

March 2005

HECB Academic Program Planning, Approval, and Review: Revising Policies and Processes

Background

One of the most important functions of the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) is the coordination of academic degree program planning, approval, and review. The purpose of these functions is to ensure that the higher education system as a whole is serving students, employers, and the community with an array of high-quality degree programs that meet regional and statewide needs.

In conjunction with the implementation of the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*, the board has established relevant academic policies and procedures to support the following policy objectives:

- Ensure that degree programs offered by the public four-year institutions meet state need, are free from unnecessary duplication, and are appropriate in terms of cost and diversity;
- Foster high-quality, innovative programs that enable students to complete their studies in a reasonable amount of time;
- Support the unique role and mission of the individual institutions;
- Respond effectively to the state's economic, civic, and social needs; and
- Recognize that institutional governing boards are accountable to the state and to the public to (a) develop degree programs and assess the academic quality of the curriculum; (b) evaluate the capacity of the institution to offer programs efficiently; and (c) make the wisest use of resources.

The HECB is specifically charged by state law [RCW 28B.76.230 (1) (5)] with approving the following activities of the public four-year institutions:¹

- New degree programs by a four-year institution;
- Creation of any off-campus program by a four-year institution;
- Purchase or lease of major off-campus facilities by a four-year public institution or a community or technical college;
- Creation of higher education centers and consortia; and
- New degree programs and creation of off-campus programs by an independent college or university, in collaboration with a community or technical college.

In 2004, the legislature and governor enacted House Bill 3103, which modified the responsibilities of the HECB. Section 9 of the bill outlines several changes that affect the board's academic program planning, approval, and review processes.

The *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* calls for integrating the HECB's statutory authority, as revised in HB 3103, to develop an assessment process to analyze the need for regional and statewide higher education programs, approve new four-year college degree programs, and support off-campus facility and real estate acquisition. This policy would designate and differentiate the types of educational programs and resources offered by public institutions of higher education. Additionally, the policy would establish the criteria and process by which the state would authorize the creation and distribution of educational resources in response to demonstrable need. To that end, the board's policies would recognize a continuum or pathway of educational resources.

This work is currently underway as part of the board's regional planning proposals within the master plan. Concurrently, work on reviewing new academic degree program planning processes and enhanced state and regional planning is underway.

This report describes the steps necessary to implement Section 9 of HB 3103 and bring the current HECB approval guidelines in line with the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*. The report summarizes the HECB's current academic program planning, review, and

¹ The HECB authorizes new degree-granting institutions and ensures that authorized degree-granting institutions operating in Washington or those applying to operate in the state meet minimum standards (Degree-Grant Institutions Act, Chapter 28B.85 RCW, the Foreign Degree-Granting Branch Campus Act, Chapter 28B.90 RCW, and the Washington State Degree Authorization Act Regulations, WAC 250-61). The HECB also determines if an institution meets exemption from authorization standards as defined in WAC.

approval policies and procedures and the key revisions under consideration. Specific proposals are included in Appendix B of this report.

The board is not asked to take action at this time. It will take action at a later meeting when staff will present revised program guidelines, including newly designed forms, for the board's review and approval.

Key Changes to Current Policy

In June 2005, the board will consider revised guidelines that will integrate the degree and program planning, approval, and review process with the planning process for centers and other off-campus programs into a new higher education resource planning and approval process. The anticipated key changes to the guidelines include the following:

- Program planning would become more flexible by allowing an institution to submit a "pre-proposal" for a new program at any time rather than in a biennial report.
- Proposals for new academic programs and program extensions would require a discussion of needs identified in the regional and statewide needs assessment, and the impact on other programs offered by public and independent institutions in the state.
- Expansion to off-site locations, the creation of higher education centers, and the development of new campuses would occur within a program planning and approval framework that clearly defines the status and authorization details of a site and the date the institution would need to return to the HECB and/or the legislature for further approval.

The Board's Current Program Planning, Approval, and Review Process

The board's current four-step process is designed to minimize unnecessary duplication of programs, use limited state resources as wisely as possible, and ensure that programs meet state needs and support the role and mission of the individual institutions.

1. PLANNING: Review and Approval of New Degree Program Plans

On a two-year cycle in January of the "even" years, each public baccalaureate institution submits to the board a plan for new degree programs proposed to be offered over the next two years.² The institution provides details on program location, need, enrollments, funding, and delivery.

