



ALASKA

ARIZONA

CALIFORNIA

COLORADO

HAWAII

IDAHO

MONTANA

NEVADA

NEW MEXICO

NORTH DAKOTA

OREGON

SOUTH DAKOTA

UTAH

WASHINGTON

WYOMING

Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu



Agenda

WICHE Commission Meeting
October 31 - November 1, 2011
Laie, Hawaii

Monday, October 31, 2011 Schedule at a Glance

7:00 am
Turtle Bay Lobby

Transportation to BYU-Hawaii for Executive Committee members

7:30 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

Breakfast for Executive Committee members

7:45 - 8:45 am [Tab 1]
Aloha Center 155/165

Agenda (Open)



Approval of the Executive Committee teleconference minutes of August 29, 2011 1-3

Discussion Item: November 2011 meeting schedule

Other business

Agenda (Closed)

Discussion Item: Informal review of the president's performance and travel during 2011 1-6

Other business

8:00 am
Turtle Bay Lobby

Transportation to BYU-Hawaii for commissioners, guests, and staff

8:30 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

Breakfast for commissioners, guests, and staff

8:45 - 9:00 am [Tab 2]
Aloha Center Ballroom

Committee of the Whole – Call to Order/Introductions

Call to order: Joe Garcia, chair

Welcome

Introduction of new commissioners and guests 2-3



Approval of the Committee of the Whole meeting minutes of May 16-17, 2011 2-4

Report of the chair

Report of the president

Report of the Nominating Committee

9:00 - 10:00 am [Tab 3]
Aloha Center Ballroom

10:00 - 10:15 am

10:15 - 11:45 am [Tab 4]
Aloha Center Ballroom

Reminder to caucus on selection of 2012 committee members

Recess until November 1, 2011, at 8:45 am

**Plenary Session I: What's Up in the West?
Reorganizing Governance in the West** 3-1

Speakers: Don Bennett, executive director, Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board; Michael Kirst, president, California State Board of Education; Camille Preus, commissioner, Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development

Break

Programs and Services Committee Meeting 4-1

Agenda

Presiding: Carl Shaff, chair

Staff: Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Margo Colalancia, director, Student Exchange Program

Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE, Western Academic Leadership Forum, and Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders



Approval of the Programs and Services Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2011 4-3



Approval of the implementation plan: new ways to apply Professional Student Exchange Program support fees – Margo Colalancia 4-7



Approval of standardizing PSEP support fees in physician assistant and physical therapy fields – Margo Colalancia 4-20



Approval of the proposed project to revamp Western Undergraduate Exchange marketing and outreach strategies – Jere Mock and Margo Colalancia 4-23



Approval of the proposed project to implement a state authorization reciprocity program – David Longanecker 4-24

10:15 - 11:45 am [Tab 5]
 Aloha Center 155/165

Discussion Item:

The Interstate Passport Project – Pat Shea

Information Item:

Student Exchange Program updates – Margo Colancia 4-32

Other business

Issue Analysis and Research Committee Meeting 5-1

Agenda

Presiding: Robert Burns (SD), chair

Staff: Brian Prescott, director of policy research
 Cheryl Graves, administrative assistant



Approval of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2011 5-3



Approval of a project on teacher preparation and professional development related to the Common Core State Standards 5-6



Approval of a project on building capacity to support state college completion goals 5-7

Information Items:

Unit update:
 Research analyst

Project on Colorado’s College Opportunity Fund (response to RFP from state auditor’s office)

Project on Washington’s Opportunity Scholarship Program

Discussion Items:

Annual update to *Benchmarks: WICHE Region 2011*

Tuition and Fees in Public Higher Education in the West: 2011-2012

Update on *Knocking at the College Door*

- Methodological review
- Publication content and timeline

Update on *Policy Insights* related to undocumented students

Proposed project to implement a state authorization reciprocity program [Tab 4, p. 24]

10:15 - 11:45 am [Tab 6]
 President's Conference Room

Progress toward FY 2012 workplan (highlights):

- *Facilitating Development of a Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange* project
- *Educational Equity and Postsecondary Student Success: A Center for Urban Education and WICHE Partnership for Policy Research and Analysis* project
- Adult College Completion Network
- College Access Challenge Grant (CACG) Consortium and Network
- WICHE's Higher Education Policy Database and Policy Publications Clearinghouse

Other business

Self-funded Units Committee Meeting

6-1

Agenda

Presiding: Jim Hansen (SD), vice chair

Staff:

- Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET
- Mollie McGill, deputy director, WCET
- Louis Fox, senior associate, Technology & Innovation
- Dennis Mohatt, vice president for behavioral health and director, Mental Health Program



Approval of the Self-funded Units Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2011

6-3



Developing the Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework

6-5

Information Items – WCET

Staff:

- Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET
- Mollie McGill, deputy director, WCET

Update on major WCET activities:

- WCET focus areas for FY 2012
- Predictive Analytics Reporting proof of concept project
- Federal activities: state authorization of distance education
- Proposed project to implement a state authorization reciprocity program [Tab 4, p. 24]
- Research: Managing Online Education survey, University Professional and Continuing Education Association survey
- Learner progress data for adult learners
- Salesforce implementation

Budget update

Information Items – Technology & Innovation

Staff: Louis Fox, senior associate

Update on Technology & Innovation activities:

- National Research and Education Network initiatives
- Global Environment for Network Innovations (GENI)
- United States Unified Community Anchor Network (U.S. UCAN)
- GigU
- USA Ignite

Mental Health Program and Technology & Innovation projects:

- Alaska Psychiatric Institute: e-psych
- South Dakota: Sinte Gleska University system of care project
- Health and Human Services: national rural health information technology training programs

Information Items – Mental Health Program

Staff: Dennis Mohatt

Guests: Michael Hoge, senior science and policy advisor, the Annapolis Coalition; John Morris, executive director, the Annapolis Coalition

Mental Health Program update:

- New project update: SAMHSA/HRSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration/Health Services Administration) Center for Integrated Health Solutions

Other business

11:45 am - 1:00 pm [Tab 7]

Aloha Center Ballroom

Lunch and Presentation: Higher Education in Hawai'i: Unique Challenges, Unique Opportunities

Speaker: M.R.C. Greenwood, president, University of Hawai'i

1:00 - 1:30 pm

Break

1:30 - 2:00 pm [Tab 8]

