals. In addition, the 2005-07 operating budget identified several performance measures for which each institution is to develop specific six-year targets. The HECB has been working with the institutions and OFM to develop accountability plans to achieve measurable and specific improvements on the performance measures.

Institutions should submit these biennial plans with their biennial budget requests. In addition, the HECB recommends that for the 2007-09 biennium these biennial plans and performance targets replace budgeted enrollment levels as the measures for which institutions are held accountable.

## 2. Allocating Student Enrollments

The HECB needs to make specific enrollment allocation recommendations to achieve the goals outlined in the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*. The size and shape of the state's higher education system is of primary concern for decision-makers looking to optimize state resources and direct students to the programs that best suit their needs.

Issues that will influence discussions of the "size and shape" of the system and the board's specific enrollment recommendations include:

- The division of resources among the public two-year and four-year colleges and universities;
- The allocation of new resources and enrollments among the main campuses, branch campuses, and off-site learning centers;
- The role of private colleges and universities in meeting the state's need for additional higher education capacity;
- The regional economic, educational, and programmatic needs; and

- The methods of program delivery, such as traditional instruction, 2+2 programs for transfer students, and technology-enhanced distance learning.

Budget proposals should include projected state-funded enrollment levels at the main and branch campuses as well as off-campus learning centers.

### **3. Increasing the Number of Degrees in High-Demand Fields**

Staff research demonstrates that it is critical for the state to align its limited resources for public higher education with the needs of the economy. Traditional liberal arts education must remain a core component of the state's higher education system because the skills it imparts are central to business and career success. However, the state also must respond to student and employer demands in fields where current or projected job creation outpaces the capacity of the higher education system to produce trained graduates.

High-demand programs have two primary elements: (1) instructional programs or fields in which student enrollment applications exceed available slots and (2) career fields in which employers are unable to find enough skilled graduates to fill available jobs. This definition recognizes both excess student demand for a program and strong economic requirements for graduates in particular fields.

The *State and Regional Needs Assessment*, completed by the HECB in fall 2005, identified areas where demand for graduates exceeded the supply of students with degrees. Areas identified include: (a) engineering, software engineering, and architecture; (b) computer science; (c) medical professions; (d) editing, writing, and performing occupations; and (e) research, scientific, and technical occupations. These areas are very broad occupational groupings covering a range of training needs. This analysis also does not include the student demand to get into these programs.

Institutions can help policymakers in the budget development process by identifying specific programs with excess student demand and demonstrated employer demand.

### **4. Keeping College Tuition Affordable and Predictable**

Washington, like many states, does not have a comprehensive tuition policy for resident undergraduate education. As a result, tuition increases generally fluctuate in a cyclical pattern — increasing moderately when state revenue is high and increasing sharply when state revenue is low. The absence of a tuition policy has made it difficult for students and parents to anticipate college costs and for Washington's Guaranteed Education Tuition program, the state's prepaid college tuition plan, to plan for long-term affordability. It also has potentially devastating consequences for thousands of financially needy families who often do not have the financial reserves to respond to unexpected spikes in tuition.

The HECB believes that Washington needs a state tuition policy that keeps tuition predictable and affordable for students and families while maintaining the high quality of education at the state's public colleges and universities. The *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* called for the state to adopt the following tuition policies for resident undergraduate tuition and fees at Washington's public two-year and four-year colleges and universities.

### ***Short-Term Tuition Policy***

- Tuition and fees would not increase by more than 31 percent during any consecutive four-year period (average increases of seven percent compounded).
- Annual tuition increases would be spread as evenly as possible over this four-year period and no annual increase should exceed ten percent.

### ***Long-Term Tuition Policy***

Over the long-term, the state has maintained a strong linkage between state funding of higher education, tuition rates, and student financial aid. Any long-term policy will need to recognize these connections as well as the institutions' needs for resources to provide a quality education, the share of that education that is expected to be paid by students and their parents, and the state's desire to see that higher education is attainable and affordable for all.

## **5. Promoting Opportunity through Student Financial Assistance**

State law declares that "financial need shall not be a barrier to participation in higher education" (RCW 28B.10.786). The HECB believes the state must maintain its longstanding commitment to higher education opportunity for all students, regardless of income.

To help economically disadvantaged students meet the rising costs of a college education, the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* called on the state to expand state financial aid and scholarship programs to help financially needy students go to college and complete their degrees or programs.

The programs that the HECB cited in the strategic master plan include:

- The State Need Grant program for the state's lowest-income students
- The State Work Study program for helping low- and middle-income students
- The Education Opportunity Grant (EOG) program
- The Washington Scholars program
- The Washington Award for Vocational Excellence program
- The development of a financial aid program to support adults who work full-time and go to college part-time

A key objective for all programs is to maintain the linkage between tuition increases and program funding to ensure that the value of individual awards keeps pace with increasing student costs.

## **6. Meeting Regional Higher Education Needs**

Washington's current higher education system has evolved largely in response to changing student demographics, employer demand, community needs, and geographic disparities in students' college attendance. It has not always been planned or implemented in a conscientious or prioritized manner.

Changes are occurring in the system. House Bill 1794, enacted in 2005, authorized three of the branch campuses (UW Tacoma, UW Bothell, and WSU Vancouver) to admit freshmen and sophomores. The legislation also authorized up to four community or technical colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees on a pilot basis. In addition, a review is underway of the educational needs in the Snohomish, Island, and Skagit Counties and how to best meet those needs.

To improve the responsiveness and effectiveness of the current system, the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* called for the development of a resource allocation framework to respond to local, regional, and state needs with clearly stated priorities. Specifically, this framework would do the following:

- Clearly identify the existing distribution of higher education resources;
- Explain the purpose and inter-relationship of these resources;
- Establish the criteria and authorities by which these resources could change in response to emerging and changing student and regional needs; and
- Use existing and new resources in a coordinated and flexible manner.

Effectively responding to regional higher education needs requires objective data analysis and study.

## **7. Helping Transfer Students Earn Bachelor's Degrees**

The state needs a barrier-free transfer system to help community college transfer students earn bachelor's degrees at four-year colleges and universities as efficiently as possible.

The 2004 Legislature directed the HECB to assume a leadership role in working with Washington's colleges and universities to ensure efficient and seamless transfer across the state. Developing a statewide on-line student advising system was a key assignment, along with developing transfer associate degrees for specific academic majors. The on-line student advising system would provide students with course equivalencies between institutions, recommended transfer programs, and electronic transcripts. Both efforts focus on better preparing students

before they enter four-year colleges and making the transfer process seamless and automatic, rather than simply smoother.

## **8. Helping Students Make the Transition to College**

Every year, large numbers of Washington students graduate from high school unprepared for college study or the workplace. Inadequate preparation in high schools takes a disproportionately greater toll on African American, Hispanic, and Native American students. Students from these groups are significantly less likely than their White or Asian peers to enroll in college within a year of graduation and more likely to require remedial instruction when they enroll. Higher education shoulders much of the cost of this lack of preparation.

Leadership at the state level is essential to develop a systemic solution to the problem of inadequate academic preparation for baccalaureate degree completion. The HECB proposes to collaborate with state K-12 and higher education systems to accomplish the following key initiatives:

- Define college readiness in the key subject areas of mathematics, science, English, social studies, world languages, and the arts;
- Establish statewide student learning outcomes for grades 11 and 12 that are required for success in postsecondary study;
- Expand effective models that promote K-12/higher education collaboration and prepare students for college success; and
- Communicate with students, families, and schools the requirements of a rigorous high school education that will lead to successful postsecondary study and careers.

These initiatives will help students prepare for higher education with a clear understanding of the knowledge and abilities required for success and the confidence that their high school coursework will be enough to gain them admission and prepare them for the rigors of college work.

The HECB, along with a team of state policymakers, K-12 and higher education administrators and faculty, and private sector representatives, are developing college readiness definitions for English and science during the 2005-07 biennium. Definitions of college readiness for mathematics are being developed through the Transition Math Project and should be available for public review in spring 2006. The HECB may request funding in the 2007-09 biennium to develop college readiness standards for social studies, world languages, and the arts.

## **9. Reducing Barriers for Non-Traditional Students**

Washington's higher education system works well for traditional students — the recent high school graduates who go from high school to college and continuously enroll until they receive their degrees. It works less well for “non-traditional” students, although the community and

technical colleges in particular have made significant advancements in programs and services during the past decade. “Non-traditional” students include, but are not limited to, unemployed adults, students whose first language is not English, and those who need to balance college, work, and family obligations.

It is imperative for the higher education system to recognize and respond to the educational and training needs of non-traditional students. By increasing the skills and knowledge of these students through education and training, we will be increasing their opportunities to better serve themselves and the state’s economic needs and development.

### **10. Promoting Student Success through Greater Accountability**

Accountability can promote greater student success by providing motivation for institutions to focus on a limited number of priority state goals. A fully functioning accountability system provides legislators, business leaders, campus officials, students, and the public with accurate and relevant information concerning how well and how quickly the system as a whole is progressing toward achievement of state goals. The information provided through an accountability system should support and guide the policy development process as well as inform budget development.

Redesigning the state’s higher education accountability system will help the state reach its goals and promote student success at the institution, sector, and state levels. The HECB and Office of Financial Management (OFM) are working with the institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges to develop and define common and institution-specific performance measures and target performance levels for each of the measures. The short-term performance targets associated with these measures should be incorporated into budget proposals for the 2007-09 biennium.

Long-term targets on these performance measures also should be developed as a next step in this process. In addition, the HECB remains committed to developing proposals, as called for in the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*, for transforming the state’s higher education funding system from an enrollment-based allocation system to a model better aligned with state goals for awarding degrees and certificates and responding to the state’s economy. This effort to re-structure the financing system is a powerful aspect of a fully developed accountability system.

Another vital component of a sound accountability system is an infrastructure of data and other information sufficiently robust and aligned with state goals to enable officials and the public to monitor step-by-step progress of the system toward achievement of the goals. This topic is addressed in the next strategic policy initiative.

### **11. Measuring Student Success with an Improved Data System**

The *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* called for a student unit record data system to evaluate progress toward state goals and to identify and eliminate barriers to student

success. A priority is to continue developing a statewide student-level database that would include data about all students at every stage of college — from submitting the college application and deciding where to enroll to choosing a major and earning a degree. Policies related to the availability, quality, efficiency, and accountability of public higher education in the state should be based on objective data analysis. The HECB is working with the Council of Presidents, the public four-year institutions, and OFM to finalize a *Memorandum of Understanding* for sharing, protecting, and accessing data.

### **Operating Budget Guidelines**

The operating budget guidelines complement the long-term goals and strategies identified in the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*, as adopted by the HECB in July 2004. The guidelines are designed to guide the institutions in developing budget items in the 2007-09 biennium that support the strategies outlined in the master plan and help the state make measurable progress toward its goals. These budget items are to be tied to performance indicators in order to measure their outcomes.

### **Forms and Formats**

The HECB will continue to use the basic forms and formats for budget requests, as prescribed by OFM. Regardless of the budget presentation format selected by OFM, the HECB continues to recognize the critical importance of adequately funded carry-forward or maintenance budgets for institutions. It is clear that adequate maintenance budgets are essential to the ongoing vitality and quality of Washington's public colleges and universities.

By using the budget presentations defined by OFM, the HECB avoids any duplication of effort by the public institutions. In the past, this approach has allowed the HECB to focus on those items and issues that are most relevant to the board's fiscal priorities.

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

### **Timing of Budget Development Activities**

The HECB's review of institutional budget requests is based on submissions formally presented by the institutions in September of each even-numbered year. HECB staff then will meet and discuss these budget requests with institutions. The requests will be presented and discussed at a board meeting. Based on these discussions, the HECB will develop and adopt its final operating budget recommendations.

## II. 2007-09 Capital Budget Guidelines

### Background

This document presents the Higher Education Coordinating Board's priorities for higher education capital projects in the 2007-09 biennium and provides a framework for evaluating and prioritizing capital project requests. Both the statement of capital priorities and the framework for prioritizing projects are directed by statute.

In 2003, the legislature and governor enacted Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2151 (HB 2151), an act pertaining to the prioritization of higher education capital project requests. This bill recognized that clear capital project expenditure priorities would be needed to support significant future investments in higher education facilities. In approving HB 2151, the legislature stated that:

*"... a capital investment in higher education facilities is needed over the next several biennia to adequately preserve, modernize, and expand the capacity of the state's public two-year and four-year colleges and universities. This investment is needed to responsibly preserve and restore existing facilities and to provide additional space for new students. Further, the legislature finds that capital appropriations will need to respond to each of these areas of need in a planned, balanced, and prioritized manner so that access to a quality system of higher education is ensured.*

*It is the intent of the legislature that a methodology be developed that will guide capital appropriation decisions by rating and individually ranking, in sequential, priority order, all major capital projects proposed by the two-year and four-year public universities and colleges. Further, it is the intent of the legislature that this rating, ranking, and prioritization of capital needs will reflect the state's higher education policies and goals, including the comprehensive master plan for higher education as submitted by the Higher Education Coordinating Board and as adopted by the legislature."*<sup>1</sup>

Specifically, HB 2151:

- Requires the public four-year institutions, in consultation with the HECB and the Council of Presidents (COP), to prepare a single prioritized individual ranking of institutional capital projects.
- Requires the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges to continue to submit a single prioritized ranking of proposed community and technical college capital projects.

---

<sup>1</sup> Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2151.

- Directs the HECB, in consultation with the Office of Financial Management and the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC), to develop common definitions for the public four-year institutions and SBCTC to use in developing the prioritized project ranking.
- Directs the HECB to include these definitions, as well as the criteria framework, categories, and rating system to be used in developing the ranking, in its biennial budget guidelines.

The board's 2005-07 guidelines include the common definitions and a criterion framework for prioritizing four-year projects, as required in HB 2151. In adopting the capital guidelines, the board recognized that the criterion framework was preliminary and would continue to be refined and enhanced over the next several biennia.

In responding to the directives of HB 2151 and the board's 2005-07 capital budget guidelines, the four-year institutions, working through COP, developed and submitted to the HECB, the governor, and legislature a single prioritized list of proposed capital projects. As part of its 2005-07 capital budget recommendation, the HECB adopted this list, as well as the prioritized list submitted by the community and technical colleges.

During the 2005 legislative session, legislators and staff involved in the development of the capital budget provided guidance on how to enhance the development of the four-year project list. This guidance was articulated in Section 908 of the 2005-07 capital appropriations act (SB 6094). Specifically, Section 908 specified, in part, that:

- The board shall, in consultation with the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the legislature, identify statewide priorities for higher education capital investments and incorporate those priorities into its biennial budget guidelines.
- The evaluation of projects should place a greater emphasis on early critical review of project proposals at the pre-design phase.
- When projects are aggregated into single line-item requests, each project must meet the definition of minor works according to the capital budget instructions issued by OFM. All major projects must be listed and ranked as individual line-item requests.
- The scoring and ranking of projects shall not be based on assigning an equal number of overall points to each public four-year institution, but shall reflect an assignment of points to individual projects based on the priorities and criteria in this section and in the board's biennial budget guidelines.
- Projects shall not be ranked on the basis of a project funding source.
- The board's biennial budget guidelines shall include a quantitative method for scoring projects on the identified priorities.

## HECB Statewide Priorities for Higher Education Capital Investments

Within the above policy context, the board's guidelines for the 2007-09 higher education capital budget reflect the overall goal of providing students with access to a high-quality education system that has adequate, fully functional space for students, faculty, and staff to pursue teaching, learning, research, and related activities.

Following from this broad goal and the provisions of Section 908, the board's statewide capital priorities for 2007-09 include those projects that implement a legislatively authorized program or capital priority, including, but not limited to:

- Reducing the backlog of deferred building, infrastructure, or system preservation, renewal, or replacement needs.
- Providing additional capacity or adaptation of space for instructional or research programs needed to help meet regional or statewide economic needs or opportunities.
- Creating additional instructional program capacity needed for underserved geographic regions or populations and institutions with existing space shortages.
- Funding projects that support institutional strategic planning priorities and areas of emphasis.

These priorities are closely aligned with the priorities identified by the House Capital Budget Committee's 2002 Interim Work Group on Higher Education Capital Budget and Facilities.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the work group identified the following priorities:

1. Reduce the preservation backlog;
2. Provide new space to increase access at the community and technical colleges;
3. Fund renovations and replacements that are critical to preserving access to current instruction space or to the mission of the institution; and
4. Address unique access and mission issues as high priorities for capital appropriations.

In addition to these expenditure priorities, the board will require thorough documentation of all pre-design project requests in developing its 2007-09 capital budget recommendations. This documentation must establish the programmatic need for initiating a new major capital project.

---

<sup>2</sup> The work group was chaired by Representative McIntire and included Representatives Esser, Kenney, and Cox. Additionally, members of the Senate Capital Budget Subcommittee and Senate Higher Education Committee participated on an ad-hoc basis. Work group participants included representatives of the HECB, the Office of Financial Management, the Council of Presidents, the public four- and two-year institutions, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and staff of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee.

## **Project Classifications: Common Definitions**

State policymakers have made it clear that they want to better understand higher education's capital project needs. The lack of commonly defined categories of project types has made it difficult for lawmakers and their staffs to understand the different needs of the various sectors and institutions. Consequently, HB 2151 directed the HECB to work with the institutions, COP, SBCTC, JLARC, and OFM to develop common definitions for the 2005-07 capital budget submittal.

Attachment A provides an association of the existing OFM project classifications of *Preservation* and *Program* with project types and their corresponding descriptions. The board recommends that the four-year institutions and SBCTC use these OFM categories in their respective project requests.

## **Criterion Framework for Ranking Projects**

The board recognizes that the community and technical colleges have an existing system and methodology to evaluate, prioritize, and rank capital projects. State policymakers are familiar with this system, which has been developed over many years. Accordingly, the board believes that the SBCTC should continue to use its existing process for prioritizing and ranking projects.

The framework for deriving the integrated prioritized list of capital projects for the four-year institutions recognizes that many considerations affect the relative priority of a capital project. These considerations include a facility's physical condition or estimates of space need as well as an institution's role and mission, its long-term strategic plan, and its areas of current program emphasis and priority. Consequently, the proposed ranking methodology, while quantitative, is designed to provide the institutions with the opportunity to exercise discretion and judgment in the ranking of projects.

## **Minor Works Requests**

Minor works requests include multiple projects, each costing less than \$1 million. The categories to be used to aggregate such projects are presented in Attachment A. The four-year institutions should use these categories in both the ranked/integrated list of capital projects and each institution's separate capital budget submittal.

The board believes that minor works requests addressing emergency/critical repairs and life/safety and code compliance should be prioritized higher than all major projects. All other minor works requests should be prioritized within the overall ranking of all projects, as directed by HB 2151. The board encourages the institutions to use an approach similar to that used by the SBCTC, which differentiates between the most urgent minor works needs (Category A) and less urgent minor works needs (Category B). Both the Category A and B minor works requests are

ranked in the overall project list at levels deemed appropriate relative to the nature and priority of other major projects.

### **Aggregated Intermediate Size Projects**

Projects costing more than \$1 million, but less than \$5 million, can be aggregated into separate ranked project categories (within the prioritized list), provided that these projects and their respective categories (a) share a common purpose or characteristic, (b) have the same institutional priority, and (c) are individually identified on worksheets accompanying the prioritized list. Accordingly, institutions should use the categories shown in Attachment A to aggregate these projects.

### **Major Projects**

The HECB is proposing a criterion framework that incorporates multiple factors to arrive at project rankings for major projects (more than \$5 million). Underlying this framework is the recognition that one type of project is not always more or less important than another type of project, either to a particular institution or to the system as a whole. Rather, each institution needs to address multiple types of needs in a balanced manner.

The criterion framework in Attachment B includes the ranking factors discussed on the following page. Ranking scores are provided for each factor. These scores represent the number of “points” that a project can receive on each factor.