² In 2004, the board deferred action on new program planning by the institutions for the 2004-2006 biennium, pending revisions in the HECB review processes called for in HB 3103 and anticipated impacts by the 2004 Strategic Master Plan. The HECB had previously conducted eight cycles of review of the institutional plans, spanning a period of 16 years.

2. APPROVAL: Review and Approval of New Degree Program Proposals

The board reviews institutional proposals for new degree programs and then approves, conditionally approves, or disapproves proposals. In addition to the required staff review, every new degree proposal is reviewed by the other public baccalaureate institutions and expert external reviewers.

The HECB annually reviews 15 to 20 academic programs submitted for consideration by the public baccalaureate institutions (see Appendix C). During 2004, the board reviewed and approved 16 new programs (six undergraduate and 10 graduate level); in 2003, the board reviewed and approved 15 new programs (six undergraduate and eight graduate level).³

3. REVIEW: Review of Existing Programs

Two ongoing reviews are reported to the board every two years in January (in the “odd” years).⁴ The board reviews fall enrollment in branch campus programs and recently approved programs to determine whether institutions have met their enrollment goals. In addition, each continuing program is subject to a comprehensive review on a cycle adopted by the institution, as required by a regional accrediting body and the HECB. Program reviews conducted during the biennium are summarized in this report. On a two-year cycle in the “even” years, the board considers each institution’s enrollment data and issues a report summarizing its review of existing degree programs.

4. REPLICATION: Offering an Existing Degree Program at a New Location

Institutions that would like to offer existing degree programs at a branch campus, new off-campus location, or via distance learning submit a Notification of Intent (NOI) to the board at least 45 days prior to the proposed start date of the program. HECB staff and the public four-year institutions review the NOI. If there are no objections, the HECB executive director approves the request.

³ The growth in academic programs by Washington’s public four-year institutions has been relatively stable for several years. By contrast, the degree-authorized institutions as a group, of which approximately one-third are for-profit, have submitted 65 new academic programs for HECB review and approval in 2004, and 43 new programs in 2003 (Appendix C). Additionally, the number of degree-authorized institutions in Washington has grown from 42 to 47 in the past three years. Given the many issues related to approval of the degree-authorized institutions and growth of their programs, a separate report is currently being prepared for the board.

⁴ Current practice has been for the campuses to submit the existing program review concurrent with the campus plans rather than in alternate years. The last HECB review including 2002-2004 program plans, 2001 enrollments in recently approved programs, and academic program reviews for 2000-2001, was approved by the board in May 2002.

Proposed Revisions to the Board's Current Process

The following section summarizes the key changes required by HB 3103 and the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* related to program review, and provides a status report on progress to date. There are three major areas of change: (1) state and regional needs assessment; (2) academic program inventory; and (3) revising the HECB program review guidelines.

State and Regional Needs Assessment

HB 3103 calls for a “comprehensive and ongoing assessment process to analyze the need for additional degrees and programs, additional off-campus centers and locations for degree programs, and consolidation or elimination of programs by the four-year institutions.” The key change in the approval process is the introduction of the regional and statewide needs assessment to the analysis. Currently, each campus conducts a needs assessment for an individual program as part of the proposal process. The revised guidelines will require that new academic program proposals reference the regional statewide needs assessment under development by the HECB, in collaboration with other agencies and the public and private colleges and universities.

Programs submitted for approval will be evaluated based on the degree to which they align with stated needs outlined in the statewide needs assessment and the strategic master plan. Proposals must specifically address student, employer, and community demand for the program, and demonstrate that projected capacity at public and private institutions is not sufficient to meet this demand. While these last elements are not new to the process, the particular emphasis placed on this aspect of the review process represents a significant change.

The *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* outlines revisions to the HECB planning, review, and approval process to ensure that program development is responsive to the state and regional needs assessment and state priorities. The revised guidelines will constitute an integrated higher education resource planning and approval process that includes the development of centers and other off-campus instructional sites.

The HECB is collaborating with a statewide interagency group, composed of representatives from key state agencies and public and private colleges and universities, to revise the program approval and review policies and procedures.

Initiatives underway include:

- Identifying key planning practices used in Washington and other states, since other states face the same need to link demand and supply of higher education services;
- Preparing a background document on linking workforce needs and education to include suggested guidelines, criteria, and limitations; and

- Selecting data sources and analytical methods for the state and regional needs assessment, which will constitute a framework for the analysis of regional and statewide needs for education and training programs to meet employer, student, and community demand in the state.