Aloha Center Ballroom

Plenary Session II: The Use of Technology in the New Normal of Higher Education

8-1

Speaker: David Lassner, vice president for information technology and chief information officer, University of Hawai'i

2:00 - 3:00 pm [Tab 8]
Aloha Center Ballroom

**Facilitated Discussion on the Use of Technology
in the New Normal of Higher Education**

8-1

Facilitator: Louis Fox, senior associate,
WICHE Technology & Innovation

3:00 pm

Transportation to Turtle Bay

4:30 pm
Turtle Bay Lobby

Transportation to the Polynesian Cultural Center

5:00 - 9:00 [Tab 9]
Polynesian Cultural Center

Luau and evening show

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

8:00 am
Turtle Bay Lobby

Transportation to BYU-Hawaii

8:30 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

Breakfast

8:45 - 9:45 am [Tab 10]
Aloha Center Ballroom

Committee of the Whole – Business Session

Agenda

Reconvene Committee of the Whole: Joe Garcia, chair

Report and recommended action of the Audit Committee:
Tom Buchanan, committee chair and immediate past
WICHE chair



FY 2011 audit report (separate document)

Report and recommended action of the Executive Committee:
Joe Garcia, WICHE chair

Report and recommended action of the Programs and Services
Committee: Carl Shaff, committee chair



Approval of the implementation plan:
new ways to apply Professional Student
Exchange Program support fees [Tab 4]



Approval of standardizing PSEP support fees in physician assistant and physical therapy fields [Tab 4]



Approval of the proposed project to revamp Western Undergraduate Exchange marketing and outreach strategies [Tab 4]



Approval of the proposed project to implement a state authorization reciprocity program [Tab 4]

Report and recommended action of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee: Robert Burns, committee chair



Approval of a project on teacher preparation and professional development related to the Common Core State Standards [Tab 5]



Approval of a project on building capacity to support state college completion goals [Tab 5]

Report and recommended action of the Self-funded Units Committee: Jim Hansen, committee vice chair



Approval for developing the Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework [Tab 6]

Committee of the Whole Action and Discussion Items



Approval of endorsement of the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability’s guidelines, detailed in “Assuring Quality, Accounting for Learning: Guidelines for Gathering and Reporting Evidence of Student Learning and Using It To Improve Outcomes,” and approval of the proposed WICHE endorsement process

10-3

Update on WICHE’s budget

10-12

Update on WICHE dues

10-15

Report on the Legislative Advisory Committee annual meeting – Senator Dave Nething, LAC member



Election of chair, vice chair, and immediate past chair as officers of the WICHE Commission

9:45 - 10:45 am [Tab 11]
Aloha Center Ballroom

Remarks of outgoing chair

Remarks of new chair

Selection of 2012 committee members

Meeting evaluation (electronic)
(<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FQ7JQPM>)

Other business

Plenary Session III: What's Up at WICHE? WCET's Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework and the Multistate Data Exchange Project

Speakers: Pearl Iboshi, director, Institutional Research and Analysis Office, University of Hawai'i System; Hae Okimoto, director, academic technologies, University of Hawai'i System; Brian Prescott, director of policy research, WICHE; Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET

10:45 - 11:00 am

Break

11:00 - 11:30 am [Tab 12]
Aloha Center Ballroom

Plenary Session IV: Finance in the New World

Speakers: Dennis Jones, president, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems; Brian Prescott, director of policy research, WICHE

11:30 am - 12:30 pm [Tab 12]
Aloha Center Ballroom

Facilitated Discussion on Finance in the New World

Facilitator: David Longanecker, president, WICHE

12:30 pm

Adjournment



Executive Committee Meeting (Open/Closed)

Monday, October 31, 2011

7:45 - 8:45 am

Aloha Center 155/165

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Monday, October 31, 2011

7:45 - 8:45 am
Aloha Center 155/165

Executive Committee Meeting (Open and Closed Sessions)

Joe Garcia (CO), chair
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT), vice chair
Tom Buchanan (WY), immediate past chair

Diane Barrans (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Mike Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
Dave Nething (ND)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Camille Preus (OR)
Jim Hansen (SD)
William Sederburg (UT)
Don Bennett (WA)
Position vacant (WY)

Agenda (Open)



Approval of the Executive Committee
teleconference minutes of August 29, 2011 1-3

Discussion Item: November 2011 meeting schedule

Other business

Agenda (Closed)

Discussion Item: Informal review of the president's performance
and travel during 2011 1-6

Other business

Other*

*Please note: Article III of Bylaws states:

Section 7. Executive Sessions

Executive sessions of the commission may be held at the discretion
of the chairman or at the request of any three commissioners

present and voting. The president shall be present at all executive sessions. The chairman, with the approval of a majority of the commissioners present and voting, may invite other individuals to attend.

Section 8. Special Executive Sessions

Special executive sessions, limited to the members of the commission, shall be held only to consider the appointment, salary, or tenure of the president.

ACTION ITEM

Executive Committee Teleconference Minutes Monday, August 29, 2011

Committee Members Present

Joe Garcia (CO), chair
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT), vice chair
Tom Buchanan (WY), immediate past chair

Diane Barrans (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Mike Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
Dave Nething (ND)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Jane Nichols for Carl Shaff (NV)
Jim Hansen (SD)
Don Bennett (WA)

Committee Members Absent

Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Camille Preus (OR)
William Sederburg (UT)

Other Commissioners Present

Dene Thomas (CO)
Karla Leach (WY)

Staff Present

David Longanecker, president
Erin Barber, executive assistant to the president
and to the commission
Craig Milburn, chief financial officer
Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Brian Prescott, director of policy research, Policy
Analysis and Research

Chair Joe Garcia called the meeting to order and asked Erin Barber to call roll. A quorum was confirmed.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of July 18, 2011

Chair Garcia asked for a motion to approve the Executive Committee teleconference minutes of July 18, 2011. Commissioner Nething moved TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2011, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE. Commissioner Hansen seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Update on WICHE's Budget

Chair Garcia called on David Longanecker to go through the budget with the committee. Longanecker noted that the report given to the committee included the final budget numbers for FY 2011 with the exception of one change proposed by the auditors. He asked Craig Milburn to discuss the change. Milburn said the auditors would like to include the delinquent California Community Colleges' dues as an expense in FY 2011. He said that the delinquent dues would be kept as an accounts receivable for FY 2012 and an account would be created for bad debt. Commissioner Harrison clarified that the \$87,000 amount was for delinquent California Community Colleges' dues and not current California state dues. Longanecker said that was correct and noted that the only unpaid FY 2012 dues are New Mexico's and the share from the University of California system (which usually pays later in the fall). He and Jere Mock have a meeting scheduled with California Community Colleges Chancellor Jack Scott early in October to discuss the possibility of the community colleges participating in WUE. If the program is implemented, he proposed adding a \$1,000 surplus to the first 87 participants as a way to recapture the \$87,000 owed to WICHE.