The criterion framework for the evaluation and ranking of the projects includes the following factors:

- **Relationship of Project to State Priorities**  
The extent to which the project has a clear and direct relationship to the HECB priorities for capital investment as described above.
- **Institutional Priority**  
The relative importance of the project within an institution’s overall capital budget request. To score this factor, the first five (or fewer where appropriate) project priorities of each institution will be assigned scores from five to one.
- **Program Functionality and Quality**  
This criterion allows institutions to rank projects based on program/quality-driven considerations. The institutions will develop a common method to score projects within the four categories of quality shown in Attachment B.

- **Physical Condition of Building System or Infrastructure**

This criterion assesses the physical condition of a building or campus infrastructure. It is scored only for projects whose scope includes the renovation of existing facilities or infrastructure. For buildings, the JLARC Facility Condition Index should be used as an initial base score. The base score may be adjusted if institutional-level condition assessment data indicates that a building's condition warrants the adjustment.

- **Space Shortage**

This criterion assesses the extent to which an existing space shortage exists for space types contained in projects that will add capacity. It is scored only for projects whose scope includes the creation of additional capacity. The determination of space shortage should be based on the space and utilization standards contained in the Facility Evaluation and Planning Guide (FEPG) or other national standards. The determination of classroom and class lab space needs should use the HECB's average weekly station utilization standards of 22 and 16 hours, respectively.

- **Ranking Consensus Points**

This criterion will be used by representatives of the four-year institutions, COP, and HECB to achieve a consensus on the ranking of projects. The legislative mandate for each institutional governing board to agree upon a single prioritized list requires a process allowing for negotiation and the exercise of professional judgment by those responsible for the capital assets of their respective institutions.

**Attachment A**

**Project Classifications**

<b>Preservation:</b> <i>Projects that maintain and preserve existing state facilities and assets and do not significantly change the program use of a facility.</i>		
<b>Line-item Request Type</b>	<b>Project Types</b>	<b>Description</b>
Minor Works (projects costing less than \$1 million)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Health, Safety, and Code Requirements</li> <li>2. Facility Preservation</li> <li>3. Infrastructure Preservation</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unanticipated needs or critical repairs needed for occupant/building risk reduction or compliance with codes.</li> <li>2. Minor repair and system replacement projects needed to sustain/return a building or system to current accepted performance.</li> </ol>
Aggregated Intermediate Size Projects (projects costing more than \$1 million and less than \$5 million)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Health, Safety, and Code Requirements</li> <li>2. Facility Preservation</li> <li>3. Infrastructure Preservation</li> </ol>	Repair and system replacement projects needed to sustain/return a building or system to current accepted performance or renovation of existing facilities and campus infrastructure needed to correct functional deficiencies of building systems or infrastructure.
Major Line-item Requests (projects costing \$5 million or more).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remodel/Renovate</li> <li>2. Infrastructure</li> </ol>	Renovation of existing facilities and campus infrastructure needed to correct functional deficiencies of building systems or infrastructure.

**Attachment A**

**Project Classifications**  
(continued)

<b>Program:</b> <i>Projects that achieve a program goal, such as changing or improving an existing space to meet new program requirements or creating a new facility or asset.</i>		
<b>Line-Item Request Type</b>	<b>Project Types</b>	<b>Description</b>
Minor Works (projects costing less than \$1 million)	1. Program	Minor repairs, system replacements, and improvements needed for program delivery requirements.
Aggregated Intermediate Size Projects (projects costing more than \$1 million and less than \$5 million)	1. Program	Repairs, system replacements, and improvements needed for program delivery requirements.
Major Line-Item Requests (projects costing \$5 million or more)	1. Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renovate/Modernize</li> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• New Facilities/Additions</li> <li>• Land Acquisition</li> <li>• Acquisition Facilities</li> </ul>	1. Replacement of deteriorated or dysfunctional facilities or infrastructure needed to enhance program delivery. 2. Construction or acquisition of new facilities or property needed to accommodate program demand or improve program delivery.

**Attachment B****Four-Year Institution Criterion Framework: Major Projects**

<b>Prioritization Criterion</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>State Priorities</b>	
Reduce the backlog of deferred building or system preservation, infrastructure, renewal, or replacement	<b>10</b>
Provide additional capacity or adaptation of space for instructional or research programs needed to help meet regional or statewide economic needs or opportunities	<b>10</b>
Provide additional instructional program capacity needed for under-served geographic regions or populations and institutions with existing space shortages	<b>10</b>
<b>Institutional Priority</b>	<b>5 - 1</b>
<b>Program Quality</b>	
Nonfunctional or nonexistent	<b>5</b>
Operational but seriously deficient	<b>4</b>
Operational but marginally deficient/inconvenient	<b>3</b>
Operational and adequate	<b>0</b>
<b>Physical Condition of Building System (per FCI) or Infrastructure</b>	
Marginal functionality (FCI=5)	<b>5</b>
Limited functionality (FCI=4)	<b>4</b>
Fair (FCI=3)	<b>3</b>
Adequate (FCI=2)	<b>2</b>
Superior (FCI=1)	<b>0</b>
<b>Space or System Capacity Shortage</b>	
Deficiency for existing student enrollment, faculty, staff activity level	<b>5</b>
Deficiency for near-term (1-6 years) growth in student enrollment, faculty, staff activity level	<b>4</b>
Deficiency for long-term (6-10 years) growth in student enrollment, faculty, staff activity level	<b>3</b>
<b>Ranking Consensus Points</b>	<b>1 - 7</b>

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-22**

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is required by statute (RCW 28B.76.210) to review, evaluate, and make recommendations on the operating and capital budget requests of the public four-year colleges and universities and the community and technical college system; and

WHEREAS, These recommendations are to be based upon the role and mission statements of the institution and the state's higher education goals, objectives, and priorities as expressed in the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*; and

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

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board reviewed the draft operating and capital budget guidelines for the 2007-09 biennium at its meeting on October 27, 2005, and these draft guidelines have been distributed for review and comment by the institutions; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board staff has discussed the draft guidelines with the board's fiscal committee;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the 2007-09 operating budget guidelines and the 2007-09 capital budget guidelines.

Adopted:

December 15, 2005

Attest:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jesus Hernandez, Secretary

December 2005

## **Bachelor of Applied Science in Food Service Management Central Washington University**

### **Introduction**

Central Washington University (CWU) is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board approval to offer a Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) degree in food service management at its main campus in Ellensburg and the centers in Des Moines, Lynnwood, and Pierce County. The program is designed to serve students who hold associate degrees in culinary arts from a community college but lack the general education coursework required for a bachelor of science degree.

### **Relationship to Institutional Role and Mission and the Strategic Master Plan**

Students enrolled in the BAS in Food Service Management would satisfy the general education requirements of the university. These requirements are intended to provide students with a foundation that will help them achieve goals integral to the mission of CWU, which include development of the tools necessary to become responsible citizens prepared to lead an enlightened and productive life.

The programmatic goals are consistent with the 2004 Strategic Master Plan of Higher Education goals of providing opportunities for students to earn degrees and responding to the state's economic needs. The program is designed to provide a pathway to a baccalaureate degree for students with a culinary arts background that generally would not transfer for academic credit toward typical bachelor's degree programs. The proposed degree program would provide students with important communication, management, and teamwork skills that would be an asset to the students and employers.

### **Program Need**

Several colleges and universities around the country are offering or developing BAS degrees. These degrees typically allow students to transfer credits from an applied associate degree and enroll in an additional two years of full-time study (or equivalent) with an emphasis on broad upper-division general education coursework, as well as additional coursework in the chosen professional field.

Applied science programs are intended to meet the educational and economic needs of the community by providing outreach and training that result in the practical application of scientific knowledge. With these programs, universities train professionals who are able to apply and use what is known from the wealth of scientific research, as well as develop the critical thinking and analytical skills that are required of today's knowledgeable workers.

Workers with diverse education and training backgrounds enter supervisory and management positions in the food service industry. Most of these positions are classified in the HECB needs assessment as requiring mid-level preparation, meaning they require more than a year of postsecondary training but less than a baccalaureate degree. However, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Outlook Handbook, employers in the food service industry express a preference for workers with a baccalaureate degree. This is especially true of larger employers, such as restaurant chains, food service contractors, and institutional providers (schools, prisons, hospitals) where additional training would provide greater opportunity for promotion from within. An important element of the BAS proposal is that it would provide greater opportunity for workers already in the food service industry to advance up the career ladder to higher-level positions with greater responsibility.

In Washington, roughly 28 percent of food service managers and food service worker supervisors hold a bachelor's degree or higher. With 249 projected annual openings between 2007 and 2012, the HECB estimates that based on current employment patterns, at least 70 positions per year would require a bachelor's degree. Changes in the food service industry, including trends toward greater reliance on contractors, new technology, and greater emphasis on efficiency, quality, and safety; may result in an even greater demand for workers with higher levels of preparation, including bachelor's degrees. Existing food service management and hospitality management programs at the baccalaureate level, graduate 30-40 students per year. This program would roughly double that number, adding 30-40 new graduates each year.

Student demand is expected to be sufficient to justify development of the food service management program. Based on classroom polling and State Board for Community and Technical College estimates, roughly 30 percent of culinary arts graduates would be expected to have an interest in the BAS degree, which would translate to demand of up to 100 students per year.

While the majority of jobs in food service management are in the population centers of Western Washington, there are currently no food service management programs offered in Western Washington.

### **Program Description**

By offering a BAS in Food Service Management, CWU would join a growing number of institutions nationwide that are responding to changing workplace demands and the desire of technically trained workers to enhance their skills and take on positions of greater authority. The program would enroll 30 students in the first year (20 FTE) and grow to 60 students (40 FTE) at full enrollment in year two. Students would be admitted to the program after completing an Associate in Culinary Arts or other appropriate associate-level program, satisfying the CWU basic skills requirements, and completing at least one year of full-time work (or 2,000 hours).

Once admitted to the program, students would be required to complete a total of 90 quarter credits, to include 55-56 quarter credits within the major. As part of the program curriculum students would also complete requirements for a minor in business administration with completion of an additional 30 credits in business and related coursework. At least 60 credits must be completed at the upper-division level. Students would typically complete their course of study over three years.

The general education requirements for students in the BAS program would be the same as those required of students in other baccalaureate degree programs at CWU. As with all BAS programs to be developed at CWU, students would receive a waiver of the foreign language requirement (this waiver is available in certain other programs at CWU). This is in recognition of the fact that the program expects to attract a number of older, returning students for whom the addition of foreign language coursework would add a significant amount of time to the degree program. In addition, many key competencies expected from foreign language study, such as an understanding of other cultures and traditions, would be met through other general education requirements.

The proposed curriculum was developed from existing coursework; primarily the Bachelor of Science in Food Science and Nutrition with specialization in Food Service Management. The proposed program has defined goals and objectives. Assessment of program objectives is linked to specific coursework, with each objective assessed in multiple courses. Specific learning outcomes are identified for each of the courses included in the core curriculum.

The program would be assessed through a campus-wide review process on a five-year cycle. The administration and faculty would monitor three key indicators of program quality; including student course evaluations, focus groups with exiting seniors, and surveys of graduates and their employers about the quality of preparation for work in the field. In addition, the CWU nutrition program currently has in place an advisory committee that would evaluate components of the BAS in Food Service Management.

The program faculty would consist of two full professors, two assistant/associate professors (one to be hired) and one non-tenure track instructor. The newly-hired faculty would act as director, with duties evenly split between instruction and administration.

### **Diversity**

The BAS in Food Service Management is designed to meet the needs of traditional on-campus students, as well as place-bound, time-bound students, through instruction delivered at centers in the Puget Sound area. The program would draw students who have completed culinary arts programs at the community colleges. These programs traditionally serve large numbers of students from ethnically diverse groups.

The program would work with CWU admissions staff on university-wide diversity efforts. In addition, the program has identified various strategies to advise and support diverse students; for example, student representatives from Black Student Union, Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de

Aztlan (MECHA), and American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES) would assist in contacting prospective and enrolled students of color. In addition, admission staff regularly attend a number of events to attract diverse students.

## **External Review**

The program was reviewed by three external experts.

A professor in the Department of Nutrition and Hospitality Management at East Carolina University provided a letter indicating support for the program. The letter cites a student assessment plan that is clearly linked to the coursework and industry needs. In addition, the reviewer cites the program assessment strategies that are outlined in the proposal. Finally, the letter indicates that the program responds to a need within the industry, as well as student interest.

A professor in the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition at Clemson University reviewed the proposal and provided a supportive letter indicating that the program would meet a need to provide a career ladder for workers in the culinary arts. She also suggested the addition of a marketing elective, which the program is considering.

The Nutrition Services supervisor for the Seattle Public Schools also reviewed the proposal. The review indicates a desire for graduates that have developed the program's mix of management skills and culinary expertise, and indicates that this mix is rarely present in the graduates of existing programs. The review indicates a desire for a stronger nutrition component, but generally applauds the proposed program for addressing a needed niche.

In addition, the program received letters of support from CWU faculty and several community colleges, as well as a statewide employer.

The HECB also received a letter of support from Eastern Washington University.

## **Program Costs**

The program would draw largely on existing resources in the delivery of curriculum. However, additional faculty and staff support would be required to offer the BAS in Food Service Management. The program would add a program director with teaching and administrative responsibilities. The program also would draw on existing faculty. In total, the department would dedicate 1.4 FTE faculty in Year One, and grow to 2 FTE faculty by Year Five. Administrative, clerical, and other functions would require .63 FTE in Year One and 1.22 FTE by Year Five. The program's first-year estimated costs are \$9,060 per FTE, decreasing to \$7,990 per FTE at full enrollment in Year Five. (The program would fall within the Agriculture and Natural Resources category in the Higher Education Cost Study. On average, this category of programs cost more than the institutional average.) While the estimated program costs are above average in Year One, the cost per FTE would fall below the \$8,166 average cost of instruction for undergraduate students at Central Washington University by Year Five.

## **Staff Analysis**

The proposed program would support the unique role and mission of CWU by providing students with a liberal arts foundation through general education courses, while providing the technical skills required to be successful in the field. The goals of the state's strategic master plan also would be supported through a degree program that would be responsive to employer needs and allow baccalaureate degree access for students with technical education training.

The student and program assessment techniques are appropriate for the program, and would include input from current and former students, faculty, and employers that would provide institutional leadership and faculty with the information they need to develop a high-quality program. The required curriculum is well defined and would allow students to complete their studies in a reasonable amount of time.

While employer needs are not immediately apparent, employment projections and HECB analysis do show some need for workers in this field that are trained at the baccalaureate level. In addition, employer letters of support and information provided in the Occupational Outlook Handbook demonstrate a preference for better-trained workers and indicate that workers with a baccalaureate degree may have greater opportunity within the industry. The local community colleges attest to a strong interest in the program among students and their communities.

The program would be offered at a reasonable cost and would add to the state's capacity to prepare workers for management and supervisory positions in the food service industry. The program is unique in that it is designed to cater to students who hold an associate degree in the culinary arts and would not duplicate existing programs.

With availability at CWU's university centers, as well as the main campus in Ellensburg, the program would appeal to a diverse population of students. Program developers also have committed to working with CWU admissions staff and a number of campus-based and outside groups on strategies to attract a diverse student body.

## **Recommendation**

Based on careful review of the program proposal and supplemental sources, HECB staff recommend approval of the Bachelor of Applied Science in Food Service Management at the Central Washington University Ellensburg campus and Des Moines, Lynnwood, and Pierce County university centers.

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-25**

WHEREAS, Central Washington University proposes to offer a Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) in Food Service Management at the main campus in Ellensburg and centers in Des Moines, Lynnwood, and Pierce County; and

WHEREAS, The program would provide students a foundation in the liberal arts and training in management specific to the food service industry; providing a pathway for workers trained in the culinary arts to advance to higher positions within their industry; and

WHEREAS, The program would serve an emerging need for better prepared workers in the food service industry; and

WHEREAS, The recruitment and diversity plan are appropriate to the program; and

WHEREAS, The program has undergone an extensive development and review process that included input from the community and technical colleges, employers, and external content experts; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) in Food Service Management at Central Washington University.

Adopted:

December 15, 2005

Attest:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jesus Hernandez, Secretary

December 2005

## **Status Report on Previously Approved Degrees**

### **HECB Information Item**

This is an informational report to the members of the Higher Education Coordinating Board at its December 15 meeting. No board action is necessary at this time.

### **Background**

The Higher Education Coordinating Board's *Program and Facility Approval Policies and Procedures* authorize the executive director to approve proposals by public four-year institutions to extend existing degree programs to off-campus locations, via distance learning or a combination of delivery methods.

The process requires an institution to notify the HECB at least 45 days prior to the proposed start date of the program. This "Notification of Intent" (NOI) must include the following information:

- Institution Name
- Degree title
- CIP number (Classification of Instructional Programs)
- Delivery mechanism(s)
- Location
- Proposed program start date
- Statement of need for the program
- Source(s) of funding
- Enrollment targets

HECB staff post the information on the HECB Web site within five business days after receiving the proposal and notify the provosts of the other public four-year institutions, the Independent Colleges of Washington, the Council of Presidents, and the four-year universities' Committee on Academic Program Planning. Interested parties have 30 days to review and comment, and if there are no objections, the HECB executive director will approve the proposal.

## Status Report

From September 2005 through November 2005, the HECB executive director approved the expansion of two degree programs. Eastern Washington University received approval to offer a Masters in Social Work to students at WSU Vancouver, effective October 31, 2005. Central Washington University received approval to expand its Bachelor of Science in Flight Technology-Aviation Management Specialization to students at their Moses Lake teaching site, effective November 15, 2005. Both programs are described below.

### **Masters in Social Work at WSU Vancouver - Effective October 31, 2005**

Eastern Washington University received approval to offer a Masters in Social Work to a second cohort of students at Washington State University Vancouver (the first group of students was admitted in 2003). The social work program at EWU is accredited by the national Council on Social Work Education. The council last reviewed the program in 2001.

Beginning in summer 2006, the program will accommodate a cohort of 60 students (48 FTE), who will complete their studies in spring 2009. Students enrolled in the program will have electronic access to the EWU library, as well as full access to the WSU library.

The EWU social work program provides education to underserved populations in rural, regional, and small urban communities. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that the need for human service workers will grow by 136 percent by 2015. The 2005 State and Regional Needs Assessment conducted by the HECB also finds a need to increase the number of human services degrees.

In accordance with HECB policies and procedures, the program proposal was circulated among the public baccalaureate institutions for comment. No institutions raised concerns about the proposed expansion of the program.

### **Bachelor of Science in Flight Technology – Aviation Management Specialization at Moses Lake – Effective November 15, 2005**

Central Washington University received approval to offer a Bachelor of Science in Flight Technology – Aviation Management Specialization at their Moses Lake teaching site. The baccalaureate flight technology program will articulate with the associate degree program in flight technology offered by Big Bend Community College. Offering the program at Moses Lake allows CWU to expand its program (which is capped at 150 at the Ellensburg Campus) and will provide opportunities for Big Bend Community College graduates to continue their studies.

Central Washington University is the only public four-year institution in the Northwest to offer a BS in Flight Technology. Beginning in fall 2006, the Moses Lake program will accommodate 10 FTE students in Year One; increasing to 20 FTE students at full enrollment in Year Two.

Growth in demand for commercial airline pilots in Washington is about average. However, the Federal Aviation Administration expects an increased demand for qualified pilots nationwide -- due in part to the agency's mandatory retirement age for pilots. In addition, broader career options for pilots outside of the commercial airlines may create even greater demand.

Student demand for flight technology coursework is high. Currently, more than 100 students annually earn an associate degree in the field at Big Bend Community College.

In accordance with HECB policies and procedures, the program proposal was circulated among the public baccalaureate institutions for comment. No institutions raised concerns about the proposed expansion of the flight technology program.



December 2005

## **The Scholarship Coalition: A Proposal to Establish a Statewide Scholarship Clearinghouse**

Board staff and representatives of organizations committed to helping students attend college have been meeting informally to discuss ways to promote college scholarships for students. Members of this group, known as the “Scholarship Coalition,” are concerned about the barriers that private donors face in setting up scholarships and the difficulties that students face in learning about and applying for scholarships.