Academic Degree Program Inventory

Currently, there is no easily accessible location for information about academic degree programs offered throughout the state. The HECB maintains a manual (paper) program inventory of programs approved by the board and a database of programs approved by the State Approving Agency for the use of veterans' benefits. But, the inventory and database are not readily accessible to people outside the agency.

The veterans' database needs to be updated to a newer software application to allow for continued support and maintenance. It does not include available programs not approved for the use of veterans' benefits. This creates an opportunity to combine the veterans' database and the Degree Authorization database with a degree inventory required in the implementation of the regional and state needs assessment.

Developing an inventory of existing degree programs available within Washington is an important element in the needs assessment. Therefore, we are in the process of developing a Web-searchable inventory of degree programs offered in Washington. The database would be used by multiple audiences and for multiple purposes.

These purposes include:

- Reporting approved programs for the use of veterans' benefits to the Department of Veterans Affairs, institutions, and those members of the public who are eligible for GI Bill benefits;
- Assisting the HECB and colleges and universities with higher education planning (needed tool in planning new degree programs);
- Assisting high school and college students in identifying programs of interest among providers;
- Assisting staff who work with students to advise them about college options (high school counselors, parents, college advisors, teachers and faculty); and
- Assisting business/industry to identify programs of interest offered in the state.

The HECB has assembled a work group to assist with development of the program database. The timeline is to develop a prototype database by June 2005. Institutions will be asked to

review their academic program entries during summer 2005 so that corrections may be made as needed.

Revising the HECB Program Review Guidelines

As outlined in the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*, revised guidelines will integrate degree and program approval with the planning process for centers and other off-campus programs. The guidelines will include definitions of off-campus programs and centers. They also will define a program's authorization based on its status and timeline and/or program benchmarks at which it would be required to return to the HECB and/or legislature for further approval.

HECB staff, in cooperation with the four-year public institutions, are in the process of revising the program planning, approval, and review guidelines. HECB staff have been working with the Inter-institutional Committee for Academic Program Planning (ICAPP), which includes the associate provosts of the four-year public institutions. The group has met several times and is making progress on revisions to the guidelines.

The development of revised policies and guidelines for program planning, approval, and review is being informed by feedback from key stakeholders and a review of guidelines used in other states (Appendix D). The goal is to develop a process for program approval that is transparent, provides clear criteria for program approval, and offers ample opportunity for interested parties to provide feedback on program proposals. Ultimately, the HECB must ensure that higher education planning meets the needs of students and employers.

Key Activities

Fall 2004	Review charge and current procedures.
November 2004	Hold first meeting to review proposed revisions with institutional representatives.
December 2004	Establish state/regional needs assessment work group and begin holding meetings.
December 2004 - January 2005	Develop proposal for Web-accessible program database to include four-year institutions and two-year institutions.
January 2005	Complete contract for state and regional needs assessment.
February - April 2005	Review proposed changes to the existing program guidelines with the institutions and the HECB. Review two-year institutions' program planning and review processes in anticipation of legislative direction for pilot baccalaureate degrees at two-year institutions.
March 2005	Release draft report of the degree authorized institutions, growth of programs, and a review of policies and procedures.
April 2005	Review draft planning, approval, and review guidelines and revised forms with the institutions.
May 2005	Complete final review of draft planning, approval, and review guidelines, including all attachments and forms, with ICAPP and HECB Education Committee.
June 2005	Implement prototype state/regional needs assessment and present draft planning, approval, and review guidelines to the board for possible action.
July 2005	Release the academic program database to the institutions for review.
September 2005	Release the academic program database for public use.
Summer 2005	Review existing program review requirements with the institutions related to the submission of the biennial reviews of existing programs and program plans due January 2006.
January 2006	Institutions submit existing program reviews and program plans to the HECB.
March 2006	Staff report to the board on campus biennial plans.

Appendix A: House Bill 3103 as Signed into Law

RCW 28B.76.230

Needs assessment process and analysis – activities requiring board approval.