Longanecker noted that WICHE ended FY 2011 with a surplus of \$299,688. A portion of the surplus was designated for several expenditures going into FY 2012 at the May 2011 commission meeting (as noted in the budget footnotes). There were no positive or negative surprises to note at this point in the FY 2012 budget. Grant revenue is looking strong, so it appears that the organization won't have any trouble reaching the indirect cost-reimbursement amount estimated for FY 2012. Commissioner Rush asked if, because of the proposed change to the FY 2011 budget by the

auditors, the \$299,688 surplus will actually be reduced by \$87,000 to account for the California Community Colleges' delinquent dues. Longanecker said he was correct. Chair Garcia asked how likely it would be that WICHE would receive the delinquent dues in FY 2012. Longanecker said it would depend on how the meeting with Chancellor Scott went in October and how quickly a program with the community colleges could be implemented.

ACTION ITEM

Washington's Opportunity Scholarship Program

Longanecker told the committee that WICHE has an opportunity to work with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) on a project in Washington State, guided and funded by Microsoft, to implement a new opportunity scholarship. The scholarship will be a blending of private and public funding to offset costs for middle-income students going into STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) fields. Washington currently has one of the most robust need-based aid programs in the country, but this new scholarship program will target students above the eligibility requirement for need-based aid.

WICHE would receive \$35,000 out of the contract with NCHEMS. Brian Prescott added that the scholarship program is targeting students pursuing baccalaureate degrees. Students at two-year institutions would be eligible as long as they plan to pursue a four-year degree in a STEM field. Longanecker asked Commissioner Bennett to add any additional insight. Commissioner Bennett said that the program has a novel structure, with both public and private involvement. The program design, application, and rewards will fall under the Opportunity Scholarship Board (which has yet to be created). Longanecker added that part of WICHE's work with NCHEMS will be to determine whether or not the program is successful. Chair Garcia noted that other states are looking into similar initiatives, since state funding is declining; it will be interesting to see how the program in Washington develops.

Commissioner Rush asked if all of the staff time designated to the project will be covered by the contract. Longanecker and Prescott affirmed that all staff time would be reimbursed. Commissioner Barrans asked if an update would be presented at an upcoming commission meeting. Longanecker said that they would likely present something about the project at the May 2012 meeting. They project a four- to five-month timeline, which would have the project wrapping up in February or March 2012. Longanecker said that staff would be eager to share what they learn and the expertise gained.

Commissioner Rush moved TO SEEK FUNDING FROM THE OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP BOARD TO SUPPORT WICHE'S ENGAGEMENT IN THIS EFFORT. Commissioner Barrans seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Preliminary Agenda for the November Commission Meeting

Chair Garcia asked Longanecker to walk the committee through the preliminary agenda for the November meeting. Longanecker went through the agenda and noted confirmed speakers and plans for the plenary sessions. President Greenwood has recently confirmed her participation as one of the luncheon presenters. He also noted that the "What's Up at WICHE?" session will now include an update on the WCET PAR Framework project and the Multistate Data Exchange program. Longanecker told the committee that he would be drafting a memo to the commission outlining the rationale behind holding the meeting in Hawai'i and the cost-savings measures that staff is taking to make the meeting affordable. The committee briefly discussed logistics around transportation and check-out on the final day of the meeting. Chair Garcia asked how participation for the meeting was looking at this point. Erin Barber responded that participation seemed on-track for about the same amount of participation as other past meetings.

DISCUSSION ITEM

2011 Nominating Committee

Chair Garcia announced that members of the 2011 Nominating Committee will include Tom Buchanan (WY), serving as chair of the committee, Rico Munn (CO), and Christopher Cabaldon (CA). He thanked the Nominating Committee for their willingness to serve and help put the leadership slate together for 2012.

Other Business

Chair Garcia called for other business. Commissioner Rush mentioned that they were working on a new commissioner appointment from Idaho to replace Robert Kustra. They hope to have a legislator appointed in time to attend the fall meeting in Hawaii. Commissioner Stearns mentioned that they hoped to receive Clayton Christian's reappointment before the fall meeting as well.

Carl Shaff moved TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 29 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE. Commissioner Rush seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEM

President's Travel – Calendar Year 2011

January

- 11 Brookings Institute Economic Forum..... Washington, D.C.
- 12 WICHE Multistate Data Exchange meeting.....Seattle, WA
- 13 Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education Board meeting Anchorage, AK
- 14 Meetings at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.....Seattle, WA
- 18 – 20 Brookings State Grant Project meeting..... Washington, D.C.
- 22 – 26 National Student Clearinghouse Board meeting San Diego, CA
- 27 *Change* magazine editorial board meeting San Francisco, CA
- 28 Meeting with Victoria Hassid (Governor Jerry Brown's office) Sacramento, CA

February

- 1 Oregon House Subcommittee on Higher Education hearing.....Salem, OR
- 2 – 3 National Student Clearinghouse Data Access Advisory Committee meeting
and National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity hearing..... Washington, D.C.
- 9 Meetings with José Garcia and Patricia Sullivan..... Santa Fe, NM

March

- 3 – 6 Complete College America Spring Academy.....Miami Beach, FL
- 8 Meeting with Martha Kanter Washington, D.C.
- 14 – 15 Pacific Northwest Gigapop Board meeting.....Seattle, WA
- 21 – 22 Adult College Completion Network meeting Indianapolis, IN
- 24 California Community Colleges Chief Instructional Officers meeting Monterey, CA
- 25 – 26 Meeting with Karla Phillips and Flinn-Brown Civic Leadership Academy Phoenix, AZ

April

- 13 – 15 Western Academic Leadership Forum annual meeting Fort Collins, CO
- 21 Oregon Governance and Policy Committee meeting..... Portland, OR
- 25 Meetings with Jane Nichols and Nevada System of Higher Education staff Reno, NV
- 28 – 29 Lumina Foundation web portal meeting Indianapolis, IN

May

- 1 Governors Education Symposium Raleigh, NC
- 3 – 4 Education Commission of the States Rural Summit Washington, D.C.
- 9 – 10 Defining Alignment and Achieving College Readiness meetingChapel Hill, NC
- 14 – 17 WICHE Commission meeting San Francisco, CA
- 18 – 20 National Student Clearinghouse Board meeting Washington, D.C.
- 27 Daring Ideas meeting Sacramento, CA
- 29 – 30 Consortium for North American Higher Education (CONAHEC) Board meeting..... Vancouver, BC

June

- 1 – 2 Center for Urban Education meeting Los Angeles, CA
- 6 – 8 Aspen Institute..... Aspen, CO
- 16 Complete College America Advisory Committee meeting Washington, D.C.
- 17 New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee meeting..... Santa Fe, NM

July

- 27 Meetings at the National Student Clearinghouse Washington, D.C.
- 28 Gates Foundation state authorization meeting..... Washington, D.C.