The Scholarship Coalition is proposing the development of a statewide scholarship clearinghouse that would be administered by the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). Coalition members will present details of the proposed scholarship clearinghouse to the board and discuss next steps.

The coalition plans to submit proposals to various foundations requesting funds to assist with further planning for the clearinghouse. The funds would allow the coalition to hire a consultant to more clearly define the need, identify costs, resolve implementation issues, and develop a timeline for implementation. The coalition is considering a tentative launch in fall 2007.

### **Similar Scholarship Clearinghouse in Oregon**

The proposed Washington clearinghouse would be modeled in many respects after an Oregon scholarship clearinghouse, administered by the Oregon Student Assistance Commission. The clearinghouse enables donors to reach thousands of students and enables students to apply for multiple scholarships by submitting one common Web-based application. Last year, the commission helped publicize more than 300 private donor scholarships. It received more than 7,000 student applications and nearly 3,000 students received awards totaling \$10 million.

Following are key characteristics of the Oregon scholarship clearinghouse program:

- All private scholarship programs publicized by the commission are specifically designated for Oregon students.
- The scholarships are not dedicated to specific colleges. (Donors that want to establish institution-specific scholarships are directed to college foundations.)

- Students can submit one Web-based application and be considered for multiple scholarships.
- Applicants are not charged any fees, although donors may be charged fees depending on the level of service provided by the commission.

In addition to Oregon, Vermont and Nebraska also offer state-specific clearinghouses. For more information about these clearinghouses, please visit the following Web sites:

Oregon: [http://www.osac.state.or.us/private\\_awarded.html](http://www.osac.state.or.us/private_awarded.html)

Vermont: <http://services.vvac.org/ilwwcm/connect/VVAC/Pay+for+College/>

Nebraska: <http://www.educationquest.org/about.asp> (see “scholarshipQUEST”)

### Next Steps

The Scholarship Coalition may recommend a “phased-in” implementation, with a Phase I focus on publicizing the availability of scholarships. A common application approach may be added to the services later.

The coalition will be seeking grants to fund a position to do planning.

HECB staff requests that the board approve a resolution expressing general support for the clearinghouse and encouraging staff to continue to work with the coalition to further determine the need and costs of the clearinghouse and identify and resolve other potential implementation issues.

### Members of the Scholarship Coalition

Diane Barone-Gillian	Education Assistance Foundation
Matt Birkeland	The Seattle Foundation
Douglas Breithaupt	College Planning Network
Randy Brians	Pride Foundation
Becki Collins	Pierce College District
Anne Katahira	The Seattle Foundation
Krista Kipp	Washington Dollars for Scholars
Danette Knudson	Northwest Education Loan Association
Paula Koontz	Northstar
Rick Millerick	Washington Dollars for Scholars
Michael Richard	The Seattle Times
Marla Skelley	Northwest Education Loan Association
Lorraine Solaegui	Washington Education Foundation
Betty Gebhardt	Higher Education Coordinating Board
Betty Lochner	Higher Education Coordinating Board

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-26**

WHEREAS, There is considerable need for private philanthropy to support students through scholarships; and

WHEREAS, It is difficult for potential donors to develop and administer new scholarship programs or to effectively reach a wide audience of students; and

WHEREAS, Searching for scholarships is a daunting and difficult task for many students; and

WHEREAS, A group of Washington organizations, known as the "Scholarship Coalition," has reviewed ways to improve the availability of private scholarships for Washington students; and

WHEREAS, the Scholarship Coalition is recommending further study and development of a clearinghouse that would help Washington students access private scholarships and help private donors publicize their scholarships to Washington students; and

WHEREAS, Oregon and other states have launched similar successful programs; and

WHEREAS, The coalition believes that the administration and coordination of a scholarship clearinghouse is an appropriate role for the Higher Education Coordinating Board; and

WHEREAS, Additional work is needed to develop the clearinghouse concept;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board authorizes staff to continue working with the coalition to further determine the need for the program, identify administrative costs, and resolve potential implementation issues.

Adopted:

December 15, 2005

Attest:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jesus Hernandez, Secretary



December 2005

## **2005-07 Higher Education Supplemental Operating Budget Recommendations**

### **Background**

State law directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to “review and evaluate the operating and capital budget requests from four-year institutions and the community and technical college system.” This directive also refers to supplemental budget requests.

The state’s public colleges and universities have submitted operating supplemental budget requests for consideration during the 2006 legislative session. The HECB fiscal committee met on December 1 to discuss these requests and to formulate recommendations for board action. The committee members are Mike Worthy, Ethelda Burke, Bill Grinstein, and Roberta Greene. The fiscal committee’s funding recommendations and comments are presented below.

### **Board Action Requested**

At the December 15 HECB meeting, the board’s fiscal committee will present the higher education budget recommendation and seek the full board’s endorsement to forward it to the legislature by January 1, 2006.

### **Overview**

During the current biennium, the state has provided \$3 billion in state general funds to higher education. To expand access to higher education and maintain its quality, the board’s fiscal committee is now recommending enhancements of \$23.3 million during the second year of the 2005-07 biennium. This would increase higher education appropriations to \$3.1 billion — an increment of 1.4 percent over the original biennial appropriation.

The board’s fiscal committee reviewed both the institutions’ proposed budgets and the board’s own budget priorities in developing the recommendation that appears below. The board’s budget priorities are represented by its 2005-07 biennial budget guidelines, published December 2003, and its *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*.

**Enrollment Increases**

- The 2004 master plan contains the state's goal to increase opportunities for students to earn degrees and sets targets for college graduation and degree completion. The master plan also calls for higher education to respond to the state's economic needs.
- The 2005 *State and Regional Needs Assessment*, published by the board in November 2005, calls for increases in opportunities for students to earn degrees in response to the needs of students, employers, and communities throughout the state.
- Regular increases in funding in all sectors are key to achieving the goals of the master plan and to meeting the needs of the state's students, employers, and communities.

**Quality Enhancement**

- A core value of the 2004 master plan is that "our entire society benefits from a strong higher education system, so everyone should share the responsibility for its quality."
- Quality can be increased both through improvements in efficiency and improvements in effectiveness.
- The state should identify sources of funding that will help colleges and the state increase the efficiency and effectiveness of educational programs and services.

To those ends, the HECB's fiscal committee recommends the following supplemental investments in 2006.

**Targeted Enrollment Increases in 2006-07 for the Following Purposes: \$9.8 million**

The fiscal committee's enrollment recommendation contains several elements, each of which relates to different aspects of the board's goals of increasing opportunities for students to complete degrees in response to the state's identifiable economic needs:

- (1) **CTC contracts:** \$800,000 - 120 enrollments at \$6,303

House Bill 1794, enacted earlier this year, authorized the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) to select three community or technical colleges to enter into contracts with one or more regional universities, branch campuses, or The Evergreen State College to offer baccalaureate programs on the community or technical college campuses. The state should provide enrollment funding to support these contracts.

(2) **Applied baccalaureate degrees:** \$904,000

The state should provide planning funds to lay the groundwork for the community and technical colleges to offer applied baccalaureate degrees on a pilot basis, as authorized in HB 1794. Direct investment in two-year enrollments is not recommended at this time. Some community and technical colleges are experiencing decreases in demand for enrollment at the same time that the system is expected to add over 2,000 enrollments in academic year 2006-07.

(3) **Bachelor's degrees: branch campuses:** \$630,300 - 100 enrollments at \$6,303

State budget writers provided funding for lower-division enrollments at the branch campuses in the enacted 2005-07 budget, within the constraints of funds available. In light of the state's improved revenue outlook, the state should provide a modest increase of enrollments at branch campuses, consistent with the direction taken in the original 2005-07 budget.

- 25 FTE at UW Tacoma
- 25 FTE at UW Bothell
- 50 FTE at WSU Vancouver

(4) **Bachelor's degrees: high-demand or high-need enrollments:** \$7,485,000 - 600 FTE

Rather than funding additional general enrollment increases for the public four-year institutions in the supplemental budget, the state should resume funding for competitive high-demand enrollment allocations of 500 FTE undergraduate enrollments at an average of \$11,000 each, as well as 100 FTE graduate enrollments at an average of \$19,500 each, plus \$35,000 in administrative costs.

The publication of the board's *State and Regional Needs Assessment* identified several emerging needs that the HECB believes can best be addressed through a competitive grant program to allocate enrollment funding to institutions and programs that are best suited to meet these needs. The assessment illustrates a need for degrees in specific high-demand fields, including life and physical sciences, health care, teacher education, and technology. The needs assessment also identified a need to increase participation rates in regions with significantly lower than average college participation. These regions include the Northwest, Tri-County, Eastern, and Southwest Washington workforce development areas.

The state should provide funding (1) for new enrollments in the fields specified in the needs assessment and (2) to increase college participation among students from areas specified in the needs assessment. The HECB would oversee a competitive grant program to allocate the funding. Institutions would be asked to demonstrate that programs proposed for funding would address the high-demand fields defined in the needs assessment. As in the past, all proposals would have to demonstrate both unmet

student demand for enrollment opportunities in specified fields and the strong likelihood that graduates from the programs would be employed upon graduation in Washington state.

Due to decreases in enrollment demand in community and technical colleges, the HECB does not anticipate including those colleges in the 2006-07 competitive grant process. However, the HECB supports including the colleges in future high-demand programs.

### **Funding to Improve Retention and Graduation Rates: \$8.3 million**

This investment would produce a pool of funds to be used to improve retention and graduation rates for purposes in line with master plan goals. The amounts requested are approximately equal to the amount each institution's general fund appropriation was reduced when the institutions were given authority to raise tuition rates in the original 2005-07 budget. Institutions and the SBCTC would submit plans to the HECB describing how funds would be used to improve retention and graduation rates. Once approved by the HECB, the institutions would submit allotments to OFM and spend the funds. This enhancement would be divided among the institutions and the two-year system as follows:

▪ UW	\$2,218,000
▪ WSU	\$1,350,500
▪ CWU	\$477,500
▪ EWU	\$431,500
▪ TESC	\$196,500
▪ WWU	\$704,500
▪ CTC	\$2,942,500

### **HECB Requests for Enhancements with Potential Statewide Benefit: \$4.8 million**

#### **(1) Statewide online student advising system: \$1,640,700**

HECB-requested items include a statewide online student advising system which will allow students 24/7 access to degree requirements at public (and eventually private) institutions across the state. This planning tool will help students make informed choices about which courses to take and how the credits they've already earned will transfer to other institutions.

#### **(2) Statewide student-focused data system: \$152,200**

The HECB has also requested funds for a student unit record data system that would centralize and consistently define student-related information, allowing researchers to better analyze higher education policy issues.

(3) **GEAR UP scholarships:** \$2,520,000

In addition, the HECB has requested funds to meet a scholarship obligation to students who participated in the GEAR UP program during the state's first six-year grant period.

(4) **Administrative items:** \$528,059

Allowing HECB employees to participate in the same retirement plans as other higher education employees will help recruitment and retention while additional funding will help the board meet increased lease costs.

**Future Teachers Conditional Scholarship and Loan Repayment Program: \$1.0 million**

The HECB administers the Future Teachers program, which provides scholarships and loan repayments for college students interested in becoming teachers. The HECB Advisory Council, legislators, and members of the Washington Learns steering committee are simultaneously exploring ways to address teacher shortages in math, science, special education, and other fields. The recent release of the Washington Learns interim report has increased the urgency of this need.

The original 2005-07 budget funded \$500,000 in new conditional scholarships. The HECB received 350 applications and will fund 69 scholarships with the existing funds. An additional appropriation of \$1 million would allow the HECB to approximately triple the number of students receiving scholarships and loan repayments under the program this biennium. As a result, the state would triple the number of teachers funded by this program who would be able to enter the workforce within about two years. The state should carry forward this proposed level of funding into the 2007-09 biennium to help in meeting the projected need for highly qualified teachers.

**Table 1**  
**Fiscal Committee Recommendation**  
**2005-07 Higher Education Operating Budget**  
**December 2005**  
**Dollars in Millions**

<b>2005-07 Enacted Budget</b>	\$3,073.2		
<b>Technical Corrections</b>	\$6.6		
<b>Unexpected Energy Costs (one-time costs)</b>	\$14.0		
		<b>Higher Ed</b>	<b>HECB</b>
		<b>Requests</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>Allocating Student Enrollments</b>			
Two-Year Enrollments	\$0.8	\$0.8	120 enrollments at \$6,303 for CTC baccalaureate contracts
Undergraduate	\$0.0	\$0.0	high-demand or high-need only
Graduate	\$0.0	\$0.0	high-demand or high-need only
<b>Increasing enrollments in specialized fields</b>			
High-demand/high-need grant program	\$0.0	\$7.5	500 FTE at \$11,000 average; 100 FTE at \$19,500 average
<b>Increasing Student Retention and Graduation Rates</b>	\$0.0	\$8.3	Reinstate 25% of 2005-07 tuition increase
<b>Salaries and Benefits</b>			
CTC Part-Time Faculty Salaries	\$6.7	\$0.0	
CTC Faculty Prof Dvlpmnt/Experience Increments	\$2.4	\$0.0	
HECB Retirement Annuity	\$0.2	\$0.2	
<b>Expanding student financial aid</b>			
GEAR UP Scholarships	\$2.5	\$2.5	
Future Teacher Conditional Scholarships	\$0.0	\$1.0	
<b>Special Program Improvements</b>			
Accommodating Students with Disabilities	\$2.7	\$0.0	
UW Improve Disaster Response Capabilities	\$2.5	\$0.0	
UW Improve Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates	\$2.0	\$0.0	See systemwide recommendation above
WWU Planning for Waterfront Expansion	\$1.6	\$0.0	
CTC Digital Libraries	\$1.4	\$0.0	
CWU Tuition Waiver Authority	\$1.3	\$0.0	
UW/WSU Tech Transfer/Policy Consensus Center	\$1.1	\$0.0	
Start Up Funding for CTC Applied Baccalaureates	\$0.9	\$0.9	Authorized by HB 1794
UW Pacific NW Seismic Network	\$0.4	\$0.0	
WWU Planning & Emergency Management Program Track	\$0.3	\$0.0	
UW Policy Consensus Center	\$0.2	\$0.0	

**Table 1 Continued**  
**Fiscal Committee Recommendation**  
**2005-07 Higher Education Operating Budget**  
**December 2005**  
**Dollars in Millions**

	<u>Higher Ed Requests</u>	<u>HECB Recommendation</u>	
<b>Maintenance and Operations</b>			
Institutions	\$12.8	\$0.0	CTC (\$7m), UW (5.8m)
HECB Lease Increase	\$0.3	\$0.3	
<b>Helping transfer students earn baccalaureate degrees</b>	\$1.6	\$1.6	Statewide online student advising system
<b>Measuring student success with improved data system</b>	\$0.2	\$0.2	Student-focused data system
<b>Research</b>			
UW "E-Science Institute"	\$3.0	\$0.0	
UW Global Health Initiative	\$2.0	\$0.0	
WSU Agricultural Weather Network	\$0.8	\$0.0	
WSU Biologically Intensive & Organic Ag	\$0.8	\$0.0	
WWU Border Policy Research Institute	\$0.4	\$0.0	
<b>Total Increase</b>	<b>\$48.8</b>	<b>\$23.2</b>	
<b>Total Operating Funds (General Fund - State)</b>	<b>\$3,142.6</b>	<b>\$3,117.0</b>	
Percentage increase 2005-07 supplemental over 2005-07 enacted		<b>1.4%</b>	
<b>Transportation Budget Request</b>			
WWU Purchase of Lincoln Creek Transportation Center	\$3.0	\$0.0	
<b>Total Transportation Funds</b>	<b>\$3.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	

December 2005

## **2005-07 Higher Education Supplemental Capital Budget Recommendations**

### **Background**

In addition to providing recommendations on supplemental operating budget requests, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) must review and make recommendations on institutions' supplemental capital budget proposals. Traditionally, both the governor and legislature have used the supplemental capital budget for the following purposes:

- To provide **technical corrections or adjustments** to appropriations or provisos contained in the biennial capital budget;
- To make **changes in project scope or purpose** and to add, modify, or clarify special conditions contained in the appropriation language of capital projects; and
- To **authorize new capital spending** for projects urgently needed to protect life, safety, and property which cannot be deferred to the regular biennial budget.

The governor and legislature have traditionally avoided the authorization of new program or preservation projects that are anticipated and included in the institutions' 10-year capital plans. These projects are customarily considered in the regular biennial budget. Additionally, for the four-year institutions, the 2003 Legislature directed (through House Bill 2151) that all major capital projects be presented in a single prioritized list for consideration in adopting the regular capital budget.

### **Summary of Higher Education Supplemental Capital Budget Requests**

Provided below is a listing of the supplemental capital project requests that have been submitted by the institutions. (Appendix A provides a description of each project request.) The project requests have been categorized by (1) those that represent technical corrections to the 2005-07 capital budget or address emergent needs that cannot be deferred and (2) those requests that would fund anticipated program or preservation projects.

As itemized below, the institutions are requesting a total of \$132 million in new capital spending authority. Of this amount, \$42 million is in state bonds. The remaining \$90 million in requested spending authority would come from local revenue bonds (Certificates of Participation) or other non-state fund sources.

<b>University of Washington</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>State Appropriated</b>	<b>Local/Other Funds</b>
<b>Technical Adjustment/Emergent Needs</b>			
Release of Restoration Phase II Design Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0
Replace Earthquake Damaged and Non-Compliant Library Shelving	\$2,650,000	\$2,650,000	\$0
UW Tacoma Land Acquisition and Soil Remediation	\$4,700,000	\$4,700,000	\$0
<b>Other Supplemental Requests</b>			
Friday Harbor Dock Replacement	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$0
Biological Structures Federal Grant Match	\$8,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
MHSC H-Wing Renovation	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$0
Undergraduate Chemistry Laboratory Remodels	\$6,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
Nanotechnology Research Program	\$6,000,000	\$4,500,000	\$1,500,000
Emergency Operations Center	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,350,000</b>	<b>\$25,850,000</b>	<b>\$9,500,000</b>

<b>Washington State University</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>State Appropriated</b>	<b>Local/Other Funds</b>
<b>Technical Adjustment/Emergent Needs</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Other Supplemental Requests</b>			
Biotechnology Life Sciences Building	\$63,000,000	\$0	\$63,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$63,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$63,000,000</b>

<b>Central Washington University</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>State Appropriated</b>	<b>Local/Other Funds</b>
<b>Technical Adjustment/Emergent Needs</b>			
Replace Chiller	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$0
<b>Other Supplemental Requests</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>Eastern Washington University</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>State Appropriated</b>	<b>Local/Other Funds</b>
<b>Technical Adjustment/Emergent Needs</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Other Supplemental Requests</b>			
Patterson Hall Renovation (pre-design/design)	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$0
Martin-Williamson Hall Remodel (pre-design/design)	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,000,000</b>	<b>\$4,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>Community and Technical Colleges</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>State Appropriated</b>	<b>Local/Other Funds</b>
<b>Technical Adjustment/Emergent Needs</b>			
Highline West Primary Power Feed Branch	\$1,717,000	\$1,717,000	\$0
Inflation Reserve Account	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$0
<b>Other Supplemental Requests</b>			
Skagit Valley Campus Fire Loop	\$1,634,000	\$1,634,000	\$0
Green River Campus Water System	\$1,951,000	\$1,951,000	\$0
Seattle Central Bulkhead, Pier and Harbor Dredging	\$1,856,000	\$1,856,000	\$0
Clark College – Corporate Education Center (change purpose of previously authorized COP)	\$9,100,000	\$0	\$9,100,000
Edmonds Student Union and Bookstore	\$8,500,000	\$0	\$8,500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$27,758,000</b>	<b>\$10,158,000</b>	<b>\$17,600,000</b>

<b>Total Higher Education</b>	<b>\$132,108,000</b>	<b>\$42,008,000</b>	<b>\$90,100,000</b>
-------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------------

## Recommendation

1. The board recommends that the governor and legislature support funding for the supplemental project requests that fall within the traditional criteria for supplemental budget funding (technical corrections and emergent needs). These projects total \$14.1 million in state funds.
2. The board also recognizes that the other supplemental requests, totaling \$118 million (\$28 million in state funds and \$90 million in local funds), while not addressing unanticipated or emergent needs, have significant merit and, accordingly, deserve consideration by the governor and legislature. However, the board will defer a recommendation on these projects for supplemental funding, pending further review by the governor and legislature.