- (1) The board shall develop a comprehensive and ongoing assessment process to analyze the need for additional degrees and programs, additional off-campus centers and locations for degree programs, and consolidation or elimination of programs by the four-year institutions.
- (2) As part of the needs assessment process, the board shall examine:
 - (a) Projections of student, employer, and community demand for education and degrees, including liberal arts degrees, on a regional and statewide basis;
 - (b) Current and projected degree programs and enrollment at public and private institutions of higher education, by location and mode of service delivery; and
 - (c) Data from the workforce training and education coordinating board and the state board for community and technical colleges on the supply and demand for work force education and certificates and associate degrees.
- (3) Every two years the board shall produce, jointly with the state board for community and technical colleges and the workforce training and education coordinating board, an assessment of the number and type of higher education and training credentials required to match employer demand for a skilled and educated work force. The assessment shall include the number of forecasted net job openings at each level of higher education and training and the number of credentials needed to match the forecast of net job openings.
- (4) The board shall determine whether certain major lines of study or types of degrees, including applied degrees or research-oriented degrees, shall be assigned uniquely to some institutions or institutional sectors in order to create centers of excellence that focus resources and expertise.
- (5) The following activities are subject to approval by the board:
 - (a) New degree programs by a four-year institution;
 - (b) Creation of any off-campus program by a four-year institution;
 - (c) Purchase or lease of major off-campus facilities by a four-year institution or a community or technical college;
 - (d) Creation of higher education centers and consortia; and

- (e) New degree programs and creation of off-campus programs by an independent college or university in collaboration with a community or technical college.

- (6) Institutions seeking board approval under this section must demonstrate that the proposal is justified by the needs assessment developed under this section. Institutions must also demonstrate how the proposals align with or implement the statewide strategic master plan for higher education under RCW 28B.76.200.

- (7) The board shall develop clear guidelines and objective decision-making criteria regarding approval of proposals under this section, which must include review and consultation with the institution and other interested agencies and individuals.

- (8) The board shall periodically recommend consolidation or elimination of programs at the four-year institutions, based on the needs assessment analysis.

[2004 c 275 § 9.]

NOTES:

Part headings not law – 2004 c 275: See note following RCW 28B.76.030.

Appendix B: Revisions under Consideration in Process and Content of Program Planning, Approval, and Review

Table 1
Revisions Under Consideration in the “Process” of Planning, Approval, and Review

**A form is provided by HECB for process and/or needs to be revised*

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
<p>Planning program changes</p>	<p>Every two years (even years), the public baccalaureate institutions are required to submit to the HECB a two-year plan that describes planned programmatic changes. These are reviewed by HECB staff and presented to the board for approval.</p> <p>Plans cover these categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renaming a current program • Adding a new program option or revising a program option • Adding a new certificate program • Developing a new degree program (submit a pre-proposal* for permission to develop) • Eliminating a degree program (suspension, termination, phased close-out)* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renaming a current program or changing its CIP number (program classification number) • Modifying new program pre-planning process with institutions submitting a “pre-proposal” for planned new programs using the Notice of Intent (NOI) process currently used for the extension to a new location of an existing program. Institutions would be required to include a listing of their planned programs in their biennial plans. Full program proposals would be submitted to the HECB for approval within two years of the NOI. • If the approval date passes before the program is developed, institutions would submit a new NOI. • No other changes are proposed. <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct CIP numbers will be needed to maintain the Web-accessible academic program database. • It is important for institutions to share their planning with other institutions and stakeholders in an open process. Business/industry is requesting that the institutions react more quickly to employer needs and the two-year planning process does not align well with needed faster response time. Staff have reviewed several other states’ processes and found that several states use a “notice of intent” process successfully in a pre-planning stage.

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
<p>New degree programs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institution submits proposal electronically at least three months prior to start. • External review includes all public baccalaureate institutions. • Review by HECB staff and placed on agenda for HECB approval. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New program proposals would be posted to the HECB Web site and announced to interested parties for comment. • Review by board education committee prior to placement on board agenda, in line with board criteria. • Institution must notify HECB when the first students enroll in the program. • Programs must begin enrolling students within three years of approval or request an extension of approval status. <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that the degree planning process be transparent and timely. • Posting proposals on the HECB Web site for stakeholder review is consistent with the process used for extending existing programs and provides for broader distribution and greater opportunity for feedback prior to board action. • It is expected that programs would be offered to students within a reasonable time after approval.
<p>Extension of an existing program: distance education or off-site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institution submits NOI electronically; the NOI is posted to the HECB Web site and announced to interested parties for comment. • Approval by HECB staff following public comment. • Information provided in executive director’s report to the board. 	<p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change – the current process is working well.