August

- 2 – 3 New Mexico Higher Education orientation..... Santa Fe, NM
- 4 – 5 National Center for Postsecondary Research Advisory Committee meeting..... Oakland, CA
- 9 Latino College Completion meeting San Francisco, CA
- 10 SHEEO Higher Education Policy Conference San Francisco, CA

September

- 8 American Council on Education (ACE) Task Force on Institutional Accreditation Washington, D.C.
- 9 Nevada System of Higher Education Board of Regents meeting..... Las Vegas, NV
- 13 – 14 Legislative Advisory Committee annual meeting.....Seattle, WA
- 16 Center for Urban Education meeting with Nevada State Higher Education Las Vegas, NV
- 20 North Dakota Non-traditional No More meeting..... Bismarck, ND
- 26 – 28 National Student Clearinghouse Board meeting.....Herndon, VA
- 29 Louisiana Board of Regents meeting Baton Rouge, LA

October

- 6 Future of State Universities meeting..... Dallas, TX
- 7 Meeting with Chancellor Jack Scott Sacramento, CA
- 10 Pacific Northwest Gigapop Board meeting.....Seattle, WA
- 12 – 14 CONAHEC Board meeting..... Puebla, Mexico
- 17 – 18 Lumina/Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) Adult Learning meeting..... Indianapolis, IN
- 27 – 28 College Board National Forum New York City, NY
- 31 WICHE Commission meeting Laie, HI

November

- 1 WICHE Commission meeting Laie, HI
- 11 New Mexico Association of Student Affairs Professionals Symposium.....Albuquerque, NM

December

- 1 – 2 Reform and Innovation in the New Ecology of U.S. Higher Education meetingStanford, CA

WICHE



Committee of the Whole Call to Order/Introductions

Monday, October 31, 2011

8:45 - 9:00 am

Aloha Center Ballroom

2 Monday 8:45-9:00 am

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Monday, October 31, 2011

8:45 - 9:00 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

Committee of the Whole – Call to Order/Introductions

Call to order: Joe Garcia, chair

Welcome

Introduction of new commissioners and guests 2-3



Approval of the Committee of the Whole
meeting minutes of May 16-17, 2011 2-4

Report of the chair

Report of the president

Report of the Nominating Committee

Reminder to caucus on selection of 2012 committee members

Recess until November 1, 2011, at 8:45 am



New Commissioners

Sam Krone is a Wyoming state representative, elected in 2010. A lifelong resident of Cody, he serves as deputy county attorney, prosecuting crimes against persons in Cody and surrounding areas. He has served for nearly eight years on the Cody City Council and for six years as council president. Krone earned a degree in finance and economics from the University of Wyoming in 1998 and graduated from the University of Wyoming College of Law in 2001.

Karla Leach is the president of Western Wyoming Community College in Rock Springs. Previously, she served in a variety of positions in Texas: as dean of workforce education at Tarrant County College; graduate faculty at Texas A&M-Commerce in community college leadership; and dean of student learning and organizational development at Lone Star College-CyFair. She earned a bachelor's degree in secondary education from Texas Tech University; an M.B.A. from the University of Texas at Arlington; and a doctorate in community college leadership from the University of North Texas. She is a member of Kiwanis International and serves on the Wyoming P-16 Council, the Governor's Taskforce for Video and IP-Based Communications, and the Wyoming Early Childhood State Advisory Council.

Mack Shirley has served in the Idaho House of Representatives since 2002. Previously, Shirley was the vice president of student life services at Ricks College (now BYU-Idaho). He was also a high school principal and teacher in the Idaho public schools. Shirley earned an M.S. and Ph.D. in higher education administration and educational administration from the University of Utah. He has served on the WICHE Legislative Advisory Council since 2008.

Dene Kay Thomas was named president of Fort Lewis College in Durango, CO, in 2010. She earned her bachelor's degree and doctorate in English from the University of Minnesota. Thomas taught writing at the University of Idaho, where she was an associate professor, before undertaking several administrative positions on campus, including vice provost of academic affairs. She became president of Lewis-Clark State College, one of Idaho's four state-supported higher education institutions, in 2001. Thomas worked closely with the Nez Perce tribe at Lewis-Clark State, the only institution that teaches the Nez Perce language.

ACTION ITEM

Minutes of the Committee of the Whole

Session I: Call to Order Monday, May 16, 2011

Commissioners Present

Joe Garcia (CO), chair
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT), vice chair
Tom Buchanan (WY), immediate past chair

Susan Anderson (AK)
Diane Barrans (AK)
James Johnsen (AK)
Tom Anderes (AZ)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Christopher Cabaldon (CA)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
Michael Kirst (CA)
Kaye Howe (CO)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Roberta Richards (HI)
Steven Wheelwright (HI)
M. Duane Nellis (ID)
Clayton Christian (MT)
Kim Gillan (MT)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
José Garcia (NM)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Duaine Epegard (ND)
Bill Goetz (ND)
Dave Nething (ND)
Robert Burns (SD)
James Hansen (SD)
Jack Warner (SD)
Ryan Deckert (OR)
Tim Nesbitt (OR)
Camille Preus (OR)
Peter Knudson (UT)
Don Bennett (WA)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (WA)
Debbie Hammons (WY)

Commissioners Absent

Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Robert Kustra (ID)
Mike Rush (ID)
Susanna Murphy (NM)
Joe Hardy (NV)
William Sederburg (UT)