## Appendix A Project Descriptions

### University of Washington

#### **Release of Restoration Phase II Design Funds: \$0**

As required by the 2005-07 capital budget, the University of Washington will request release of Phase II design funding for the university's restoration program (Savery Hall, Clark Hall, and the Playhouse Theatre). Pre-design documents for these major restoration projects will be submitted to the legislative fiscal committees and to the Office of Financial Management in December for review and approval. This item is simply requesting the release of previously appropriated design funds for these projects.

#### **UW Tacoma Land Acquisition and Soil Remediation: \$4,700,000**

\$4.7 million will be requested for acquisition and required soil remediation for additional properties at the UW Tacoma campus. \$5.5 million for this purpose was requested but not funded during the 2005-07 legislative session. \$4 million is needed during 2006 for acquisition of certain target properties within the UW Tacoma campus boundaries. These properties are identified as targets for immediate purchase because they are poised to be developed or marketed for sale. An additional \$700,000 is needed to complete necessary remediation of contaminated soils and to stabilize and provide urgent roof repairs to the Joy Building.

#### **Replace Earthquake Damaged and Non-Compliant Library Shelving: \$2,650,000**

Most of the shelving in the Engineering Library and a significant amount of shelving in the Social Work Library were damaged or compromised as a result of the 2001 Nisqually Earthquake. Following the earthquake, the university completed a survey of all Seattle campus library shelving and determined that shelving in 14 of the university's libraries does not meet current code and would likely be compromised during a future earthquake. The university sought support through the Federal Emergency Management Agency mitigation grant program but was not selected for funding. A phased program for replacing non-compliant shelving has been developed. The university has allocated minor works preservation funds in the amount of \$350,000 for Phase I of the shelving replacement during 2005-07. An additional \$2,650,000 will be requested from the state to fund the remaining phases of shelving replacement.

#### **Friday Harbor Dock Replacement: \$2,000,000**

The existing dock and breakwater structures at Friday Harbor Laboratories have been evaluated for safety and structural integrity issues (including an underwater survey and it has been determined that significant portions of the dock — including decking and utilities — should be replaced. \$2 million is requested for safety repairs to the dock and completion of associated structural and utility work to ensure that the dock will support required vehicular and research vessel use and that the three floating breakwaters will be stable during a severe storm.

## **Appendix A**

### **Project Descriptions**

(continued)

#### **University of Washington (continued)**

##### **Biological Structures Federal Grant Match: \$4,000,000**

The university will request \$4 million as a 1:1 match for the proposed UW federal NCCR facilities grant for the Biological Structures Renovation project, which includes some space in the phased H-Wing renovation project.

##### **MHSC H-Wing Renovation: \$4,000,000**

An additional \$4 million will be requested for phase 2a of the H-Wing remodel, in order to complete infrastructure improvements on the fifth floor and achieve considerable economies in surge costs for the overall H-Wing project. This work is being accelerated in order to realize significant efficiencies in the use of the Biological Structures Renovation project funds described above.

##### **Undergraduate Chemistry Laboratory Remodels: \$3,000,000**

The university has initiated a phased plan to remodel and modernize the undergraduate chemistry laboratories in Bagley Hall. These laboratories, many of which have not been significantly modernized since their original construction in 1930, are heavily utilized by students from across all academic disciplines. The university has approved \$3 million in local funds to complete a portion of the next phase of the modernization project and will request a \$3 million match from the state to complete this phase.

##### **Nanotechnology Research Program: \$4,500,000**

The university will request \$4 million in renovation funds to allow for expansion of the nanotechnology research program and the renovation of existing space to create laboratories and offices to support this growing program.

#### **Washington State University**

##### **COP Authority for Biotechnology Life Sciences Building: \$63,000,000**

Washington State University requests authority to utilize the state's Certificate of Participation (COP) process to finance up to \$63,000,000 (plus financing costs and expenses) to construct the WSU Biotechnology/Life Sciences Building, beginning in 2006. The COPs will be repaid through revenue earned on the university's permanent funds and deposited into the WSU Building Account. Funding capacity is available because earlier projects funded in this manner will soon be repaid. This revised request requires no state construction funding and does not affect the state's debt limit.

## Appendix A Project Descriptions (continued)

### Central Washington University

**Replace Chiller: \$2,000,000**

This request is for funding for a new 1,200 ton chiller to mitigate the risk to the teaching/learning function of the university from unreliable and insufficient capacity of existing cooling equipment. During summer 2005, one of the two chillers in the CWU central plant experienced a major mechanical failure. During the weeks required to repair this chiller, it was not possible to fully cool all of the buildings connected to the central plant. A similar chiller failure next year would result in a much greater impact on the teaching/learning function of the university because of additional new construction (a new student union and recreation facility) scheduled for completion in April 2006. In anticipation of the additional cooling load that will result from this new building and the recently opened music facility, the university had requested funding for an additional new chiller in the 2005-07 capital budget; however, this was not authorized by the legislature.

### Eastern Washington University

**Patterson Hall Renovation (pre-design/design): \$2,000,000**

Patterson Hall, constructed in 1969, does not meet the operational, technology, or program capacity needs that are an essential part of Eastern Washington University's academic strategic plan. Patterson Hall is the largest of EWU's academic facilities at 103,000 gross square feet and houses classroom seating for 1,478 students and laboratory seating for 80. The design requested for the renovation of Patterson Hall on the Eastern Washington University campus was the highest-ranking unfunded priority for capital funding in the 2005-07 capital budget.

**Martin-Williamson Hall Remodel (pre-design/design): \$2,000,000**

Martin Hall was originally built in 1947, with its annex Williamson Hall constructed in 1977. At 91,483 gross square feet, the Martin-Williamson facility is one of EWU's largest academic buildings, with an instructional seating capacity for 1,280 students and laboratory seating for 172. Funding for the pre-design/design costs of renovating Martin-Williamson Hall on the Eastern Washington University campus was included in EWU's 2005-07 budget request.

### State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

**Highline West Primary Power Feed Branch: \$1,717,000**

Provides for the replacement of failing transformers and deteriorating primary power cables.

## **Appendix A**

### **Project Descriptions**

(continued)

<b>State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (continued)</b>
---

**Skagit Valley Campus Fire Loop: \$1,634,000**

The campus fire loop is undersized to meet the needs of sprinkler and fire hydrant protection. The City of Mount Vernon has required that the system be replaced before it will grant permits for remodel or construction of new projects.

**Green River Campus Water System: \$1,951,000**

Replace and upgrade the campus water system to bring it into code compliance.

**Seattle Central Bulkhead, Pier, and Harbor Dredging: \$1,856,000**

Bulkheads at the Seattle Maritime Academy need to be replaced, along with repair of paved surfaces damaged from the shifting bulkheads. The project also includes dredging required to make docks accessible.

**Inflation Reserve Account: \$3,000,000**

Several projects that have bid recently reflect a jump in bid pricing that exceeds allowances for escalation in respective appropriations. The magnitude of these increases cannot be absorbed by the colleges. Architects and estimators cite the recent rise in fuel costs as well as the uncertainty in material pricing, material shortages, and skyrocketing delivery pricing as the reasons for this market adjustment. This account would establish a pool of funds to address rapidly increasing inflation in building costs. To encourage colleges to take an active role in limiting the overall impact of increasing costs, this pool would be implemented on a “matching” basis, with state funds covering 50 percent of the estimated impact.

**Bellevue Community College North Center Building Purchase: -\$20,000,000**

The college is withdrawing its COP request as negotiations with the sellers failed and were terminated.

**Clark College Corporate Education Center: \$9,100,000**

This item revises the scope of a previously authorized COP project to build structured parking, canceling that project and substituting construction of a 25,000 gross square foot training center.

**Edmonds Student Union Building and Bookstore: \$8,500,000**

Students have voted to assess themselves a fee to construct a new 31,000 gross square foot student union building. Fund reserves and enterprise revenue will be used to construct a new bookstore.

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-23**

WHEREAS, It is the responsibility of the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to recommend higher education funding priorities to the legislature for regular biennial budgets as well as supplemental budget requests; and

WHEREAS, These recommendations are to be based on a review and evaluation of the operating and capital budget requests from the four-year institutions and the community and technical college system and how well these requests align with the board's budget priorities, the missions of the institutions, and the statewide strategic master plan for higher education; and

WHEREAS, The fiscal committee of the HECB met to consider the supplemental operating and capital budget requests on December 1, 2005; and

WHEREAS, The fiscal committee made recommendations and comments to the full HECB for consideration on December 15, 2005;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the recommendations of the fiscal committee, that in 2006 the legislature provide \$23.2 million in additional state investments in the higher education operating budget and \$14.1 million in additional state investments in the higher education capital budget, and supports the comments and observations offered by the committee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board directs those recommendations and comments be forwarded to the legislature.

Adopted:

December 15, 2005

Attest:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jesus Hernandez, Secretary

December 2005

## Accountability Update

### Overview

In 2004, the legislature and governor enacted House Bill 3103, revising the responsibilities of the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Section 11 of the bill directed the board to “establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goals in higher education.”

Later in 2004, the HECB adopted the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*. The master plan establishes two goals and outlines 11 strategic policy initiatives related to the goals. One of the 11 strategic policy initiatives – “Promoting student success through greater accountability” articulates the view that, “By redesigning the state’s higher education accountability system, the state can identify and address the strengths and weaknesses at the institution, sector, and state levels to better promote student success.”

The strategic master plan also declares, “[A] strong accountability system must ensure that efficiency, equity, and effectiveness are defined in measurable terms and that statewide and institutional policies are created, modified, or discontinued based on an analysis of accountability results.”

### HECB Accountability Framework

Urged on by the legislature and in accordance with its own plans, the HECB adopted an accountability framework at its April, 2005 meeting. That accountability framework consists of four main components:

- A context section
- Performance indicators common to all institutions (one set of indicators for public baccalaureate institutions, and a separate set of indicators for the two-year college system)
- Baccalaureate institution-specific performance indicators relating to the unique mission of particular campuses
- A timeline for linking the biennial budget and accountability reporting cycles

Performance targets on the established indicators for the baccalaureate institutions are to be approved by the HECB. Campus-level performance targets for the two-year institutions are to be set by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC); statewide performance targets for the two-year system as a whole are to be set by the SBCTC, with HECB approval. The institutions will use a three-year average to calculate baseline performance on the indicators. The targets, according to the HECB's accountability framework, will meet or exceed the baseline. The two-year colleges base their targets on funding and will continue this method.

The framework envisions an overall evaluation of the accountability framework every four years, timed to coincide with the development of the strategic master plan.

### **2005-07 Biennial Budget**

In May 2005, with passage of the operating budget, another layer of accountability measures for the four-year institutions was added. The institutions, the OFM, and HECB are required to establish performance targets on six performance measures described in the budget. The budget also requires performance targets on defined indicators at the two-year institutions. But the indicators referenced in the budget for the two-year campuses were already contained within the accountability framework previously adopted by the HECB.

### **Related Provisions**

The HECB is required to report every two years on the performance of the institutions in relation to the indicators spelled out as part of the accountability system. The HECB adopted its most recent accountability report in January, 2005. The next biennial accountability report up for adoption by the HECB will be presented by the end of 2006.

The HECB is required to annually review the actual achievements of the institutions. Institutions are required to annually report data to the HECB permitting such review of actual achievements on accountability indicators. The review by the HECB of actual achievements of the institutions for the 2004-05 academic year will occur following submission of data by the institutions. This data has been requested by HECB staff; some data has already been received.

### **HECB Role**

HECB staff have held discussions with representatives of the baccalaureate institutions. Each institution has proposed a rationale for each of the indicators applicable to its institution. Specifically, the institutions have determined whether their own past performance, results for a group of peer institutions, or some other basis of comparison, is most appropriate for each

indicator. The institutions have also proposed goals (or targets) for their own institutional results on each relevant indicator. The indicators from the budget require six-year targets. The HECB accountability framework indicators require only two-year targets.

HECB staff have also discussed with SBCTC staff the impact of these provisions in the two-year sector. The SBCTC board is expected to approve two-year targets on the defined performance indicators at its December, 2005 meeting.

HECB staff will present the proposed performance targets to the HECB at the December, 2005 board meeting, with adoption scheduled for January, 2006.

December 2005

## Accountability in Higher Education in Washington

### State Legislative/Administrative History

- 1986            HECB highlights issue of accountability in master plan.
- 1987            Budget provision calls on HECB and SBCTC to report to the Legislature concerning a number of accountability/assessment measures.
- 1995            Budget directs institutions to report to HECB on strategies to meet increasing demands for efficiency, focusing on:
- Faculty contact
  - Time-to-degree/certificate
  - Graduation rates
  - Increasing number of degrees per instructional faculty
- 1996            HECB publishes Accountability Report, containing state and institutional results on numerous indicators in relation to goals of the board.
- 1997            Budget establishes requirement for performance goals in relation to:
- Graduation efficiency index (95% freshmen/90% transfer)
  - Student retention (95% research/90% comprehensive)
  - Five-year graduation rates (65% research/55% comprehensive)
  - Faculty productivity
  - A campus-specific accountability measure

Two percent of non-instructional funding (\$10.7 million) is withheld from baccalaureate institutions, placed in reserve, to be released upon certification by HECB that institutions have met performance targets. HECB reviews and approves institutions' plans, recommends release of all funds for first year of budget. All reserve funds are released in the first year.

Two-year colleges have similar framework of performance goals (wages for vocational graduates, academic transfer rate increases, core course completion, graduation efficiency index). Partial funding is withheld in reserve

1998 HECB publishes report entitled, “Performance Funding and Accountability,” reporting that two-thirds of goals (39 of 58 separate measures) were met or exceeded. The HECB recommends release of 77% of withheld funds, creation of incentive pool of performance funds available through competitive grants. The report encourages new assessment projects in quantitative skills and technology literacy.

[For the biennium, \$9.1 million was eventually released; \$1.5 million was not released to institutions, and lapsed to the Education Savings Account.]

1999 Budget does not withhold funds. Baccalaureate institutions are directed to report to HECB on annual progress toward goals (from 1997-99 budget).

Fall Accountability Forum participants agreed to emphasize student learning outcomes (writing, information and technology literacy, quantitative reasoning)

2000 HB 2375 directs public baccalaureates to define information and technology literacy, develop strategies for measuring achievement, and report to Legislature by January, 2002 on feasibility and implementation plans.

HECB publishes report entitled, “Performance Accountability,” recommends against budgetary penalties linked to performance measures, and recommends re-evaluating goals set by Legislature in 97-99 budget.

2001 Budget does not include indicators or targets; directs HECB to set targets and requires institutions to prepare accountability plans to achieve measurable and specific improvement. HECB delegates to institutions responsibility for setting meaningful targets

2003 HECB reviews targets, publishes “Higher Education Accountability Plans” report, and recommends changing August deadline for accountability plans since data are not available until October.

2004 HB 3103 is adopted, revising HECB responsibilities.

- HECB “shall establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goals”

2005-07  
Budget      Base funding increases approved for institutions. Institutions are required to “show demonstrable progress” toward specified six-year goals.

- Proportion of students who graduate within 125% of credits required
- Proportion of degrees awarded to Pell grant recipients
- Freshman retention
- National ranking for federal research grants
- Job placement or graduate school acceptance rates
- Number of accredited programs

\* Also included in budget as performance indicators.

**HECB DEGREES AWARDED INDICATOR**  
**Targets Proposed by Institutions for 2006-07 Academic Year**

	<b>Baseline* Associate Degrees</b>	<b>Target** Associate Degrees</b>	<b>Baseline* Bachelor's Degrees</b>	<b>Target** Bachelor's Degrees</b>	<b>Baseline* Grad/Prof Degrees</b>	<b>Target** Grad/Prof Degrees</b>
CTC system associate degrees	21,696	--				
Public associate academic degrees	14,152	--				
Public associate technical degrees	7,544	--				
Private associate degrees	1,292	912**				
State Total	22,988					
UW Seattle			7,083	7,150	3,478	3,500
UW Bothell			527	575	94	100
UW Tacoma			668	725	125	150
WSU			4,166	4,170	1,076	1,090
CWU			2,031	2,100	203	203
EWU			1,742	1,800	556	579
TESC			1,152	1,152	93	93
WWU			2,813	2,913	364	364
Public 4-year Total			20,182	20,585	5,989	6,079
Private 4-year			6,879	6,720**	4,495	4,644**
State Total			27,061	27,305	10,484	10,723
HECB Interim target 06-07 (12/04 budget recs rept)		22,800 (96% public)		28,000 (76% public - 21,280)		10,800 (57% public - 6,156)
Master Plan target 09-10		27,000		30,000		11,500
Master Plan public share 09-10		25,800		22,800		6,555
Master Plan private share 09-10		1,200		7,200		4,945

\*Baselines reflect the average over the most recent three years for which data are available. From 2003-04 to 2004-05, private bachelor's degree production jumped 11.6% and private graduate degree production rose 9%. Associate degree awards dropped in 2004-05 in both the public and private sectors from 2003-04.

\*\*Targets are for the 2006-07 academic year. Private sector targets assume fixed percentage of total identified in 2004 Strategic Master Plan.



Border signifies proposed goals below baseline performance. (Accountability framework adopted by HECB stipulates that goals are to meet or exceed baseline performance.)

## HECB COMMON BACCALAUREATE INDICATORS

### Goals Proposed by Institutions for 2006-07 Academic Year

	UW Seattle	UW Bothell	UW Tacoma	WSU	CWU	EWU	TESC	WWU
Baseline high demand* 4-year degrees	2,121	165	81	582	43	337	0	--
Target high demand 4-year degrees	2,175	175	100	616	52	405	0	--
Baseline 6-yr graduation rate**	71.0%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	61.2%	50.9%	46.2%	50.4%	61.6%
Target 6-yr graduation rate	73%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	62%	51%	52%	50%	62%
Baseline 3-yr graduation*** rate	70.6%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	63.4%	73.7%	60.7%	71.8%	60.8%
Target 3-year graduation rate	74%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	64%	75%	62%	73%	61%
Baseline 4 <sup>th</sup> year persistence rate***	10.3%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	17.7%	27.5%	16.7%	5.6%	14.3%
Target 4 <sup>th</sup> year persistence rate	10%	Aggregate reported	Aggregate reported	17%	28%	20%	5%	15%
Baseline Graduation Efficiency Index (GEI) – (non-transfer)	0.899	0.883	0.846	0.901	0.837	0.804	0.900	0.913
Target GEI (non-transfer)	0.90	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.84	0.82	0.90	0.91
Baseline GEI (transfer)	0.820	0.868	0.864	0.858	0.790	0.697	0.883	0.838
Target GEI (transfer)	0.82	0.87	0.87	0.86	0.79	0.71	0.88	0.84

\*“High demand” areas, defined by the HECB in *State and Regional Needs Assessment* (Nov. 2005), are computer science, engineering, software engineering, architecture and health care occupations.

\*\*Washington public and private baccalaureate institutions had a 6-year graduation rate of 63% in 2004. This rate is up from 61% ten years earlier. **The 2004 graduation rate places Washington among the top 5 states in the country for this measure**, according to *Measuring Up, 2004*, published by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. The top 5 states had an average graduation rate of 64%.

\*\*\*For students transferring from a Washington community college



Border signifies proposed goals below baseline performance. (Accountability framework adopted by HECB stipulates that goals are to meet or exceed baseline performance.)