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
<p>Review of existing programs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutions submit enrollment report for all programs approved in the past five years by the HECB (or all programs at the branch campuses). • Program reports are submitted for programs reviewed in the prior biennium. • Review the schedule of reviews with the institutions for the upcoming biennium. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutions would modify enrollment report to include an explanatory statement for any programs not meeting original enrollment targets or that have not yet begun to enroll students. • Institutions would add enrollment report (actual vs. target) on all off-campus programs/degrees, including centers, by location and cohort if applicable. • Change branch campus enrollment reporting to reflect the policy on the “main” campus (enrollment reports only in the first five years of program). <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The branch campuses are all housed in permanent facilities and are of a size that justifies reporting consistent with the research and regional institutions in the state. • Enrollments are regularly reported to the Office of Financial Management. It is anticipated that these data will be available in 2005-06 to HECB staff through a common database project. • Information on centers and consortia is not readily available at the state level. An accounting of programs and enrollments in these is essential in statewide planning and needs assessment.

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
Site Planning		
Off-campus courses or programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not addressed outside program approval process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To extend a program to an existing center or campus, use NOI process.* • To extend a program to a new off-site location, use NOI format with board review.* <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board is required under RCW 28B.76.230 to approve off-campus locations for degree programs. The proposed process is based on, and would be integrated with, the existing process used for the approval of off-campus programs.
Establishment of a center	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handled presently in context of program approval (in many cases as a result of multiple program approvals). • Lease or acquisition of property is handled in a separate HECB process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new policy to address development of centers is under development as part of master plan regional planning implementation. The board is required under RCW 28B.76.230 to approve off-campus centers and consortia. <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed process will ensure the HECB and other policy-makers have enough information to ensure that the program meets state and regional needs, is consistent with the institutional role and mission, and does not unnecessarily duplicate or compete with programs or services provided by other Washington public institutions.

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
<p>Transition to four-year institution for a two-year institution, a center, or a branch</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires legislative action. • The four research university branch campuses have received HECB recommendations in response to their self-studies as directed by House Bill 2707. The recommendations have been approved by the board and submitted to the legislature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy framework to support this type of planning is currently under development as part of regional planning proposals in the master plan. <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education</i> calls for the development of a continuum or pathway of educational resources that would allow for a systematic approach to the growth and development of the system of higher education.

Table 2
Revisions Under Consideration in the “Content”
of Planning, Approval, and Review

**A form is provided by HECB for process and/or needs to be revised*

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
Planning		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise to address the new statewide and regional needs assessment.*
NOIs (Notices of Intent)	<p>Information required on form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of institution • Degree title • Delivery mechanism • Location • Implementation date • Substantive statement of need • Source of funding • Year 1 and full enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions to cover page.* • Statement of need must connect to the regional/statewide needs assessment. • Add a statement to connect program to institutional mission/role. • Add a student section to describe student population, including information about articulation and transfer with community college (transfer pathways) for undergraduate programs. • Revised enrollment and budget tables. <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCW 28B.76.230 requires that the HECB take into account regional and statewide needs in the planning and approval process. • The primary purpose of the NOI process is an early check of program need and potential program duplication. • The NOI must include enough information about the need and program so various stakeholders can evaluate the proposal and provide feedback.

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
<p>New Degree Program</p>	<p>Information required in proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship to role, mission • Statement of need (demand) • Relationship to other institutions • Program goals, objectives, learning outcomes • Curriculum (course of study, admission requirements, course sharing) • Use of technology • Faculty • Students (enrollments, time to completion, diversity efforts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised cover sheet and new proposal forms.* • Needs statement revised to require that statement connects the program to regional and statewide needs assessment and specifically address student demand, employer demand, and community/social needs. • Student section: Add populations served, more robust discussion of diversity and outreach, long-term enrollment projections. • Curriculum section: Add table of required/elective coursework. Add discussion of course scheduling (when will courses be offered), delivery mechanism, campus location(s). • Collaboration: Describe considerations of collaboration with other institutions to leverage resources. • Transfer pathways: Add information about transfers for undergraduate programs. • Clarify requirement for information on infrastructure impacts – currently addressed only in the budget (library, technology, space, equipment). • Faculty/administrative section: Revised tables. • Finance section: Revised budget and enrollment tables. Clarify outline items for discussion. Require review by institutional budget office.