Guests/Speakers

Stephanie Butler, director of program operations, Alaska
Commission on Postsecondary Education
Jimmy Clarke, senior consultant, HCM Strategists
Deborah Everhart, chief architect, Blackboard
Karen Humphrey, executive director, California
Postsecondary Education Commission
Reyna Iwamoto, student services specialist, University of
Hawai'i System
Louise Lynch, certifying officer, Arizona Board of Regents
Darren Marshall, manager of audit and financial services,
Utah System of Higher Education
Karan Powell, senior vice president of academic affairs,
American Public University System
Jeannine Sherrick, certifying officer, Nevada System of
Higher Education
Lisa Shipley, certifying officer, University of Wyoming
Natalie Sidarous, policy analyst, California Postsecondary
Education Commission
Burck Smith, chief executive officer and founder,
StraighterLine
Ken Sorber, vice president of strategic relations, Western
Governors University
Laurie Tobol, certifying officer, Montana Office of the
Commissioner of Higher Education

Staff Present

Erin Barber, executive assistant to the president and to the
commission
Margo Colalancia, director, Student Exchange Program
Louis Fox, senior associate, Technology & Innovation
Patrick Lane, project coordinator, Policy Analysis and
Research
David Longanecker, president
Mollie McGill, deputy director, WCET
Demarée Michelau, director of policy analysis, Policy
Analysis and Research
Craig Milburn, chief financial officer
Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Dennis Mohatt, vice president for behavioral health,
director, WICHE Mental Health Program
Russell Poulin, deputy director, WCET
Brian Prescott, director of policy research, Policy Analysis
and Research
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE, the Forum, and the
Alliance
Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET

Chair Joe Garcia called the meeting to order and asked Karen Humphrey, executive director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, to give opening remarks.

Chair Garcia introduced newly appointed commissioners:

Tom Anderes, Arizona
Christopher Cabaldon, California
Dianne Harrison, California
Michael Kirst, California
José Garcia, New Mexico

Chair Garcia introduced guests attending the meeting and listed commissioners whose terms are expiring after the meeting.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of the Minutes of the November 8 - 9, 2010, Committee of the Whole Meeting

The minutes from the November 8-9, 2011, Committee of the Whole meeting were approved unanimously. Chair Garcia called on David Longanecker for the report of the president. Longanecker introduced staff in attendance and discussed logistics for transportation to the Nexus Policy Research Center later that afternoon. He also invited commissioners and guests to a reception hosted by Jimmy Clarke from HCM Strategists in the evening. Longanecker told commissioners that sign-up sheets were available if anyone was interested in organizing groups for dinner.

The first session of the Committee of the Whole was concluded, and the committee went into recess until Tuesday, May 17.

Session II: Business Session

Tuesday, May 17, 2011

Commissioners Present

Joe Garcia (CO), chair
Tom Buchanan (WY), immediate past chair

Susan Anderson (AK)
James Johnsen (AK)
Tom Anderes (AZ)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Christopher Cabaldon (CA)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
Michael Kirst (CA)
Kaye Howe (CO)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Roberta Richards (HI)
M. Duane Nellis (ID)
Kim Gillan (MT)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
José Garcia (NM)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Duaine Espegard (ND)
Bill Goetz (ND)
Dave Nething (ND)
Robert Burns (SD)
James Hansen (SD)
Jack Warner (SD)
Tim Nesbitt (OR)
Camille Preus (OR)
Don Bennett (WA)
Debbie Hammons (WY)

Commissioners Absent

Diane Barrans (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Steven Wheelwright (HI)
Robert Kustra (ID)
Mike Rush (ID)
Clayton Christian (MT)
Susanna Murphy (NM)
Joe Hardy (NV)
Ryan Deckert (OR)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (WA)

Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT), vice chair
Peter Knudson (UT)
William Sederburg (UT)

Guests/Speakers

Stephanie Butler, director of program operations, Alaska
Commission on Postsecondary Education
Jimmy Clarke, senior consultant, HCM Strategists
Reyna Iwamoto, student services specialist, University of
Hawai'i System
Louise Lynch, certifying officer, Arizona Board of Regents
Darren Marshall, manager of audit and financial services,
Utah System of Higher Education
Jeannine Sherrick, certifying officer, Nevada System of
Higher Education
Lisa Shipley, certifying officer, University of Wyoming
Natalie Sidarous, policy analyst, California Postsecondary
Education Commission
Burck Smith, chief executive officer and founder,
StraighterLine
Peter Smith, senior vice president of academic strategies
and development, Kaplan Higher Education

Staff Present

Erin Barber, executive assistant to the president and to
the commission
Margo Colalancia, director, Student Exchange Program
Louis Fox, senior consultant, Technology & Innovation
Patrick Lane, project coordinator, Policy Analysis and
Research
David Longanecker, president
Mollie McGill, deputy director, WCET
Demarée Michelau, director of policy analysis, Policy
Analysis and Research
Craig Milburn, chief financial officer
Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Dennis Mohatt, vice president for behavioral health and
director, Mental Health Program
Russell Poulin, deputy director, WCET
Brian Prescott, director of policy research, Policy Analysis
and Research
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE, the Forum, and the
Alliance
Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET

Chair Joe Garcia called the meeting to order and reconvened the Committee of the Whole.

Report and Recommended Action of the Audit Committee

Committee Chair Tom Buchanan reported that the Audit Committee had met three times over the course of the year. After retaining Clifton Gunderson for nine years for the WICHE audit, the committee met via teleconference in March to review RFPs from other auditing firms. The committee selected Bondi & Co. as the new auditing firm; they will be conducting the FY 2011 audit this summer. The committee met on Sunday, May 15, prior to the commission meeting to review the committee charter, calendar, and code of ethics. No changes were made to these documents. The Audit Committee will meet in the fall to review the WICHE audit, and a report will be presented at the November commission meeting.

Report and Recommended Action of the Executive Committee

Chair Joe Garcia reported that the Executive Committee met on Monday morning, prior to the start of the commission meeting. The committee approved minutes from their March 23, 2011, teleconference, and David Longanecker discussed the meeting schedule. The committee went into a closed session to discuss Longanecker's performance and self-evaluation. Garcia reported that the committee is generally satisfied with WICHE's leadership and acknowledges that it's facing some challenges.

Report and Recommended Action of the Programs and Services Committee

Committee Chair Carl Shaff reported that the Programs and Services Committee heard reports on various programs, including the Student Exchange Program. Updates were given on WICHE Internet Course Exchange (ICE) and the new North American Network of Science Labs Online (NANSLO) program, both directed by Pat Shea. Work being done with the Western Academic Leadership Forum (the Forum) and the Western Alliance for Community College Academic Leaders (the Alliance) includes regional initiatives to improve student mobility and transfer and articulation.