**HECB ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK and BUDGET INDICATORS**  
**Targets Proposed by Community and Technical College System for**  
**2006-07 Academic Year**

	<b>Technical associate degrees awarded</b>	<b>Academic associate degrees awarded</b>	<b>Students prepared for transfer*</b>	<b>Students prepared for work*</b>	<b>Students gaining basic skills*</b>
Baseline	7,544	14,152	17,436	23,394	20,950
Target** recommended to SBCTC	--	--	17,800	23,500	21,809
Target as % of base			102.1%	100.5%	104.1%

\*Indicator is both an indicator within the HECB-adopted accountability framework and in the 2005-07 operating budget. However, budget language requires 6-year targets; HECB indicators use 2-year targets.

\*\*Targets are recommendations to the SBCTC board contained in a draft resolution prepared by SBCTC staff for consideration by the board. SBCTC action not yet known.

**Definitions**

**Baseline** – For degrees awarded, baselines are calculated using the average for the most recent three completed academic years. For other indicators, baselines are the performance results reported by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges for the 2004-05 academic year.

**Prepared for Transfer** – Students who have earned an associate degree or have earned 45 college-level academic credits with a GPA of at least 2.0, including completion of core requirements typically completed by freshmen at a baccalaureate institution.

**Prepared for Work** – Students who have completed a vocational program (degree, certificate, or other program), including achievement of industry skill standards, or who have completed 45 vocational college-level credits with a GPA of at least 2.0.

**Gaining Basic Skills** – The proportion of students enrolled in a basic skills program (English as a Second Language, Adult Basic Education, or high school diploma equivalency, that is, GED) who gain one competency level in at least one subject area during the year.

## BUDGET MEASURES –Targets Proposed by Institutions (2010-11 AY)

	UW	WSU	CWU	EWU	TESC	WWU
Baseline* % graduating w/in 125% of required credits	92.1%	91.6%	85.7%	78%	96.8%	94.9%
Target** % graduating within 125% of required credits	93%	93%	87%	79% 06-7 81% 08-9 83% 10-11 AY	97%	95%
Baseline % UG degrees to Pell grant recipients	29.4%	36.5%	39%	49%	41.9%	32.6%
Target UG degrees to Pell grant recipients	30%	37%	38%	49%	42%	33%
Baseline freshmen retention***	91.5%	84.5%	78.5%	75.5%	71.9%	83.9%
Target freshmen retention	93%	85%	80%	76% 06-7 78% 08-9 81% 10- 11	72%	84%
Baseline job placement or grad schl enrollment	24% earn grad degree w/in 5 yrs	82.3% employed; 22.9% grad school	70.7% employed; 27.3% grad school	90% employed	90.3% employed or grad school	77.1% employed; 14.5% grad school
Target job placement or grad schl enroll	25% earn grad degree w/in 5 yrs	82% employed; 22% grad school	60% employed; 30% grad school	90% employed	90% employed or grad school	77% employed; 14% grad school
Baseline top 20 programs	14.5	2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Target top 20 programs	17	2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseline federal research rank	2 <sup>nd</sup> overall (1 <sup>st</sup> public)	109 <sup>th</sup> overall (72 <sup>nd</sup> public)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Target federal research rank	1 <sup>st</sup> public	99 <sup>th</sup> overall (73 <sup>rd</sup> public)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseline programs accredited	NA	NA	8	56 of 73 programs (77%)	NA	38 of 46 programs (83%)
Target programs accredited	NA	NA	8	56 programs (77%)	NA	41 programs (90%)

\*Baselines are calculated by averaging the result for the three (when three are available) most recent data points available for the indicator, following the methodology for HECB accountability framework.

\*\*Targets relate to 2010-11 academic year. EWU also includes interim targets for two indicators.

\*\*\*According to the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (*Measuring Up, 2004*), **Washington's freshmen retention rate in 2004 was 83%, up from 80% ten years earlier. The 2004 rate places Washington among the top 5 states, which averaged 84%.**

December 2005

## **Progress in Meeting Demand for Healthcare Professionals**

*Master Plan Policy Proposal 6: Meeting Regional Higher Education Needs*

### **Background**

The HECB 2005 State and Regional Needs Assessment identified a significant gap between the number of workers prepared to enter occupations in health care and the number of workers needed in the health care industry. Almost half of the need for additional training at the baccalaureate level and above was due to demand for training in nursing. More than one-third of new registered nurses receive their initial training at the baccalaureate level. Over time, others seek additional training, resulting in roughly 55 percent of registered nurses holding a bachelor's degree or higher.

The recommendations and analysis in the needs assessment recognized ongoing work by other agencies in assessing need and identifying strategies to address shortages in health care occupations. Since 2001, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board has convened stakeholders to understand the critical shortage areas in health care occupations, identify strategies to meet employer demand, and track progress toward preparing greater numbers of Washington residents for jobs in the health care industry. With the enactment of HB 1852 in 2003, the Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force was directed to continue monitoring progress in meeting demand in health care shortage areas and report to the legislature annually.

### **Progress in Closing the Gap**

Since the Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force began its work in 2001, significant progress has been made in a number of occupations. Madeleine Thompson, policy analyst and legislative liaison with the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, will review the strategic goals established by the Task Force and discuss progress toward those goals. This progress is the result of academic and training program expansion, including enhanced funding for high-demand academic programs; institutional commitments to expand capacity and to increase cooperative efforts with other colleges and universities; federal incentive grants supporting program expansion; initiatives by partnerships of local health care employers, business and labor groups, educators, and government; and support from industry partners.



# *The Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force - Update*

**Presentation to the  
Higher Education Coordinating Board  
December 15, 2005**

## **Presenter**

Madeleine Thompson, Lead Task Force Staff (Workforce Board)  
**The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board**

**<http://www.wtb.wa>**





# The Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force

- The Workforce Board convened health care stakeholders to examine the shortages of health care personnel starting in 2001. Following direction from legislative leaders a Task Force was formed in 2002.
- The Task Force published a state plan with **40 strategies and 16 outcome measures** in January 2003: **“Crisis or Opportunity?”**
- **2003 Legislation**, Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB) 1852 requests the Workforce Board to continue to convene stakeholders and **report progress** annually. (*Annual Reports: Progress 2003, Progress 2004, Progress 2005 - forthcoming*)



# Who is on the Task Force?

- \* Michele Johnson, Chair (Chancellor- Pierce Colleges)
- \* Bill Gray, Vice Chair (Dean - WSU Spokane)
- \* Washington State Hospital Association
- \* Washington State Nurses Association
- \* Higher Education Coordinating Board
- \* State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
- \* Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
- \* Assoc. of Washington Public Hospital Districts
- \* Workforce Board (WTECB)
- \* Service Employees International Union (Allied Health)
- \* United Food and Commercial Workers Union (Allied Health)
- \* Migrant and Community Health
- \* WA Dental Association
- \* WA State Medical Assoc.
- \* Allied Health
- \* Group Health Cooperative
- \* Department of Health
- \* Rural Health
- \* Long-Term Care
- \* State Board of Health



# Shortages: Current Status

## Shortages Continue

- 2005 job vacancy survey reported over 11,340 vacancies in health (Up from 8,200)
- Over 8,900 are for jobs that require postsecondary preparation
- Employers still report difficulty finding personnel



## 2005 Hospital Survey

➤ Over 80 percent of hospitals report 'very difficult' or 'somewhat difficult' to recruit:

- ❖ Nuclear medical technologists
- ❖ Ultrasound technologists
- ❖ Radiation therapy technologists
- ❖ Specialized radiology technologists
- ❖ Pharmacists
- ❖ Physical therapists
- ❖ Occupational therapists
- ❖ Staff nurses (registered nurses)
- ❖ Advanced practice nurses
- ❖ Respiratory therapists
- ❖ Medical records coders

Hospitals employ 37 percent of health care personnel



# Demand/ Supply Gap Analysis

➤ Gap analysis can be completed for select occupations where data available is sufficient:

- ❖ 520 more registered nurses each year than are currently prepared for the workforce
- ❖ 80 more dentists each year than are currently prepared for the workforce
- ❖ 70 more physical therapists each year than are currently prepared for the workforce
- ❖ 40 more occupational therapists each year than are currently prepared for the workforce
- ❖ 40 more occupational therapists each year than are currently prepared for the workforce

Source: Workforce Board analysis based on labor market information including forecast job growth. Data applicable for 2002 through 2012. Please note that as supply changes, forecasts change over time.



## Contributing factors

- ❖ Aging population: People over 65 in Washington will number 1.2 million by 2020:
  - People over 65 need more health care
  - More health care workers are retiring
- ❖ Bottlenecks in education programs continue
- ❖ Recruitment: Career image and awareness of opportunities
- ❖ Retention: Training for incumbent workers, burnout



# "Crisis or Opportunity?"

## State Plan for Addressing Shortages

### 6 Goals:

1. Increase educational capacity & efficiency in health care education and training programs to enable more people to gain qualifications to work in health care occupations.
2. Recruit more individuals, especially targeted populations into health care occupations, and promote adequate preparation prior to entry.
3. Develop a data collection and analysis system to assess health workforce supply and demand.



# The strategy for creating an adequate supply of health care personnel

## 6 Goals (continued...):

4. **Retain** current health care workers.
5. **Enable local communities** to implement strategies to alleviate the health care personnel shortages in their areas.
6. Develop a mechanism to **ensure continued collaboration** among stakeholders, **track progress**, **create accountability** for fulfilling this plan, and to **plan** for future health workforce needs.



## Progress Overview

- ✓ Expanded educational capacity
- ✓ Legislative action to address barriers
- ✓ Recruitment initiatives
- ✓ Retention initiatives
- ✓ Data development
- ✓ Health skill panel achievements



## Expanded Educational Capacity

➤ Since 2003 about **\$15.45 million** in state appropriated funds has been directed toward expanding capacity in health care education and training programs:

- ✓ High Demand funds

- ✓ Workforce development funds

➤ This does not include other funds to expand capacity: local workforce development council funds leveraged federal grants, and private contributions via health skill panels

➤ Hospitals contributed \$18 million in 2003

It is estimated that capacity will expanded by at least **2,230 FTE's**.



# Expanded Educational Capacity: High-Demand Funds

<b>Baccalaureate Institution / Program</b>	<b>03-05</b>
UW, Bachelors of Science in Nursing (32 FTEs)	\$456,000
WSU, Bachelors of Science in Nursing (98 FTEs)	\$1,652,000
CWU, Safety & Health Management (12 FTEs)	\$168,000
EWU, Doctorate of Physical Therapy (8 FTEs)	\$96,000
EWU, Bachelor of Science Dental Hygiene (14 FTEs)	\$102,000
UW, Doctor of Pharmacy (10 FTEs)	\$113,000
WSU, Pharmacy (46 FTEs)	\$929,000
WSU, Pre-Science/Pre-Health Science (30 FTEs)	\$268,130
<b>Total ongoing FTEs = 245</b>	<b>Total \$3,780,000</b>

No funds allocated at the four-year level for 2005-2007.



# Expanded Educational Capacity: High-Demand Funds

**Community and Technical Colleges:** Bates, Bellevue, Bellingham (with Skagit/Whatcom), Clover Park with Pierce-Puyallup, Big Bend, Centralia, Clark, Columbia Basin, Everett, Grays Harbor, Lower Columbia, Olympic, Pierce-Ft Steilacoom, Peninsula, Renton, Seattle District, Spokane, Tacoma.

**Programs:** Associate Degree Nurse, Practical Nurse, Medical Informatics, Dental Hygiene, and other allied health programs.

- **High-Demand Funds 2003-2005:** \$3,124,000
- **High-Demand Funds 2005-2007:** \$2,088,000
- **Total ongoing FTEs: 546**



## Other Education Initiatives

- SBCTC named Yakima Valley Community College a **Center of Excellence in Allied Health**: leader, innovator, statewide resource
- ❖ Developed **core curricula** in allied health
- ❖ Holds statewide meetings for allied health faculty; leader for **teaching the distance learning teacher** best methods for instruction in distance learning for allied health
- Clinical Site Coordination: Pierce County/ Puget Sound, Spokane, and Northwest consortiums



## Legislative Highlights 2004

- ✓ Removing barriers to entry: Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6554 eliminates barriers to credentialing for some high- demand occupations, such as registered nurses and dental hygienists
- ✓ Improving articulation: Substitute House Bill 2382 directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board and two- and four-year institutions to develop transfer associate degrees in specific majors, including nursing
- ✓ Increasing diversity: Senate Concurrent Resolution 8419 creates a Joint Select Committee on Health Disparities included considering ways to increase people of color in the health care workforce, among other objectives



## Legislative Highlights 2003

- ✓ Improving recruitment: Substitute House Bill 1189 allowed hospital districts to **reimburse employees for education and training**, and for travel to interviews
- ✓ Improving recruitment: Substitute Senate Bill 5966 **reduced barriers for dentists** from other states to practice in Washington
- ✓ Monitoring progress: Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1852 required the Workforce Board to continue to **convene health care workforce stakeholders**, and **report progress annually**



## Recruitment Initiatives

- ✓ 2004 Legislature increased biennial funding for the **health scholarship and loan repayment** program from \$4 million to \$6 million
- ✓ Washington's **\$3 million federal award** for surpassing performance targets for workforce development programs has been utilized by Workforce Development Councils, in partnership with community and technical colleges and K-12, **to fund health career workshops for youth, scholarships for students,** and other recruitment programs
- ✓ Yakima Valley Community College, a Center of Excellence in Allied Health is establishing **a statewide health careers website aimed at youth** following Task Force subcommittee recommendations



# Retention Initiatives

- ✓ Incumbent worker training: Employment Security grants, federal grants: H1-B, Nursing Reinvestment Act, federal high demand funds
- ✓ Workplace career specialists
- ✓ Revolving funds for tuition for incumbent workers
- ✓ Washington Health Foundation: \$1 million dollar grant supported 7 projects in hospitals to improve nursing retention
- ✓ Skill panels sponsoring workshops; statewide nurse retention conferences



# Data Project for Targeting Resources

- ✓ The Workforce Board, in partnership with the Department of Health, contracted with the Social and Economic Science Research Center (SESRC) at Washington State University to assess available health care workforce data, determine gaps, and recommend a coordinated method for collection and maintenance
- ✓ The Task Force recommends collection of data on the supply of health care personnel, every two years, to all licensed health care practitioners (see 2006 priorities)
- ✓ The Workforce Board submitted a budget request to support this priority



## Health Skill Panels

- ✓ All 12 workforce development areas have local health skill panels consisting of local health care employers, labor and education representatives, convened by Workforce Development Councils
- ✓ Since 2002 skill panels have leveraged \$1.2 million federal dollars allocated by the Governor to raise over \$36 million dollars in other public and private funding to implement local priorities for addressing health care personnel shortages



## Health Skill Panels

- ✓ Pacific Mountain: Working with the military and the state nursing commission to recognize military training in the civilian health care work force
- ✓ Benton-Franklin: Provides health careers information to youth via *healthcarework.org*, in 2004 provided health summer camps for youth that included work-based learning and career decision-making support
- ✓ Olympic: Sponsored workshops on site at hospitals for 100 math and science teachers - provided context examples for using math and science in a health care setting; health careers camp for 30 high school students



## Health Skill Panels

- ✓ Tacoma-Pierce: Developed first-in-the-nation apprenticeship programs for health unit coordinator, computed tomography, and magnetic resonance imaging, created a satellite invasive cardiovascular technologist program; created nursing residency programs
- ✓ Eastern (7 counties): Sponsored health careers fairs for high school students; creating a health careers website
- ✓ Seattle-King: Youth nurse ladder program; Careers pathways program assists incumbent workers to move up the career ladder; developed a workplace literacy program customized to meet employer and incumbent worker needs



## Health Skill Panels

- ✓ North Central: Working with long-term care providers to build Nursing Assistant preparation and certification programs into school district careers pathway programs; provided \$50,000 in financial aid for 16 of 32 new nursing students
- ✓ Northwest: Received Governor's Best Practice Award in Workforce Development for work with school districts and colleges to recruit youth into health care programs; 200 middle and high school students attended health camps, 58 low-income and at-risk youth participated in internships, over 620 middle and high school students have participated in health careers fairs



## Health Skill Panels

- ✓ Snohomish: Developed articulation tool to assist students to transfer between nursing programs; provided incumbent worker training; provided program that connected health care employers and WorkSource staff
- ✓ Southwest WA: mapped educational needs for health care programs – faculty, pre-requisites, waiting lists; worked with the skills center and school district to expand health care careers pathways in K-12; hired a WorkSource career specialist at hospitals to assist incumbent workers achieve educational goals



## Health Skill Panels

- ✓ Tri-County: supported Farm Workers Clinic program to develop health careers pathways in K-12; hired a workSource career specialist at Yakima Valley Memorial Hospital to connect incumbent workers with educational opportunities; Senior Project seminar to be offered to 40 students on-site at the hospital; scholarships
- ✓ Spokane: Increased clinical site availability by 20% through coordination; identified nursing specialty programs needed; reduced pre-requisite waiting lists in anatomy and physiology



## Ad Hoc Committees

- ✓ **Core curricula committee:** Examined core curricula in health care programs in other states, and Yakima Valley Community College Washington's allied health core curricula. SBCTC will work with the colleges to expand articulation of the core
- ✓ **Faculty committees for nursing and allied health:** Examined national current local initiative; Made further recommendations for improving recruitment, retention, and diversity of faculty
- ✓ **Website committee:** Examined youth website in other states, Michigan's found to be a good model, Yakima Valley Community College with assistance from other partners will coordinate the development of this site



## 2006 Task Force Priorities

- Collect data on health workforce supply. This is critical to guide cost effective workforce planning (budget appropriation needed)
- Provide funds to health care education and training programs to expand capacity and allow for the higher costs of providing these programs (support budget requests)
- Increase availability, diversity, and retention of health care faculty in high demand health care programs that have difficulty recruiting faculty (support school programs to increase recruitment and retention and budget requests)



## Task Force 2006 Priorities (continued...)

- Provide health career exploration and adequately prepare youth for postsecondary health care programs ([more health programs in high schools, work-based learning, youth website](#))
- Increase efficiency in health care education and training programs ([expand Yakima Valley Community College's core curricula in allied health to other colleges and programs](#))
- Enable local areas to address their priority shortages ([support budget request for skill panels](#))



For publications and other information go to the Task Force web page at:

**<http://www.wtb.wa.gov/healthcaretaskforce2.html>**

For further information please contact

Madeleine Thompson, Lead Staff to the Task Force

Telephone: (360) 753-5653

Email: [mthompson@wtb.wa.gov](mailto:mthompson@wtb.wa.gov)

**The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board**



December 2005

## **Competency-based Transfer Pilot Project – Final Report Executive Summary**

### **Background**

In 2003, the legislature and governor enacted House Bill 1909 to create a pilot project on competency-based transfer between two- and four-year colleges and universities. The legislation directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to select institutions to define transfer requirements in several disciplines on the basis of students' skills and knowledge. Eastern Washington University and the two community colleges in Spokane, which volunteered to undertake the project, began the pilot in fall 2003. The participating institutions, in collaboration with the Higher Education Coordinating Board, were directed to report on the progress and status of the project to the legislative higher education committees by December 1, 2005. This report, subject to the approval of the HECB, is intended to fulfill that requirement.

Competency-based transfer is described in the statute as “the knowledge, skills and abilities students should possess in order to enter an upper division program in a particular academic discipline.” In contrast to the current system, it does not necessarily involve “seat time” or the successful completion of a specified number of classes as a measure of student achievement and preparation for transfer. Rather, students must demonstrate that they have mastered the necessary knowledge through a series of assessments. The objective of the legislation was to create a pilot project that explored how these “competencies” could be developed and assessed so that they could be used as the basis for transfer evaluation and admission to upper division programs.

Eastern Washington University, Spokane Falls Community College and Spokane Community College collaborated throughout the project with the HECB, the Council of Presidents (COP), and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC). Academic leadership and faculty from the three colleges identified criminal justice, elementary education, and computer information systems as the pilot project disciplines. Faculty from the two- and four-year institutions worked together to reach agreements on the core competencies in each major, as summarized below:

### **Summary of selected academic disciplines**

Criminal Justice: Faculty at EWU developed a list of expected competencies for two foundational criminal justice courses: Basic Research Methods and Introduction to Statistics. When they developed an assessment tool and administered it to both EWU students and a limited

number of community college students, they found the community college students were not exposed to enough instruction in statistics or research methods to attain the skills they needed to transfer.