Programs	Current	Changes/Additions Under Consideration
<p>New Degree Program (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration • Program assessment • Student assessment • Finances/program costs • External review (two evaluators) • Review by other public four-year programs 	<p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of this information is already included in the reports. These changes are designed to prompt for information items sometimes difficult to find and/or that frequently require follow-up with the campus during the HECB review. • Some additions (e.g., transfer pathways) are required to ensure programs are in line with the strategic master plan. • To ensure efficient use of state resources (primary role of the HECB in program approval), it is important that staff have a clear understanding of the financial model and budget implications of the proposed program. Added text in the financial section will help illuminate how numbers presented in the tables were generated. The role of the institution’s budget office will be to ensure that the budget items are accurate and complete.
<p>Sites and New Facilities</p>		
<p>Establish a new higher education teaching site (extend a program to a new off-site location)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administered via program extension process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use NOI format with extended budget section to address terms of the property lease or acquisition required for approval.* <p><u>Rationale for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of programs to new sites may have significant long-term financial implications. The board must consider expansion to new sites carefully to ensure the expansion is an efficient use of state resources, is appropriate to the mission and role of the institution, and provides for appropriate student, faculty, and staff support to ensure program quality.
<p>Extend a program to an existing center or campus</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administered via program extension process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use NOI format and process.* <p><u>Rational for change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change – The current process is working well.

Appendix C: HECB-Approved Programs in 2003 and 2004

Table 1
Four-Year Public Institution HECB-Approved Programs
2003 and 2004

Institution	Degree	Area of Study	Offered Off-Campus
2003			
Central Washington University	BS B	Environmental Geological Sciences Education-broad area special education	
University of Washington	MS PhD PhD D PhD D	Strategic Planning for Critical Infrastructure Biomedical and Health Informatics Built Environment Physical Therapy Digital Arts and Experimental Media Audiology	
University of Washington/Bothell	MS	Computing and Software Systems	
Washington State University	MA BA BA	Philosophy Digital Technology and Culture Psychology	Collaboration with U. of Idaho Pullman, Tri-Cities, Vancouver
Western Washington University	BA BA BA	East Asian Studies Financial Economics Linguistics	
2004			
Central Washington University	M BAS BAS	Education - Inclusiveness Teaching Strategies Industrial Technology Safety and Health Management	Ellensburg, SeaTac, Lynnwood Ellensburg, SeaTac, Lynnwood
Eastern Washington University	M BS	Occupational Therapy Electrical Engineering	EWU - North Seattle CC denied
University of Washington	BFA	Digital Arts and Experimental Media	Interdisciplinary Design Institute
Washington State University	PhD MS PhD EdD	Design Computer Engineering Criminal Justice School Administrators	Statewide
Washington State University/Spokane	D BA BS D	Design Professional Development Exercise Physiology and Metabolism Audiology	Interdisciplinary Design Institute
Western Washington University	M M	Education - Advanced Classroom Practice Education - Continuing and College Education	Bellingham and Everett CCs

Source: Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Table 2
Degree-Authorized Institution HECB-Approved Programs
2003 and 2004

	Associate	Bachelor	Graduate Certificate	Masters	Doctorate	Total
2003	5	11	2	15	10	43
2004	15	26	3	17	4	65

Source: Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Appendix D: Program Approval Criteria/Stages by Selected States' System Governing Boards (g) & Coordinating Boards (c)

REVIEW CRITERIA	WA c	IN c	WV c	UT g	OR g	ID* c	GA g	CO c	TX c	AZ g	OK g	WI g
Need/demand data	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assessment/student learning outcomes	X			X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Program evaluation/effectiveness	X	X	X	X	X		X		X			
Diversity/affirmative action	X						X					X
Program budget/costs/revenues	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Internal review (by other colleges)	X											X
External review	All	Grad		Grad	Grad	Doc	All	Grad				All
Use of technology/distance education	X			X	X			X			X	X
Relationship to institution role/mission	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Unnecessary duplication	X	X	X	X	X	X	Xx	X	X	X	X	X
Curriculum design: courses, credits	X	X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X
Faculty profile: credentials, number, employment status	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Estimated program size, admissions	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Facilities/physical plant/equipment		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Administration of program	X		X				X		X			
Accreditation			X	X	X		X		X			X
Collaboration with other institutions		X	X	X	X		X					X
Library resources		X	X	X	X				x		x	X
Transferability of credits		X										
STAGES												
Pre-planning approval	X									X		X
Notice of Intent/Statement			X	X	X	x						
New program review for full approval	X	X			X					X		X
New program approval for conditional/staged approval								Yr 5				Yr 5
Post-approval review - enrollments, graduate degrees	X				Yr 5		Yr 4	Yr 3/5				
Discontinuance approval/review	X		X			X						X
OFF-CAMPUS SITES												
Approval of new site	X	X			X					x		
Approval of current degree to new sites	X	X			X		NOI					X
Notice of intent/degree to new site			X									x

*Idaho's program review is optional; goes to Council and they recommend if program review is in order.

Source: HECB staff reviews of Web site (January/February 2005).