Commissioner Shaff moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2012 WORKPLAN SECTIONS PERTAINING TO THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES UNIT'S ACTIVITIES. Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Shaff reported that the committee heard proposals from staff for updating the structure of the Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) support fees. The current support fees are not meeting out-of-state differentials, creating an increased risk of schools pulling out of PSEP, which would limit students' access to healthcare education. This issue is also eroding preferential admission given to WICHE students in the PSEP fields. The Programs and Services staff has had numerous conversations over the past year to come up with options for the commission to consider. In the first option, all public institutions would be required to credit the support fee against full nonresident tuition, and the student would pay the balance. In the second option, the program would allow public institutions whose differential we are not meeting to credit support fees against full nonresident tuition, and the student would pay the balance; this would allow WICHE candidates to maintain some level of preference in the admission process, and institutions would retain their incentives. The second option was approved by the Programs and Services Committee. Staff will provide a complete proposal for this option at the November meeting. Commissioner Shaff continued to report that the committee was presented with information on the need to update the student exchange databases to be more contemporary, efficient, and user-friendly. The cost of the upgrade is estimated at \$60,000 and is part of budget carry-over considerations that will be presented during the business session.

Report and Recommended Action of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee

Committee Chair Bob Burns reported that several changes were made to the FY 2012 workplan for the Policy Analysis and Research unit: 1) the committee struck the proposed Western Consortium for Accelerated Learning Opportunities (WCALO) project because of limitations regarding WICHE's ability to subgrant to states; and 2) the committee removed the "Completion" item from "On The Horizon" because it is already listed in "Existing Activities."

Commissioner Burns moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2012 WORKPLAN SECTIONS PERTAINING TO ISSUE ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, AS AMENDED. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Burns reported that the committee had discussions about the current format of the workplan and expressed a need to clarify projects by providing more information on their scope, scale, funding source, and duration. He said the committee discussed the idea of looking into campus safety and security as a possible activity for the Policy Analysis and Research unit. The committee felt that this was not a priority issue for the Policy unit due to Homeland Security's work in this area, and it wasn't clear that the Policy unit could add value to this issue. The

committee acknowledged that guns are a significant issue on campuses, but it was not clear how the Policy unit could work in this area.

Commissioner Burns added that an outline for a data and policy brief on undocumented students was presented. There is an array of issues on this topic, and the policy brief will look at current policy and data. The committee was given updates on the methodology review of the projections of high school graduates; the data analysis project in Nevada with the Center for Urban Education; the state data exchange project in Idaho, Hawai'i, Washington, and Oregon; the adult learners project; and a policy brief on issues around the Common Core State Standards. Finally, the committee discussed the Legislative Advisory Council (LAC); staff will be seeking assistance from commissioners to fill current vacancies.

Report and Recommended Action of the Self-funded Units Committee

Committee Chair Kaye Howe moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2012 WORKPLAN SECTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SELF-FUNDED UNITS' ACTIVITIES. Commissioner Nething seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Howe reported that Ellen Wager gave an update on WCET activities, including their work with the State Authorization Network and multiple membership services, such as listservs, common interest groups, and blogs. WCET was also pleased to announce that they recently received a \$1 million grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for the first phase of a project called the Predictive Analytics Reporting (PAR) Framework. They hope to be funded for a second phase upon successful completion of this project. Commissioner Howe reported that the Mental Health Program's budget has come out of the red, with revenues exceeding current projections. They have helped fund WICHE with indirect costs from grants and contracts. The Mental Health Program's work spanned the WICHE region in FY 2011. Currently, two of their professional staff are being replaced by two postdocs. They currently have a technical assistance project in Doña Ana County in New Mexico, developing crisis intervention for the county. Staff is providing training in mental health first aid and workforce professional development for healthcare leaders.

The committee heard a report from Louis Fox on the work being done in Technology & Innovation. He is currently working with Dennis Mohatt on an "e-psych" effort in Alaska to provide acute in-patient care online so that patients can receive treatment in their local community hospitals instead of being transferred to a state mental health facility. Fox is also working on a project with Internet 2, building the backbone to connect anchor institutions with the healthcare community and public safety. Commissioner Howe also reported on Northern Tier's effort to connect states between Chicago and Seattle.

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of the FY 2012 Annual Operating Budget and Approval of the Request to Carry Forward Funds from FY 2011 to FY 2012

Chair Joe Garcia asked David Longanecker and Craig Milburn to walk the commissioners through the budget. Milburn noted that there was a \$215,000 projected surplus in the FY 2011 budget due to frugal expenditures in the units. He said that revenues did not change, but expenditures were down in the organization. Milburn said there were several projects left uncompleted in FY 2011 due to staffing issues, so staff would be asking for some of the surplus to be carried over to the FY 2012 budget, instead of going into reserves. For FY 2012 Milburn noted that they were projecting \$27,000 in excess revenues. The reserves are currently at \$1.3 million and are an accumulation of prior year budgets.

He said \$45,000 of the reserves are dedicated for the Internet 2 installation and the president's deferred compensation. In lines 8-9 on the general fund budget worksheet, additional dedications are listed.

Longanecker shared that of the \$1.3 million in reserves, a minimum reserve requirement of 12 percent of the general fund operating budget (comment c) was established in May 2000. An amount established in 2007 is reserved for the equivalent to six months of facilities payments, as part of the Ford Foundation loan for WICHE's ownership share of the State Higher Education Policy Center (SHEPC) building, owned with NCHEMS and SHEEO (comment d). In addition, action was taken a few years ago by the commission to dedicate some of the reserves for unexpected shortfalls in the case of unanticipated events. The unexpected shortfall line provides staff with the capacity to spend \$219,000, or 10 percent of the operating budget, with commission approval (comment e). To date, reserves have not been used for unexpected shortfalls. Finally, there are reserves dedicated as part of the loan requirement with the Colorado Educational and Cultural Facilities Authority, a loan secured to cover a portion of WICHE's financial

responsibilities in funding SHEPC (comment f). This loan is expected to be paid off in 2015. Longanecker reported that the installation of Internet2 (line 6 of dedicated reserves) is close to completion. The Boulder Research and Administration Network is in the process of getting all of the approvals necessary to move forward.