Computer Information Systems: Faculty at EWU aligned the entire curriculum to conform to national standards in computer information systems education and have shared updated course descriptions with the community colleges. This standards-based information will, in turn, be used to align community college coursework with the expectations for entry to computer information systems majors at EWU. All students are currently required to pass a placement test before they requesting junior status in the department.

Elementary Education: Faculty from EWU, SFCC, and SCC developed competencies for the Introduction to Education classes that are taught at all three institutions. Faculty workgroups made preliminary recommendations regarding assessment of students but did not test them.

## **Findings and recommendations**

Developing a statewide competency-based transfer system would take significant investment of funding and faculty and staff time. However, most competency-based initiatives are too new to have produced outcome data that would indicate whether students are actually moving through the system more efficiently and effectively than through the current system, which requires the completion of specific academic credits. Thus, policy makers have little data with which to evaluate the prospective value of the large new investment that would be needed to refocus the current transfer system. It is therefore the joint recommendation of the pilot project participants and the Higher Education Coordinating Board to maintain the current system until outcome data from groups that are defining competencies can be subjected to cost/benefit analyses.

In the meantime, if the legislature finds that the pilot project should be expanded statewide, or, on a more limited basis, to other academic disciplines, the HECB and the participating institutions recommend the following steps be taken:

- The state should allocate funding to support planning at the state level and to expand opportunities for ongoing communication between two- and four-year faculty;
- Institutions should develop competencies for the general education requirements that are required for most transfer students, regardless of their desired majors;
- Institutions should develop oversight committees to designate and/or update competencies and design student assessments;
- The departments at receiving four-year institutions must describe the standard body of knowledge required for entry into their programs; and
- Four-year institutions should communicate their expectations to transfer students early in their community college careers so that they can pursue coursework that will adequately prepare them for transfer.

December 2005

## **Competency-based Transfer Pilot Project Final Report on House Bill 1909**

### **Background**

In approving HB 1909 (see Appendix C) during the 2003 session, the legislature found that “the focus of transfer between institutions of higher education has been on students’ accumulation of credits” to certify student achievement and preparation for entry into junior/senior level coursework. The accumulation of these course credits varies by institution and academic discipline because the courses “necessary for entry to each successive level of higher education” have been individually identified by each institution (HB 1909, Sec. 1). It was the legislature’s intent to change the focus of transfer from accumulation of course credit to defining and recognizing student skills and knowledge.

Competency-based transfer is based on defining and assessing the skills and abilities students must possess to enter upper division courses in a particular discipline. In contrast to the current system, it does not necessarily involve “seat time” or the successful completion of a specified number of classes as a measure of student achievement and preparation for transfer. Rather, students must demonstrate that they have mastered the necessary knowledge through a series of assessments that certify transfer readiness.

Competency-based transfer initiatives are becoming increasingly prevalent within higher education because access to learning opportunities is greater now than at any previous time. In short, students are obtaining education differently than they did in the past. Whether students are entering college later or returning to college later in life, taking courses through interactive television or on-line, or acquiring skills and knowledge through their jobs; they are learning “anytime, anyplace, anywhere” and increasingly want academic credit for the competencies they have gained through life experience.

House Bill 1909 directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to “recruit and select institutions of higher education to participate in a pilot project to define transfer standards in selected disciplines on the basis of student competencies”. The legislation requires that the pilot project participants, in collaboration with the Higher Education Coordinating Board, “report to the higher education committees of the legislature by December 1, 2005, on the progress and

status of the pilot project. The report is to identify any barriers encountered by the project and make recommendations for next steps in developing a competency-based transfer system for higher education.

The Higher Education Coordinating Board worked with the Council of Presidents (COP) and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) to identify one public baccalaureate and two community colleges “that regularly transfer a substantial number of students to that four-year institution” to participate in the pilot project. Eastern Washington University (EWU), Spokane Community College (SCC), and Spokane Falls Community College (SFCC) volunteered to serve as the pilot project participants. HB 1909 also directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board to recruit “one or more private career colleges that prepare students in the academic disciplines selected under the pilot project”. The Art Institute of Seattle and Crown College volunteered to participate.<sup>1</sup>

Once the participants were identified, academic leadership of these institutions worked internally and with the Higher Education Coordinating Board to identify academic disciplines. The disciplines were selected based on their student demand, employer need, volume of transfer students, and potential links with career colleges, as well as faculty willingness to participate. Elementary education, criminal justice, and computer information systems were selected.

The project was managed by a steering committee that included representatives from the Higher Education Coordinating Board, Council of Presidents, and State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, as well as faculty members, academic leadership, and staff from the pilot schools and private career colleges. The steering committee was responsible for developing a working definition of competency-based transfer that would guide the work of the faculty workgroups. In addition, the committee participated in the selection of disciplines for the pilot, the identification of faculty work groups, and the identification of proprietary partner institutions.

Faculty work groups from each of the selected disciplines met regularly and included representatives from the two-year and four-year institutions. Each group included a lead faculty member who reported monthly to the steering committee. The faculty groups were charged by the steering committee with defining the competencies required for major-specific entry at the junior level and with developing methods to assess whether students adequately met those standards.

---

<sup>1</sup> \*Identifying the private career colleges was difficult and required more time than originally anticipated, which resulted in the schools being selected *after* the steering committee selected the pilot project majors. Therefore, only Crown College had an academic discipline connection to the pilot project. Representatives from both colleges, however, played integral roles in the pilot project’s implementation.

## **Pilot Project Objectives**

The steering committee agreed in March 2004 that the working definition of competency-based transfer would be, “what students need to know or learn at the lower division to properly prepare for entry into a major at the upper division”. The objective of this work was to create a pilot project that explored how these competencies could be developed and assessed so they could be used as the basis for transfer evaluation and admission.

HB 1909 specified that two and four-year institutions would have separate, but closely related tasks. Section 3 directed the four-year institutions to work in collaboration with the two-year institutions to “define the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should possess in order to enter an upper division program in a particular academic discipline”.

Once the competencies were defined, the institutions providing the lower-division preparation (predominantly two-year schools) were responsible for certifying that a student met the expected standards. The institutions were granted the flexibility to determine how to assess whether students met the standards; however, House Bill 1909 did specify that the assessments, “need not be based on completion of particular courses or accumulation of credits” (Section 3).

The HECB, the steering committee, and the faculty work groups were advised that no funding would be allocated to the project. Section 4 of the legislation stated that development costs for the project would be absorbed within existing institution and agency budgets. For this reason, the steering committee and faculty work groups decided that the work of the pilot project would include defining only the competencies specific to the major, rather than those gained through general education requirements. For instance, faculty did not pinpoint competencies gained through coursework in English composition, though it is part of the required coursework for transfer preparation. They did, however, identify competencies for introduction to education coursework, since it is specific to an elementary education major. Pilot projects participants agreed that identifying general education competencies would be too expensive and time consuming to be readily absorbed within existing budgets.

## **Faculty Workgroup Outcomes**

### **Criminal Justice**

Faculty from the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at EWU worked together with the faculty at SFCC and SCC to identify competencies necessary to enter the department with junior-level status. A list of faculty workgroup members is listed in Appendix A.

The group determined that they would identify competencies in two, 200-level courses at EWU specific to the criminal justice major, rather than competencies gained through general education coursework. The courses were Integrated Research Methods in the Social Sciences and

Introduction to Statistics. Two faculty committees were established at EWU to identify competencies in each subject area. They are listed below in Table 1.1. A complete listing of the competencies is included in the faculty committee's final report included in Appendix B1.

**Table 1.1**  
**Required Competencies for Students Entering Criminal Justice Majors**

Course	Competencies
Introduction to Statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acquire concepts basic to descriptive statistics</li> <li>• Appropriately select, interpret, and calculate values of measures</li> <li>• Understand the areas underlying hypothesis testing and errors</li> <li>• Appropriately select, interpret the results, and perform necessary calculations for inferential tests.</li> </ul>
Integrated Research Methods in the Social Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand the scientific method as it is currently applied in social scientific research</li> <li>• Understand ethics of social scientific research</li> <li>• Be familiar with the basic principles of disciplinary writing in the social sciences</li> <li>• Interpret and critique published research on a particular topic</li> <li>• Create a research design to explore social scientific research question</li> <li>• Assemble bibliography of published research</li> </ul>

Faculty committees developed pilot tests to assess whether students had mastered the competencies listed above. The exams included multiple choice, matching, and short essay questions administered by hand (i.e. they were not computerized). The pilot tests were not integrated into classroom work, rather they were intended to stand alone to certify that students had mastered the course content. For example, if a student were to pass the tests, they would have effectively 'tested out' of the 200-level coursework and would be well prepared for entry into a Criminal Justice Major. The full examinations can be found in Appendix B1.

Once the pilot tests were developed, they were administered to three sections of the Introduction to Statistics class and one section of the Research Methods course, both at EWU<sup>2</sup>. The faculty committees used this testing data to develop appropriate scoring methods for each competency. Once the scoring methodology had been established, the examinations were sent to SFCC and SCC to be given to samples of community college students who intended to be Criminal Justice majors. Spokane Falls Community College administered the exam and returned ten completed tests to the faculty committees at EWU.

<sup>2</sup> The pilot test was given to a total of 92 students enrolled in the Introduction to Statistics course at EWU and 38 students enrolled in Research Methods.

## Findings

Analysis of the pilot tests from SFCC indicate that no students achieved competency in statistics or research methods, see Table 1.2 below. However, Criminal Justice majors at SFCC are not required to take courses in statistics or research methods and likely had not been exposed to the material through coursework or life experience. This suggests that competency expectations must be clearly articulated to community college faculty, so they can align curriculum (including opportunities for self-study) to the competencies necessary for entry into four-year institutions.

**Table 1.2**  
**Results of Competency Testing for Criminal Justice Majors**

School	Course	Number of Students Tested	Total Points Possible on Test	Average Points Scored
EWU	Statistics	92	18	9
SFCC	Statistics	10	18	6
EWU	Research Methods	38	30	24
SFCC	Research Methods	10	30	9

It is also of note that some students came very close to achieving transfer competency, based on their score on the pilot tests. These students had taken four or more classes in the social sciences or two classes in mathematics, suggesting that students who take more social science and math courses are higher achievers in competency testing. At a minimum, this indicates that with a modest increase of statistics and research methods content in courses, it may be possible for students to acquire a sufficient amount of knowledge to attain transfer competency. Augmenting current required coursework with self-study options could also better prepare students.

## Elementary Education

The Elementary Education faculty workgroup met together for the first time on November 8, 2004, and held subsequent meetings on November 18, 2004; February 4, 2005; and March 16, 2005. The group communicated predominantly via e-mail between meetings to facilitate agreement on shared competencies. Appendix A contains a list of faculty workgroup members.

The group agreed that their main goal was to match competencies gained through the “Introduction to Education” courses taught at SCC, SFCC, and the counterpart course taught at EWU.<sup>3</sup> This course was identified as a ‘basic survey course’ that explored a broad range of issues relating to the teaching profession. It was selected for the pilot project because it not only imparts principals that lay a solid foundation for future educators to master upper-division coursework necessary to become successful educators; but it also provides enough breadth to allow students to explore a teaching career and realize it may not be the right career choice for

---

<sup>3</sup> The introduction to education course at SFCC is ED 202-Survey of Education, at SCC it is ED 201-Introduction to Education. At EWU, the course is entitled EDUC 201 – Introduction to Education.

them. Faculty members state in their final report, “the legislative goal of efficiency is better achieved when our collective students embark on the right career path early in their educational experience”. Appendix B2 contains a complete version of the group’s final report.

At the second meeting, faculty members began to discuss the commonalities embedded in their respective coursework. The group identified five broad subject areas covered in their introduction classes, which included the following:

- Philosophy and history of public education
- Legal, ethical, and moral issues faced by educators
- State and national standards for curricula development
- Teaching strategies and the need for continuous professional development
- Challenges of teaching to a diverse student population

Faculty then began the work of articulating competency statements based on these broad subject areas. The group also discussed how the competencies should be integrated into standards specified in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). The faculty workgroup focused on aligning competencies for a common entry course, rather than creating a ‘stand alone’ assessment. Therefore, the following table lists the shared competencies for the Introduction to Education course, as well as potential assessment tools tied to course completion.

**Table 1.3**  
**Required Competencies for Students Entering Elementary Education**

<b>Competency Statement</b>	<b>Assessment Tool</b>
Articulate a personal philosophy of education based on knowledge of historical, philosophical, and social foundations of education.	Philosophy of education essay
Explain school organizational structure and the importance of partnerships among educators, parents, students, community agencies, and potential employers.	Reading quiz and class discussion
Articulate the roles and responsibilities of educators as well as the personal and professional qualities of successful educators.	Reading quiz, class discussion, and reflection on portfolio artifacts.
Describe the legal, ethical, and moral issues related to the education of all children	Pre-practicum requirements, current issues, and school law assignments
Demonstrate an understanding of learning and human development and respect for linguistic, gender, cultural, and ethnic diversity represented among children, families, and colleagues	Lesson plan activities
Practice reflective thinking on beliefs, attitudes, and actions, as well as documenting continuous professional growth	Development of professional portfolio

Observe, identify, demonstrate, and evaluate teaching strategies, methods, and assessments that accommodate the needs of all learners in a typical classroom; relate the Grade Level Expectations and Essential Academic Learning Requirements of the State of Washington.	Development of professional portfolio
Make tentative decision on education as a career choice	Development of professional portfolio

**Barriers**

The faculty group identified three barriers to completing the pilot project. The first related to EWU faculty availability and meeting attendance. Given that many of the EWU faculty members were absent from the project meetings, the team had to rely on course syllabi, rather than in-depth cross-institutional conversations. The group did not have a list of specified competencies from EWU, which negatively impacted their ability to refine the broad competencies listed above. This suggests that expansion of the project would entail a commitment, from both two and four-year sectors, to honor professional obligations throughout the duration of the project.

The lack of faculty participation was likely related to the second barrier; the fact that the project did not include a budget for faculty incentives, meeting preparation, and meeting time. The lack of funding limited the project scope. For instance, faculty members concentrated their efforts on competencies specific to the major rather than on general education competencies because project tasks were added to the regular duties of faculty with full workloads. Though this barrier was specifically identified in the final report of the Elementary Education workgroup, each participating discipline noted that dedicated funding was necessary to expand competency-based transfer to more disciplines and institutions.

The third barrier related to the use of common terms, specifically the “disconnect” between terms used in a legislative environment versus those used by educators. National trends toward performance based programs in teacher education have begun to replace terminology used in competency-based models. Though the frameworks share overlapping themes, semantic differences could lead to different work products and outcomes.

**Computer Information Systems**

Faculty from EWU, SCC, and SFCC met together to explore competency-based transfer into an accredited computer information systems program at a four year institution at the junior level. A list of participating faculty can be found in Appendix A. During the time that faculty conversations regarding competency-based transfer were taking place, the Computer Science Department at EWU was in the midst of the accreditation renewal process. Academic leadership

decided to update its curriculum to conform more closely to national standards in computer science education.

The new standards adopted by EWU followed the model set by the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) Computing Curriculum for 2001 (CC2001). CC2001 is the de-facto standard for the courses and topics that should be taught in a computer science degree.

The body of knowledge is organized hierarchically into three levels. The highest level is the “area”. Each area, with the exception of Computational Science and Numerical Methods, is required as part of the core national standard.<sup>4</sup> The areas are broken down into smaller divisions called “units”, and the units are broken into a set of topics, which form the basis for core and elective coursework. Given the level of detail specified in the recommendations for the national standard, specific information regarding the competencies within each area can be found at <http://www.sigcse.org/cc2001/>.

As a result of the computer science program revision, EWU is writing descriptions for all courses in the revised program. The new descriptions for freshman, sophomore, and entry-level junior courses are being shared with faculty at SCC and SFCC. With the new standards-based information, community college faculty can align their coursework with the expectations for entry at EWU. Further, community colleges will have the ability to prepare their students for transfer without regard to the number of courses necessary for entry.

As with other disciplines, assessment is a key component in validating students’ knowledge. The computer science department at EWU has already developed and is administering an advancement exam. The exam is used to certify that students have mastered freshman- and sophomore-level competencies. All students (including both direct entry and transfers) are required to pass the exam before they can request junior status in the department and begin taking junior-level classes at EWU. The material on the advancement exam has been made available to SCC and SFCC, so they can align their curriculum to better prepare their students for the exam. The faculty workgroup agreed that adding additional testing at the community college level is also necessary.

## Barriers

The faculty work group relayed several concerns regarding potential barriers to increasing the scope of using competencies as the basis for transfer evaluation and admission. First, program content varies widely on an institution by institution basis, and faculty make decisions regarding what to include and exclude in courses. Thus, the body of knowledge required for entry is necessarily different.

---

<sup>4</sup> The CC2001 Task Force has defined the core requirements as those for which there is a broad consensus that the corresponding material is essential to anyone obtaining an undergraduate degree in the field. Units that are taught as part of the undergraduate program but which fall outside the core are considered to be elective. (ACM, CC2001 Task Force, Chapter 5, Section 1.1)

Second, even if a fundamental body of knowledge is demonstrated, programming language for core coursework used at the four-year institutions differs. Transfer students would be required to take remedial coursework or self-study electives in the language used by the four-year institution, despite demonstrating mastery of core curricular requirements.

Third, there could be friction between institutions over who gets to teach courses. In the face of rising education costs and shrinking resources, four-year institutions cannot sustain offering more costly, upper-division courses without the benefit of enrollment in cost-effective lower division courses.

Finally, the faculty workgroup noted that some four-year institutions may simply have standards beyond what community college students can readily attain. These four-year institutions may be unwilling to participate in competency-based transfer models.

## Recommendations

Participants in the pilot project saw value in a number of the steps involved in identifying competencies and student assessments. Faculty developed a better sense of the commonalities and differences embedded in their curricula. Ongoing communication between two- and four-year colleges sparked by this pilot project helped faculty to align curriculum and program expectations across institutions. This type of collaboration is also happening outside the competency-based transfer pilot through informal relationships and specific initiatives, like the development of targeted associate degrees for transfer students in specific academic fields.

Washington State already has a relatively efficient transfer system. Research by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges indicates that community college transfer students take an average of one additional quarter of credits more than their direct-entry counterparts on their way to a baccalaureate degree.<sup>5</sup> This demonstrated efficiency represents a significant finding, given that transfer students enter the state's higher education system in a different institution from where they finish. Developing a new statewide competency-based transfer system would take significant investment of funding, and faculty and staff time to address an efficiency issue that may not be as significant as originally thought. Other states that have undertaken this approach have spent several years and millions of dollars doing so.

The question then becomes, would the significant investment required to develop a statewide competency-based transfer system be justified given the potential for relatively modest returns? Using performance-based measures as a basis for transfer would be easier in some disciplines than others, but would still represent a significant challenge for the academic disciplines involved. For instance, those disciplines that already have defined state or national standards must still agree on how to assess them—a process that can often be the most difficult aspect of

---

<sup>5</sup> Source: State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and public university study, *Role of Transfer in the Bachelor's Degree at Washington Public Baccalaureate Institutions*, 2003.

competency based transfer. If the legislature does find that the competency pilot should be expanded, doing so in targeted disciplines would be a logical first step.

The largest (and most expensive) challenge in developing a new transfer system would be the definition and assessment of general education requirements. Many disciplines have extensive pre-major requirements fulfilled by general education coursework. This process would necessarily involve two- and four-year faculty from a wide swath of disciplines, i.e., composition, mathematics, social sciences, foreign language, to commit to several years of work. For example, faculty who developed competencies and assessments several years ago for the Western Governors University, met once a month for two consecutive days for three to four years. Costs associated with each meeting included faculty release time, staff time to plan and coordinate meetings, as well as expenses for facilities, food, and transportation.