Longanecker explained the projects listed in lines 8-9. These were activities planned and budgeted for FY 2011 but not completed, due to staffing constraints. Two of these projects included \$25,000 for the State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIDO) database update and \$25,000 for the PSEP database update. WICHE currently only has two professional staff members in IT, and a major project from WCET (the installation of Salesforce) shifted IT staff time and resources away from other projects. Longanecker said staff was seeking approval to have money carried forward from FY 2011 to FY 2012 so these planned projects can be completed. Additionally, Longanecker asked that \$10,000 from the commission meeting budget surplus be transferred to FY 2012 to cover the additional expenses projected for holding the fall meeting in Hawai'i. He also asked that \$25,000 in the general fund be transferred over to FY 2012 for the LAC meeting. The LAC meeting was budgeted at \$25,000 in FY 2011, but the meeting was paid for by one of the grants from the Policy unit, leaving the \$25,000 in the general fund budget.

In addition to the proposed carry-over funds for projects, Longanecker asked that \$12,000 be carried over for staff bonuses. He told the committee that there would be no salary increases this year, but the costs of health benefits are increasing and staff are losing their base salaries with these increases. The amount of the bonuses given to staff would help to defray the cost in increased health insurance premiums. Finally, Longanecker mentioned the special allocation to install Salesforce for WICHE and to update the Student Exchange Program database. The total amount of carryover being requested is \$192,000, taking the reserves down by \$21,000, after accounting for these new dedications.

Commissioner Nething asked Milburn about the variance column summations in each of the unit budgets. Milburn said that the variance for each revenue and expense line is accurate, as is the sum of the revenue and sum of the expense variances; but the sum of the sum of the variances has no useful meaning. Milburn noted that a page was missing from the Mental Health Program budgets and said that Mental Health planned to spend or defer all of the revenue they bring in.

Commissioner Nething asked about WCET's budget on p. 11-7 and how the \$190,000 deficit was being covered. Longanecker said that \$100,000 had been provided to WCET during their transition and a portion will come out of their reserves. The \$100,000 in transition funding will eventually be paid back to WICHE. Longanecker also noted that the WCET budgets in the agenda book do not reflect the new funding they have received from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. He hoped that the new funding would help balance WCET's budgets. Ellen Wagner said that they hoped to be back in the black next year and thought that the new grant would also accelerate memberships, sponsorships, and inquiries.

Commissioner Hansen moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2012 ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET (GENERAL AND NON-GENERAL FUND BUDGETS). Commission Shaff seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Nething moved TO APPROVE THE REQUEST TO CARRY FORWARD FUNDS FROM FY 2011 TO FY 2012. Commissioner Espegard seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of Salary and Benefit Recommendations for FY 2012

Longanecker told the committee that he was proposing no increases to staff salaries for FY 2012. WICHE staff do not receive cost-of-living increases, and all salary increases are based on merit or equity only instruments. The financial circumstances of the organization and the states it serves dictate that no increases be given for salaries. There is no increase in WICHE dues in FY 2012, so the organization is not in a position to adjust staff salaries. Longanecker noted that bonuses would be provided to staff under the previous action item.

Commissioner Preus moved TO APPROVE THE SALARY AND BENEFIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 2012. Commissioner Johnsen seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of Future Dates and Locations for WICHE Commission Meetings

Longanecker told the committee that the fall meeting would be held in Laie, HI. Meeting participants will be staying at Turtle Bay Resort, and the meeting will be held at Brigham Young University (BYU)-Hawaii. On Monday evening guests will attend a luau at the Polynesian Cultural Center, which is run by BYU-Hawaii. The proposed location of the May 2012 meeting is Fort Collins, CO, because of the relationship between WICHE and Colorado State University-Fort Collins's veterinary medicine program. The proposed November 2012 meeting location is Salt Lake City; the proposed location for May 2013 is Seattle. The May dates avoid conflict with Mother's Day. The fall meetings in 2012 and 2014 fall on Veteran's Day, and Longanecker asked if that would pose any difficulty among the commission.

Commissioner Hansen moved TO APPROVE THE FUTURE DATES AND LOCATIONS FOR WICHE COMMISSION MEETINGS. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of the FY 2012 Workplan

Commissioner Shaff moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2012 WORKPLAN. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Chair Garcia reminded commissioners that the Commissioner Code of Ethics was located in their agenda books. Commissioner Anderson asked if the document needs to be signed by commissioners. Longanecker said that the commission decided that signatures are not needed. The Commissioner Code of Ethics is a voluntary activity, and it's fine to review it each year. Longanecker signs the President's Code of Ethics each year.

Chair Garcia reminded the commissioners that the meeting evaluation would be sent to them electronically and adjourned the Committee of the Whole Business Session.

WICHE



Plenary Session I: What's Up in the West? Reorganizing Governance in the West

Monday, October 31, 2011
9:00 - 10:00 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

3 Monday 9:00-10:00 am

Monday, October 31, 2011

9:00 - 10:00 am

Aloha Center Ballroom

Plenary Session I:

What's Up in the West? Reorganizing Governance in the West

During the 2011 legislative season, three WICHE states substantially changed their governance structures. California and Washington both eliminated their statewide higher education coordinating boards, though in somewhat different fashions. In California, via budgetary veto, Governor Jerry Brown simply eliminated state funding for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and a number of other statewide commissions, immediately terminating these agencies. Critical functions performed by CPEC were then farmed out to other state offices. In Washington the legislative action to eliminate the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) came at the end of the legislative session: the legislation eliminates the HECB at the end of fiscal year 2012 and establishes a task force to work with the governor to come up with some entity to replace it.

Oregon, interestingly, had no coordinating board but created one. This new coordinating board will promote a public agenda for higher education, primarily by coordinating planning and program collaboration between Oregon's community colleges and universities and by working closely with another newly created entity, the Oregon Education Investment Board, to develop a long-term funding strategy to serve the public agenda.

Michael Kirst will describe what has taken place in California and why. Don Bennett will provide similar information on Washington, including an update on the task force that will propose a replacement for the HECB. And Camille Preus will bring us up to date on what's happening in Oregon.

Speakers: Don Bennett, executive director, Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board; Michael Kirst, president, California State Board of Education; Camille Preus, commissioner, Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development.