Academic leadership and faculty at each four-year institution in Washington would need to replicate this process, since each is responsible for developing the coursework for their institution. Though there are broad similarities in curriculum across institutions, faculty members have the freedom to design their own competency expectations and curriculum to ensure that the quality of instruction in each discipline meets the requirements set by each institutions governing body. Thus, adopting a standard list of competencies developed by another group (Western Governor's University) for all public four-year institutions in Washington, would not be feasible.

Most competency-based initiatives are too new to have produced outcome data that would indicate whether students are actually moving through the system more efficiently. Thus, policy makers have little data with which to evaluate the degree to which efficiency would be increased given the large investment. As more data is developed, cost/benefit analyses could be conducted to assess whether the appropriations would result in helping more students attain their degree in the most cost effective way possible. Therefore, it is the Higher Education Coordinating Board's recommendation to delay the expansion of the pilot project to other disciplines and institutions, until outcome data can be analyzed from groups, such as the Western Governors University, who have defined general education requirements.

However, if the legislature does move forward to expand the pilot project to other institutions and disciplines, several recommendations from the faculty work groups should be followed.

## **Next Steps for Policy Makers:**

### **Allocate resources for planning at the state level**

The lack of funding for the pilot project appears to have prevented the participating institutions from making in-depth commitments to address the breadth of issues necessary to expand competency-based transfer to other disciplines and institutions. All pilot project faculty groups stated that identifying, assessing, and maintaining the applicability of competencies as the basis for transfer will require an on-going monetary commitment from the state. At a minimum,

funding to grant faculty course release time so they could adequately prepare for and participate in on-going planning meetings and committees, is essential if the project is to continue. Funding would also be necessary for travel, meeting facilities, and staff time to coordinate meetings. When HB 1909 was introduced in 2003, the cost of the pilot project was estimated at \$80,000 per year for one baccalaureate institution and two community colleges to define competencies specific to three majors.

### **Develop oversight committees to designate and update competencies and assessments**

Accurately defining and assessing the skills and abilities that undergraduates must master to transfer to a four-year institution is the key element in successful competency-based initiatives. Therefore, policy makers should instruct the public baccalaureates and community colleges to form standing committees to designate and update competencies and student assessments. The participants should mirror the pilot projects discipline-specific faculty committees, though membership should be expanded to include more faculty members, as well as external stakeholders. Their responsibilities could include the following:

- Establishing specific competencies required for all students for graduation;
- Maintaining the currency and quality of those competencies;
- Establishing the assessments that will be used to measure the competencies; and,
- Participating in program evaluations and accreditation renewals.

### **Next Steps for Institutions**

#### **Develop competencies for general education requirements**

While each major includes a core of coursework specific to a particular department, many of the requirements for upper-division major entry are fulfilled through general education requirements. The process of developing the competencies and the assessments is a long-term prospect. Based on nationally-established competency-based transfer models, on-going two- and four-year faculty conversations (both within and across disciplines) must be coupled with input from external stakeholders, like employers and outside professional practitioners, to identify general education competencies. In other settings, this process has taken roughly four years to complete.

#### **Expand opportunities for ongoing communication between two-year and four-year faculty**

Solid communication between sectors facilitates appropriate and timely adjustments to competency expectations and curricula. Faculty must honor their professional commitments to adequately prepare and attend planning meetings throughout the duration of the project. Further conversation could also help align programs across sectors to ensure that community college students are developing the appropriate competencies required for admission into four-year

institutions. On-going communication would also help faculty to adapt curricula to reflect changes to state and national standards. It is important to note that this step is already occurring outside the context of this pilot. Faculty and staff have been meeting via the development of the ‘major ready pathways’ as mandated in House Bill 2382. Communication between the sectors should continue, regardless of whether the competency based transfer pilot is expanded.

### **The departments at four-year institutions must develop a standard body of knowledge required for entry into their programs**

To ensure that competencies are both valid and reliable, with the aim of being fully “transportable” between institutions, competencies must be described in a uniform manner so they have the same meaning in a variety of contexts and for a variety of audiences. This work will include:

- Standardization of terminology so students, faculty, employers, and policy makers have a common understanding of shared terms and definitions
- Competencies must be defined at a sufficient level to be accurately assessed and aligned with state and national standards

### **Communicate expectations to students early in their community college careers**

Faculty and staff must communicate the specific skills and abilities that students must master if they intend to continue their studies at a four-year institution. In some cases, students may need to augment their core coursework with self-study, depending the discipline or institution to which they anticipate transfer.

## Competency Based Transfer Workgroup Participants

**Karin Hilgersom, SCC**  
Dean of Instruction for  
Liberal Arts and  
Vocational-Related  
Instruction

**Mike Mires, SCC**  
Dean of Instruction for  
Technical Education

**Mary OFury, SCC**  
Acting Dean of  
Instruction: Business,  
Hospitality & Information

**Jim Minkler, SFCC**  
Dean of Humanities and  
Social Sciences

**Marcus Jorgensen, SFCC**  
Dean of Business,  
Computing, Math and  
Science

**Ron Dalla, EWU**  
Interim Provost

**Val Appleton, EWU**  
Dean of the College of  
Education and Human  
Development

**Brian Spraggins, EWU**  
Director of Community  
College Relations

**Nina Oman, HECB**  
Associate Director, Fiscal  
& Policy

**Mick Brzoska, EWU**  
Associate Dean of the  
College of Science, Math  
and Technology

**Joe Dunlap, SCC**  
Vice President for  
Learning

**Pam Praeger, SFCC**  
Vice President of Learning

**Peg Gerber**  
Art Institute of Seattle

**Karen McDaniel, EWU**  
Director of Undergraduate  
Programs and Field  
Experiences

**Thomas Capaul, EWU**  
Computer Science Faculty

**Betsy Clewett, EWU**  
Education Department  
Chair

**David Cornelius, EWU**  
Acting Dean of the College  
of Social and Behavioral  
Sciences

**Scott Dawson, SCC**  
Department Chair of  
Computer Information  
Systems

**Randel Jones, Crown  
College**  
Criminal Justice Faculty

**Linda Kelly, SFCC**  
Sociology Faculty

**Dale Lindekugel, EWU**  
Criminal Justice Faculty

**Darrell Mihara, SFCC**  
Dean of Workforce  
Education and Distance  
Learning

**John Mill, SFCC**  
Computer Science Faculty

**Judy Noel, SFCC**  
Education Faculty

**Dennis Olson, SCC**  
Education Faculty

**Loretta Seppanen,  
SBCTC**  
Assistant Director,  
Education Services

**Andi Smith, HECB**  
Academic Policy Analyst

**Gary Johns, SCC**  
Law Enforcement Faculty

**Cindy Morana, COP**  
Associate Director

## **Final Report: Criminal Justice**

### **Report**

#### **Criminal Justice Competency-Based Transfer Project**

#### **Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice**

#### **Eastern Washington University**

#### **Preparers:**

**David Cornelius, Interim Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences**

**Dale Lindekugel, Chair, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice**

**Leonard Stern, Chair, Statistics Committee, CSBS**

**Jeff Stafford, Research Methods Committee member and instructor**

**Linda Kelley, Criminal Justice faculty, SFCC**

### **Overview of Project**

The Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at Eastern Washington University participated in a project with community colleges in Spokane and Bellevue, Washington to determine the feasibility of measuring competencies in Criminal Justice to determine the transfer of credits toward a four year degree. It was planned that the competencies from three courses be specified and measured by paper and pencil tests in a pilot test of students at EWU, SFCC, SCC and BCC. The courses were: Introduction to Criminal Justice, Integrated Research Methods in the Social Sciences, and Introduction to Statistics. Due to the loss of a significant faculty member in Criminal Justice program at the beginning of the project, it was determined to remove the Introduction to Criminal Justice course from the pilot test and postpone until the following year.

Two committees were established at EWU, the Statistics Committee and the Research Methods Committee, to develop the expected competencies and a pilot examination. Once the examinations were developed, they were taken by three sections of the statistics class at EWU (92 students) and one section of the Research Methods course (38 students). These data were used to help determine the scoring methods for competency. The pilot tests were sent to the community colleges to be given to samples of students who plan to be Criminal Justice majors. Ten of these exams were taken by SFCC students and returned. We are waiting for the samples from SCC and BCC. Using the exams that have been returned, an analysis was done to determine the feasibility of this method of transfer. It was determined that students are not presently getting enough statistics or research methods in the community colleges to attain competency transfer. However, it was clear that students who had taken more social science courses and math courses were higher achievers in the competency testing. It may be possible to add more statistics and research methods content to present courses or to provide a self-study approach for students to prepare for these competencies.

## Summary of Accomplishments

Both the Statistics Committee and the Research Methods Committee developed a set of competencies to be measured and the pilot tests for these competencies. The sample pilot tests are included in the appendices at the end of this report. The specific competencies with the designated questions for measurement are listed in the tables below.

---

**Table 1**

---

### Competencies for Introductory Statistics

---

1. Acquire concepts basic to descriptive statistics that allow
    - a. classifying variables
    - b. organizing raw data into tables and graphs
  
  2. Appropriately select, interpret, and calculate values of measures that describe
    - a. key properties of distributions
    - b. a score's relative standing in a distribution
    - c. the degree of association between pairs of variables
  
  3. Understand the ideas underlying
    - a. hypothesis testing
    - b. errors in testing hypotheses
    - c. statistical power
  
  4. Appropriately select, interpret the results of, and perform necessary calculations for inferential tests that
    - a. compare a single sample mean to a known population mean
    - b. compare 2 sample means
    - c. compare 2 or more sample means of a single factor (One-way ANOVA)
    - d. compare means of 2 factors in a factorial (Two-way ANOVA) design
    - e. assess the relation between 2 nominally-scaled variables
- 

A set of 18 multiple-choice questions was developed to assess these four competency areas. The correspondence between the competency areas listed in Table 1 and the assessment questions is shown in Table 2. The questions can be found in Appendix A.

**Table 2**

**Statistics Competencies and Related Pilot Test Questions**

---

<b>Question #</b>	<b>Competencies</b>
5,17	1a. classifying variables
9,16	1b. organizing raw data into tables and graphs
2,6	2a. key properties of distributions
1,8	2b. a score's relative standing in a distribution
7,14	2c. the degree of association between pairs of variables
4	3a. hypothesis testing
3,11	3b. errors in testing hypotheses
15	3c. statistical power
none	4a. compare a single sample mean to a known population mean
18	4b. compare 2 sample means
13	4c. compare 2 or more samples of a single factor
10	4d. compare means of 2 factors in a factorial (Two-way
12	4e. assess the relation between 2 nominally-scaled variables

---

The Research Methods Committee developed 6 measurable competencies and a four part examination to measure them. They are listed in Table 3 below.

**Table 3**

**Research Methods Competencies and Performance Measures**

<b>Conceptual Area</b>	<b>Competencies</b>	<b>Performance Measures</b>
<u>Philosophy of Methods</u>	<p>1. Students will understand the scientific method as it is currently applied in social science research.</p> <p>2. Students will understand ethics as applied to social sciences research.</p>	<p>Matching Part 1 5 Points</p> <p>The students should be able to match the different paradigms with the defining questions.</p>
<u>The Language of Methods</u>	<p>3. Students will be familiar with basic principles of disciplinary writing in the social sciences</p>	<p>Definitions Part 2 10 Points</p> <p>Random selection of 5 essential terms that student must define – 70% required.</p>
<u>Methodological Concepts</u>	<p>4. Students will interpret and critique published social science research on a particular topic.</p>	<p>Multiple Choice Part 3</p> <p>5 multiple choice Questions – 5 Points</p>
<u>Application</u>	<p>5. Students will be able to create a research design/ plan for exploring a social sciences research question.</p> <p>6. Students will be able to assemble a bibliography of published social sciences research on a particular topic.</p>	<p>Situational Short Essay Part 4</p> <p>Worth 10 points, student must score at least a 7.</p>

## Results and Analysis

The results of the testing of EWU students in the designated classes and the SFCC students who are planning to major in Criminal Justice but have not had the designated classes are listed below in Table 4.

---

Table 4

---

### Results of Pilot Competency Tests

---

School	Course	Number	Mean	Std. Dev.	Median
EWU	Statistics	92	8.48	2.32	9
SFCC	Statistics	10	5.90	1.37	6
EWU	Research Methods	38	24.28	3.58	24
SFCC	Research Methods	10	8.80	5.07	9

---

Note: EWU number of students is high because whole classes were used; SFCC number of students is low because only a sample of students was taken.

As the results indicate, no SFCC students have achieved competency in statistics or research methods at this time. This is not surprising, since there are no required courses in statistics or research methods at the community colleges for criminal justice students. There were some students who were close to achieving competency. These students had three or more classes in the social sciences (Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology) or math (Math 115). This indicates it may be possible for students to acquire a sufficient amount of knowledge in the courses available and with guidance for self-learning could pass the competency examinations without taking the specific required classes in statistics and research methods. See Table 5 on the following page.

**Table 5**

**Competency Results Compared to Number of Relevant Classes Taken by SFCC Sample**

<b>Number of Relevant Classes Taken</b>	<b>Statistics Score</b>	<b>Research Methods Score</b>
4 classes (no math)	5	19*
4 classes (no math)	4	14
2 classes (with math)	8*	9
2 classes (no math)	6	9
2 classes (no math)	7	4
2 classes (no math)	7	5
2 classes (no math)	4	10
2 classes (no math)	5	11
1 class (no math)	6	4
1 class (no math)	7	3

\* near competency

The students with four social science classes had scores on the research methods examinations that were near competency. The one student with a Math 115 class also was close to achieving competency in the statistics examination. These results will be clearer when we get further samples returned.

## **Problems Encountered**

The major problem with this approach is that competency tests need to be developed, coordinated with course content and objectives, validated, administered, and scored, with security measures in place. For the pilot test we used existing committees at EWU to do this process. If this becomes a standard process, then structure will have to be created to coordinate and monitor these procedures.

## **Recommendations for Project Continuation**

This is a viable approach to transfer if these recommendations are followed:

- (1) All competencies must be distributed to community college students early in their community college careers so that they can set learning goals.
- (2) Social science course work at the community college level should be encouraged to include some work concerning the competencies in these two areas – research methods and statistics.
- (3) The competencies need to be distributed to faculty teaching in the social sciences areas.
- (4) A test bank needs to be developed with items that have been tested through item analysis to assure validity and discrimination.
- (5) This approach will work for Criminal Justice but may not work in a discipline that requires a stronger emphasis in research methods and statistics, e.g. Psychology and Sociology/
- (6) Coordinating committees need to be established at the community colleges and the four year institutions to run this process.

Appendix A



Statistics Competency Assessment

For each question below, circle the letter (a-d) that corresponds to the best answer.

1. If scores in a distribution are converted to z-scores, the mean of the z-distribution will be
  - a. 1
  - b. the same as the original population's meanZ
  - c. 100
  
2. The measure of central tendency that reports the value of the score in a distribution that occurs most frequently is known as the
  - a. median
  - b. mean
  - c. mode
  - d. root mean square
  
3. Rejecting a null hypothesis that is true is known as
  - a. the power of a test
  - b. a type I error
  - c. a type II error
  - d. beta
  
4. A theoretical distribution of possible values of a sample statistic is called
  - a. the standard bell curve
  - b. the standard error of the mean
  - c. a sampling distribution
  - d. a sample
  
5. The number of students in any class is an example of a
  - a. continuous quantitative variable
  - b. a discrete quantitative variable
  - c. an ordered qualitative variable
  - d. an unordered qualitative variable
  
6. The best measure for describing the variability of a skewed quantitative variable is the
  - a. range
  - b. variance
  - c. standard deviation
  - d. interquartile range
  
7. The  $r^2$  value of two perfectly correlated variables will be
  - a. -1
  - b. 1
  - c. 0
  - d. none of the above

8. The percent of scores in a distribution that have values equal to or less than the value of a given score is known as the
- a. percentile rank  
b. z-score  
c. percentile point  
d. none of the above
9. A suitable graphical technique for displaying the distribution of heights of students in a class is
- a. a bar graph  
b. a pie chart  
→ c. a histogram  
d. a Venn diagram
10. In a two factor analysis of variance, the effect of one factor on the dependent variable, disregarding the effect of the other factor on the dependent variable, is known as
- a. the null effect  
b. a simple effect  
c. an interaction  
→ d. a main effect
11. In the conclusion of a hypothesis test, the expression,  $p < .05$  indicates
- a. the probability of the conclusion being correct is less than 5%.  
b. the probability of having made any error is less than 5%  
c. the probability of having made a type 2 error is less than 5%  
→ d. the probability of having made a type 1 error is less than 5%
12. A chi square test of independence is used to determine if
- a. a single mean differs from a known value  
b. two normally distributed populations have different means  
c. two normally distributed populations have different variances  
→ d. two nominally-scaled variables are related
13. An appropriate statistical test to determine if the means of three independent, normally distributed populations are not all identical is
- a. the analysis of variance  
b. a t-test for independent samples  
c. a t-test for paired (correlated) samples  
d. a Mann-Whitney U test
14. Which of the following statistics expresses the proportion of variance in one variable that we can explain or remove using knowledge of another variable?
- a. t  
b. z  
c. F  
→ d.  $r^2$

15. The power of a statistical test is affected by
- a. the sample size
  - b. whether a test is directional or non-directional
  - c. the size of alpha
  - d. all of the above

16. In the following table:

Class Interval	Midpoint	Frequency	Relative Frequency
33-35	34	1	.10
30-32	31	3	.30
27-29	28	4	.40
24-26	25	2	.20
		N=10	

- the size of each class interval is
- a. 2
  - b. 2.5
  - c. 3
  - d. 3.5
17. An example of a nominal measurement scale is
- a. running speed as measured by order of finishing a race
  - b. temperature as measured in degrees Fahrenheit
  - c. a person's gender as measured by the values male and female
  - d. speed of a car as measured in miles per hour

18. Students' blood pressure is measured both before and after they exercise. The best test to perform to determine if exercise affects blood pressure is a
- a. single sample z-test
  - b. two-factor ANOVA
  - c. t-test for independent samples
  - d. t-test for paired (correlated) samples

**Appendix B**

**Methods Competency Based Assessment Pilot Exam**  
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences: EWU  
May 2005

**Part 1: Matching (5 points)**

Instructions: Matching the following questions with the conceptual terms

1. \_\_\_\_ Do we need others to be ourselves?
2. \_\_\_\_ Do you have to be one to know one?
3. \_\_\_\_ Do people in different cultures live in different worlds?
4. \_\_\_\_ Does our culture or society make us what we are?
5. \_\_\_\_ Must we assume others are rationale?

- A. Rationalism
- B. Objectivism
- C. Perspectivism
- D. Holism
- E. Atomism
- F. Solipsism
- G. Multiculturalism

**Part 2 Definitions (10 points)**

Write a short definition for the term below.

6. Causation

7. Confounding factor

8. Focus Group

9. Operational Definition

10. Validity

**Part 3: Multiple Choice (5 points)**

Instructions: Choose the best answer

11. Which is an advantage of ethnographic research?
- A. You can reach large numbers of people
  - B. You can see the big picture
  - C. You can develop a relationship with the participant
  - D. You can control subject matter
12. Triangulation is the use of more than one method in a study. We do this for many reasons. The most important is:
- A. It helps us to quantify the data through the law of triangles.
  - B. It helps us to be more efficient in our research.
  - C. It helps us to verify the findings from one method to another
  - D. It helps us to get the research published
  - E. It helps us to add data to the study.
13. Which is the better size for a focus group?
- A. 2-4 participants
  - B. 5-6 participants
  - C. 7-12 participants
  - D. 10-15 participants
14. For causation to occur two things must happen. The first is that you have a correlation of some sort between the variables. The second is:
- A. The two things are related in some way
  - B. You have a theoretical reason to believe that there is a causal order
  - C. The population you are studying has been correlated
  - D. The sample you are studying is small
  - E. You have evidence that shows the condition of confounding variables.
15. Which step is the most important of the 6 steps of planning?
- A. Develop and Refine Your Questions
  - B. State Your Purpose
  - C. Think about and plan the Logistics
  - D. Anticipate Problems
  - E. Develop Major Agenda Items
  - F. Structure the Questions in a Logical Order

**Part 4: Essay (10 Points)**

Question 1. Part 1. You have been asked by the Director of the Alumni Association at EWU to help to conduct a series of Focus Groups of alumni. But everyone in the Alumni Association does not understand what a focus group is.

You are going to go to a meeting where you will define what focus group research is and give an example of how to use it.

The Director of the Alumni Association has asked you to prepare a handout describing the process in some detail.

Question 1. Part 2. In the same meeting you will be asked to tell the group the best way to get a sample of participants for the study. You should assume that the Focus Groups are to be conducted in Spokane, the Tri Cities and Seattle. Assume that the Alumni Association is only interested in people who have graduated in 1990 to the present day.

Make some suggestions about how many groups in the different locations, their make-up and what some of the problems might be. Also lay out what questions you would ask them to help you to answer the question.

## Final Report: Elementary Education

### General Summary:

The Elementary Education core group (consisting of faculty and deans) met together for the first time on Monday, November 8, 2004. Our first main goal was identified: Competencies of Education 201 should match competencies of its counterpart course at EWU (meeting minutes 11/8/04 and 11/18/04). We thus agreed to develop shared competencies for the Introduction to Education course taught at both SFCC/SCC and at EWU. The selection of this particular course also made sense from the legislative point of view. A summary of the legislative intent of this project includes:

1. Establishing shared competencies in appropriate courses leads to consistency of general core courses and eases transfer among institutions;
2. Pinpointing competencies allows institutions to offer credit to those who *demonstrate competencies* by nontraditional means, and this may eliminate duplicative costs to the state for work already completed by students;
3. To be provided with answers to the following questions from the standpoint of elementary education degree preparation: “What do students need to know or learn at the lower division to properly prepare for entry into a major/program at the upper division?” “How will the competencies be assessed?”

Selection of the Introduction to Elementary Education course for this project also made sense from the perspective of what the students need. Students at the community college level are often in the process of exploring career choices while earning their Associate of Arts degree. This exploration is often true of incoming freshman at EWU as well. In addition to laying a solid foundation for our future educators, the Introduction to Education course allows students to explore teaching careers in an in-depth and thought provoking way. For many students, this leads to a firm commitment to teaching. Many students also learn from the basic survey course that the education courses to follow at the upper division level are relevant, and that these future courses include competencies that students should master in order to become successful educators. For a smaller group of students enrolled in Introduction to Education, the course affords enough depth for students to realize *early on* that a teaching career is **not** for them. The legislative goal of efficiency is better achieved when our collective students embark on the right career path early in their educational experience.

During the November 2004 meeting the team also decided on two long-term goals that could result from our collaborative effort. The additional goals included:

- 1) Learning communities: EWU will explore using learning communities for education majors. Math and science would be a part of this, along with a new biology course targeting education majors. An education survey course could be linked to biology and study skills in preparation for the West E. Work has already been done between faculty in the

Science and Math areas to develop courses target and improve K-12 teacher preparation programs in these subject areas. *SFCC has already offered learning communities that link study skills to academic areas. In addition, SCC successfully offered a team taught combination of Environmental Biology coupled with Math for Liberal Arts, Spring Quarter 2005, and will continue to do so on an annual basis.*

- 2) A commitment to work together and seek flexible transfer opportunities that have a competency — based emphasis.

The next meeting occurred on February 4, 2005. Although the meeting was poorly attended, the attendees began to discuss the commonalities embedded in our respective Introduction to Education courses. The team quickly realized that for all three institutions the course is a survey course that explores the philosophy and history of public education, as well as the legal, ethical, and moral issues faced by educators. The course also allows college students to explore the field of contemporary teaching, including state and national standards for curricula, the need for continuous professional development of teachers and teaching strategies, and the challenges of teaching to a diverse student population on a variety of levels. We agreed to set another meeting time and to “collaborate around the development of a common competency-based course, EDUC 201 Introduction to Education, for our three institutions.”

The third meeting occurred at EWU on Wednesday, March 16, 2005. The team mapped out broad and general competency statements and also discussed how state and national teaching standards should be integrated into the shared course competencies. There were not enough EWU faculty in attendance to reach a clear consensus on this issue.

At this point, the team relied largely on e-mail correspondence to agree upon shared competencies.

### **Barriers and Recommendations:**

Three barriers were obvious. First, meeting attendance proved to be a barrier for this project. The team attempted to rely on “traditional” course syllabi from EWU faculty (in the absence of meeting attendees from EWU) and in lieu of specified competencies. This made completion of the task nearly impossible.

In the end, the community college faculty modified the short list of broad competencies by including brief recommendations for common assessments. The final list of competencies also relies upon the competencies set by the State of Washington and OSPI, as well as the standards set by INTASC (The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium). Additional refinement and elaboration may continue to occur for the EDUC 201 course. The second barrier relates to the use of common terms—namely, a discrepancy between terms selected by the Washington State Legislature for this project and the terms used by educators surrounding the semantic equivalent to what “competency” means. In brief, the nationwide trend toward standards and performance based programs in teacher education has begun to replace terminology used in competency-based models. While these frameworks share many overlapping themes and concepts it will be worthwhile to acknowledge the differences and agree on basic

foundational terms. Such consensus will be necessary as we explore the “benchmark” approach for the Introductory Education class and then define portfolio contents to verify meeting that benchmark.

The third barrier relates to the fact that the project did not include a budget for meeting preparation and meeting time. This lack of funding limited the project scope as it was simply added on to the regular duties of participants with full workloads. We recommend that resources be allocated for planning at the state level. Funding would ideally allow a series of sessions, perhaps even a two day working retreat that would afford time to carefully integrate standards and performance based benchmarks. Such time could also allow a good dialogue on vitally important general education questions.

Locally, we recommend additional meeting sessions on our shared education courses. Invitees should include the entire EWU faculty who teach the “shared” course and meeting attendees should confirm and honor their commitment. In addition, when competencies are brought to a specific level and performance indicators delineated at the university level, then community college faculty can respond as appropriate. As for the Introduction to Education course specifically, we further recommend that state and national standards be seriously considered at all levels of teacher preparation, as these standards are the current “drivers” of what K-12 teachers need to know in order to succeed.

Finally, we recommend further collaboration between the CCS district and our partners in higher education at EWU, especially as changes occur in our respective teacher education programs. There is great value in working together and learning about the nature of transfer and the effects of transfer policies and practices upon the student-citizens we seek to share and serve.

### **Shared Competencies for the Basic Introductory Education Course:**

Upon completion of this course (at SFCC the course is ED 202-Survey of Education, at SCC it is ED 201-Introduction to Education), students will:

1. Articulate a personal philosophy of education based on knowledge of historical, philosophical and social foundations of education;

Assessment: Philosophy of education

2. Explain school organizational structure and the importance of partnerships among educators, parents, students, and community agencies and potential employers.

Assessment: Reading quiz and class discussion

3. Articulate the roles and responsibilities of educators as well as the personal and professional qualities of successful teachers.

Assessment: Reading quiz, class discussion, and reflection on portfolio artifacts

3. Describe the legal, ethical and moral issues related to the education of all children;

Assessment: Pre-practicum requirements, current issues and school law assignments

5. Demonstrate an understanding of learning and human development, and respect for the linguistic, gender, cultural and ethnic diversity represented among children, families and colleagues

Assessment: Lesson plan activities

6. Practice reflective thinking on beliefs, attitudes and actions, as well as in documenting and demonstrating continuous professional growth;

Assessment: Development of professional portfolio

7. Observe, identify, demonstrate and evaluate teaching strategies, methods and assessments that accommodate the needs of all learners in a typical classroom; and relate to the Grade Level Expectations and Essential Academic Learning requirements of the state of Washington.

Assessment: Development of professional portfolio

8. Make tentative decisions on education as a career choice.

Assessment: Development of professional portfolio

## Final Report: Computer Science



**Thomas B. Capaul, Senior Lecturer**  
Computer Science Department  
202 Computer Science Bldg.  
Cheney, WA 99004-2412

**SUBJECT: Computer Science Competency Based Transfer Draft**

**DATE: Thursday, December 08, 2005**

The following document summarizes the progress made in exploring Competency Based Transfer (CBT) in Computer Science (CS) between Spokane Community College (SCC), Spokane Falls Community College (SFCC), and Eastern Washington University (EWU).

### Update of Progress

Transferring to an accredited computer science program at a four year institution at the junior level is ambitious. A bachelor of science in computer science (BSCS) typically requires one year of calculus and a one year science sequence (usually physics or chemistry) before many junior level computer science courses can be taken. At EWU, the BSCS requires at least 84 credits at the freshman and sophomore levels (Appendix A), many of which are not in the computer science department. Furthermore, these credits do not include many of the necessary general education core requirement (GECR) courses. These add 20 more lower division credits. Thus, the number of credits required to achieve junior status is at least 104.

The focus of CBT is not on the number of courses and credits, but an acceptable body of knowledge that demonstrates required proficiency. In the interests of simplicity, time, and productivity, it was decided at the October CBT meeting to focus on just computer science courses and/or the body of knowledge required in this area to transfer in at the junior level. While there are many outside requirements, a good number of these are somewhat standard between community colleges and four year institutions (Calculus I, II, and III, Calculus based Physics, etc.), so the possibility of giving credit for these courses for the purposes of CBT may not be difficult.

The CS department at EWU recently underwent accreditation renewal and decided to update its curriculum to conform more closely to national standards in computer science education. The model followed was the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) Computing Curriculum for 2001 (CC2001). CC2001 is the de-facto standard for the courses and topics that should be

taught in a computer science degree. More information about CC2001 can be found at <http://www.sigcse.org/cc2001/>. It should be noted that there is a draft for CC2005, but its contents are very similar to CC2001. More information about CC2005 can be found at <http://www.acm.org/education/curricula.html#CC2005>.

As a result of program revision, EWU feels very strongly that the body of knowledge required in their program is representative of CC2001 specifications. EWU is writing syllabi for all courses in the revised program. Draft syllabi for freshman, sophomore, and the entry junior level course are being made available to SCC and SFCC. With this information, it is possible for the community colleges to prepare their students for transfer without regard to the number of courses.

A key component to validating a student's knowledge is assessment. At EWU, students are currently required to pass an advancement exam before taking senior level courses. With the new curriculum, students will not be allowed to take junior level courses until they have satisfied the exam requirements.

Any incoming student to EWU that demonstrates the required body of knowledge (via course work at the community college level), and passes the advancement exam, is positioned to request junior status in the department. SCC and SFCC are examining assessment measures as well to verify student preparedness. EWU will make the material on its advancement exam available to SCC and SFCC so they might better prepare their students for the exam.

SCC, SFCC, and EWU are hopeful that the above measures will facilitate CBT in CS. EWU's updated curriculum, based on national standards, can be used as a model for other four year institutions for purposes of CBT should those institutions desire. Assessment is an important component to CBT and should be implemented at both levels.

## **Concerns**

On an institution by institution basis, program content can vary widely. Decisions of what to include and exclude in courses are made by individual faculty, course committees, or department consensus. The body of knowledge required is necessarily different because of this.

Even if a fundamental body of knowledge is demonstrated, the possibility remains that a CBT student won't be prepared because the programming language used at the four year institution for core work differs. It could require a remedial course or time for self-study in the language used at the four year school.

Computer Science departments nationwide are experiencing drops in enrollment. As the count of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) becomes more of a concern, there could be friction between institutions over who gets to teach the courses. The higher costs in offering upper division courses cannot be sustained by four year institutions without enrollment in cost-efficient lower courses.

Some four year institutions may have standards beyond what community college students can normally attain. These four year institutions may be unwilling to accommodate CBT.

## **Conclusions**

CBT can work for computer science provided:

- there is a standard body of knowledge that is accepted by the four year institution
- required courses outside computer science are validated for the purposes of CBT
- assessment exists to validate student preparedness and sufficient body of knowledge

Further exploration is necessary. As a next step, it would be productive to include additional institutions in the process.

## Appendix A

- **Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (BSCS) (139-150 credits)**
  - ABET accredited
  - Student earns minor in Physics and minor in Mathematics
  - Can be completed in four years, but should expect to take five
  - Very rigorous
  - Strong degree that is a stepping stone to both industry and advanced degrees in computer science
  - Required 100 and 200 level courses, their credits, and their pre-requisites (at least 84 credits total)
    - CSCD 205: Programming Principles 1 Lab (1 credit; concurrent enrollment in CSCD 225)
    - CSCD 225: Programming Principles I (5 credits; concurrent enrollment in MATH 105 (pre-calculus) or math proficiency, CPLA 100 or 120 (basic literacy I))
    - CSCD 226: Programming Principles II (5 credits; CSCD 225, MATH 105 or math proficiency)
    - CSCD 228: Introduction to Unix (2 credits; CPLA 100 or 120)
    - CSCD 229: C Programming Language (3 credits; CSCD 226, CSCD 228, CSCD 260 (micro-assembly), math proficiency)
    - CSCD 260: Micro-Assembly language (3 credits; ENGR 160 (digital circuits), CSCD 225, MATH 105 or math proficiency)
    - CMST 200: Intro to Speech Communications (4 credits)
    - ENGR 160: Digital Circuits (4 credits; MATH 104 or equivalent)
    - ENGR 250: Digital Hardware (2 credits; ENGR 160)
    - ENGL 201: College Composition (5 credits; ENGL 101)
    - ENGL 205: Introduction to Technical Writing (5 credits; ENGL 101 or 201)
    - MATH 161: Calculus I (5 credits; MATH 106 (pre-calculus II) and ENGL 100)
    - MATH 162: Calculus II (5 credits; MATH 161)
    - MATH 163: Calculus III (5 credits; MATH 162)
    - MATH 225: Foundations of Mathematics (5 credits; MATH 161)
    - MATH 231: Linear Algebra (5 credits; MATH 106)
    - PHYS 151: General Physics I (4 credits; concurrent enrollment in MATH 161)
    - PHYS 152: General Physics II (4 credits; PHYS 151, concurrent enrollment in MATH 162)
    - PHYS 153: General Physics III (4 credits; PHYS 152, concurrent enrollment in MATH 163)
    - PHYS 161: Mechanics Lab (1 credit; concurrent enrollment in PHYS 151 recommended)
    - PHYS 162: Heat and Optics Lab (1 credit)
    - PHYS 163: Instrumentation Lab I (1 credit)

- One course from the following:
  - BIOL 171: Biology I (4 credits) **and** BIOL 270: Biological Investigation (3 credits)
  - CHEM 151: General Chemistry (5 credits; CHEM 100 or one year in high school, MATH 104)
  - GEOL 120: Physical Geology – The solid earth (5 credits; 1 year high school chemistry, MATH 104 or equivalent)
  - GEOL 121: Physical Geology – Surficial Processes (5 credits; GEOL 120 or 100, CPLA 100, MATH 104 or equivalent)
  - PHYS 221: General Physics IV (4 credits; PHYS 153)

CERTIFICATION OF ENROLLMENT

**SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1909**

Chapter 131, Laws of 2003

58th Legislature  
2003 Regular Session

HIGHER EDUCATION--COMPETENCY-BASED TRANSFERS

EFFECTIVE DATE: 7/27/03

Passed by the House April 21, 2003  
Yeas 97 Nays 0

FRANK CHOPP

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Speaker of the House of Representatives**

Passed by the Senate April 11, 2003  
Yeas 49 Nays 0

BRAD OWEN

\_\_\_\_\_  
**President of the Senate**

Approved May 7, 2003.

GARY LOCKE

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Governor of the State of Washington**

CERTIFICATE

I, Cynthia Zehnder, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the attached is **SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1909** as passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate on the dates hereon set forth.

CYNTHIA ZEHNDER

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chief Clerk**

FILED

May 7, 2003 - 3:03 p.m.

**Secretary of State  
State of Washington**

---

**SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1909**

---

AS AMENDED BY THE SENATE

Passed Legislature - 2003 Regular Session

**State of Washington                      58th Legislature                      2003 Regular Session**

**By** House Committee on Higher Education (originally sponsored by Representatives Jarrett, Kenney, Cox, Fromhold, Chase, Berkey, Pearson, McCoy, Gombosky, Lantz, Clements, Talcott, Buck, Rockefeller, Pflug, Moeller, Priest, Edwards and Santos)

READ FIRST TIME 03/05/03.

1            AN ACT Relating to creating a pilot project for competency-based  
2 transfer in higher education; creating new sections; and providing an  
3 expiration date.

4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

5            NEW SECTION.    **Sec. 1.** The legislature finds that the focus of  
6 transfer between institutions of higher education has been on students'  
7 accumulation of credits, where courses necessary for entry to each  
8 successive level of higher education have been individually identified  
9 and vary by institution and academic discipline. It is the  
10 legislature's intent to begin a process that will change the focus of  
11 transfer to defining and recognizing student competencies.

12            NEW SECTION.    **Sec. 2.** (1) The higher education coordinating board,  
13 in consultation with the state board for community and technical  
14 colleges and the council of presidents, shall recruit and select  
15 institutions of higher education to participate in a pilot project to  
16 define transfer standards in selected academic disciplines on the basis  
17 of student competencies. Participants shall include one public four-  
18 year institution of higher education, two or more community or

1 technical colleges that regularly transfer a substantial number of  
2 students to that four-year institution, and one or more private career  
3 colleges that prepare students in the academic disciplines selected  
4 under the pilot project. Such colleges shall be accredited and  
5 licensed under chapter 28C.10 RCW.

6 (2) The pilot project participants shall identify several academic  
7 disciplines to form the basis of the project and develop a work plan,  
8 timelines, and expected products for the project, which shall be  
9 presented by the higher education coordinating board in a preliminary  
10 report to the higher education committees of the legislature by  
11 December 1, 2004.

12 (3) Under the pilot project, participants shall develop standards,  
13 definitions, and procedures for quality assurance for a transfer system  
14 based on student competencies. It is the legislature's intent that  
15 under such a system, four-year institutions of higher education, in  
16 collaboration with two-year institutions of higher education, define  
17 the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should possess in order  
18 to enter an upper division program in a particular academic discipline.  
19 The two and four-year institutions providing lower division preparation  
20 for such an upper division program are responsible for certifying that  
21 a student meets the expected standards, but have flexibility to  
22 determine how to assess whether the student has obtained the necessary  
23 knowledge, skills, and abilities. Such assessments need not be based  
24 on completion of particular courses or accumulation of credits.

25 (4) The pilot project participants may request assistance in their  
26 work from the higher education coordinating board, the western  
27 interstate commission on higher education, the state board for  
28 community and technical colleges, or the council of presidents. The  
29 pilot project participants and the higher education coordinating board  
30 shall structure the work of the project in such a way that development  
31 costs for the project are absorbed within existing institution and  
32 agency budgets.

33 (5) In collaboration with the higher education coordinating board,  
34 the pilot project participants shall report to the higher education  
35 committees of the legislature by December 1, 2005, on the progress and  
36 status of the pilot project. The report shall identify any barriers  
37 encountered by the project and make recommendations for next steps in

1 developing a competency-based transfer system for higher education.

2 (6) This section expires June 30, 2006.

Passed by the House April 21, 2003.

Passed by the Senate April 11, 2003.

Approved by the Governor May 7, 2003.

Filed in Office of Secretary of State May 7, 2003.

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-24**

WHEREAS, The legislature and governor enacted a statute in 2003 (RCW 28B.76.720) that directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board to recruit and select institutions of higher education to participate in a pilot project to define transfer standard in selected academic disciplines on the basis of student competencies; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board was directed to report to the higher education committees of the legislature by December 2005 regarding the progress and status of the pilot project; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board worked with Eastern Washington University, Spokane Community College, and Spokane Falls Community College as pilot project participants, and also collaborated the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Council of Presidents; and

WHEREAS, The pilot project participants and the staff of the HECB have fulfilled the terms of the legislation by conducting the pilot project as directed and by submitting a report for the board's approval and submission to the legislature;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the background, findings and recommendations of the Final Report of the Competency-based Transfer Pilot Project as presented to the board on December 15, 2005.

Adopted:

December 15, 2005

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jesus Hernandez, Secretary