Biographical Information on the Speakers

Don Bennett is the executive director of the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board. A key member of the HECB team responsible for developing the state's 2008 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education, Bennett served as interim director of the Workforce Training and Education Coordination Board for a year prior to joining the HECB. He served from 1997-2006 as executive secretary of the State Personnel Board. He was deployed to Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom from 2004 to 2005 with the 81st Brigade Combat Team; he currently serves as state judge advocate, Joint Forces Headquarters, Washington Army National Guard, and holds the rank of colonel. He has significant experience in educational policy issues, having served as director of policy and legal services for the Washington State School Directors Association, leadership counsel for the Washington State Senate, and staff counsel for the Senate Education Committee. He

earned a J.D. from the University of Puget Sound School of Law (now Seattle University) in 1986.

Michael Kirst is president of the California State Board of Education and professor emeritus of education at Stanford University. He has been on the Stanford faculty since 1969. Before joining the Stanford University faculty, Kirst held several positions with the federal government, including staff director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment and Poverty and director of program planning for elementary and secondary education at the U.S. Office of Education. He was a former president of the California State Board of Education. His latest books are *From High School to College* with Andrea Venezia (2004) and *Political Dynamics of American Education* (2009). Kirst is a member of both the National Academy of Education and the International Academy of Education. He received his Ph.D. in political economy and government from Harvard.

Camille Preus is the commissioner of the Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development. Previous to this she was the workforce policy coordinator at the Oregon Governor's Office of Education and Workforce Policy and served as the director of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning, as well as in a number of other government and industry positions. Her B.S. is from Middle Tennessee State University; her M.S. in business administration is from Indiana University; and she received a doctorate in community college leadership from Oregon State University.

CHANGING ROLES

By Gordon K. Davies

OF GOVERNING AND COORDINATING BOARDS

Downloaded by [Mr Gloria Auer] at 14:45 30 August 2011

The work of state higher education system boards is changing. By “system boards,” I mean governing boards for all of higher education in a state, governing boards for certain kinds of institutions (such as the Louisiana Community and Technical College System and the California State University system), and state coordinating agencies (such as the Illinois Board of Higher Education). All of them have a general responsibility to promote cooperation and coherence among the institutions for which they are responsible.

But times have changed, and so should the ways in which systems boards do that work.

Many of these boards (or agencies) were created in the 1950s and 60s, when the US faced the great challenge of rapidly building capacity to accommodate large numbers

of students. The GI Bill had sparked a movement in which people from a wide range of backgrounds found college education suddenly available to them, ushering in a vastly larger college-going population that would lead to dramatic growth of the American middle class.

In the mid-20th century, the primary work of the governing and coordinating agencies was to promote rational and politically acceptable expansion, ensuring that all regions of a state were served by institutions that were reasonably accessible and that these institutions offered comparable and appropriate arrays of programs, student services, and amenities.

Fast forward to 2010. The major challenge today is not building capacity; it is instead using the existing capacity of state systems of colleges and universities as efficiently and effectively as possible. Certainly new buildings need to be built, but not as many as during the mid-20th century. New

Gordon K. Davies (gdavies02@comcast.net) has been the executive head of two statewide coordinating boards, one in Virginia (the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia) and the other in Kentucky (the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education).

programs need to be started, but not as many. New institutions need to be established, but not many. There are more than enough highly selective universities and not nearly enough colleges committed to meeting the needs of the people in the states in which they are located.

The size and strength of the for-profit sector of postsecondary education has also changed American higher education. It now enrolls about 12 percent of all students, who collect about 25 percent of federal grants and loans. Most of these institutions operate nationally or at least regionally, often offering online learning in states in which they have no physical presence. State approval, still nominally a responsibility of most coordinating or governing boards, has become difficult and frustrating.

From the World War II veterans onward, millions of families now are entering the fourth generation of college-going, while states are seeking at the same time to serve a new population of potential first-time students. The first group tends to think of college as a right, even to take it for granted, while the second faces daunting obstacles to enrolling, persisting, and completing programs of study.

State boards now have two major responsibilities. First, they must insist upon the public purpose of higher education: to meet the needs of the people of the states in which they are located. Second, they must continue to act as “buffers” between the colleges and universities and the political and bureaucratic institutions of government.

It sounds simple if you say it fast. But actually, this dual role is complicated and difficult because of the social, economic, and political situation in which we find ourselves.

We have an economy in which people must be college educated (and have a degree or certificate to show for it) in order to participate and contribute. But we have a politi-



© Matthew Henry Hall www.matthewhenryhall.com

cal situation in which there is no will to generate additional revenues or to stop deficit spending. And we have a general public that wants colleges and universities to make available services and modes of delivery that most of them are not equipped to provide.

Seeing that old models of governance do not work in this new environment, state leaders have responded in two contradictory ways: with excessive deregulation or with exces-

sive central control. Both are understandable, given what is happening in states across the nation. And both are wrong.

Excessive deregulation is a predictable outcome of state reductions in higher education funding. “If the state will not, or cannot, support us, then cut us loose to do what we think best in order to make our university as good as it can be,” say flagships and other universities with top-twenty ambitions (obviously, this is not as big an issue with community colleges). At a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, James Duderstadt, former president of the University of Michigan, advanced this argument: “We’re facing the prospect in which state money is so meaningless as to not be worth the regulatory burden.”

At least one governor has responded to this complaint by offering a flagship university complete autonomy in return for its purchase of the land and physical assets that have been provided by the state. That ended the discussion. But the argument that if a state gives its institutions very little support, it should exercise very little control is appealing. In Wisconsin, the governor took this position to the point of recommending that the flagship University of Wisconsin, Madison, break off from the rest of the system and assume the status of a “public authority.”

Meanwhile, at the other end of the governance spectrum, some state governments have assumed direct control of their public colleges and universities. In several, the governor has assumed authority to appoint the head of the state governing or coordinating body, while others have eliminated or greatly weakened the “buffer” boards that once helped to guard against both political interference in higher education and excessive bureaucratization of the institutions.

Independent buffer boards are apparently under fire in other nations with sophisticated higher education systems as well. In England, for example, the Higher Education Funding Council is moving to a more regulatory model as the result of a government review. In Japan, the independent buffer agencies are experiencing pressure from a government that wants more control. (A panelist at a Japanese symposium on the changing roles of buffer boards said of them that, in being situated between government and the institutions, they are “kicked from below and punched from above.”)

The result is a highly political system that can distort the historic values and purposes of higher education. The recent tendency to treat colleges and universities simply as weapons in a global battle for economic supremacy is a good example of this trend.

Politically controlled systems also tend to lack long-term coherence. As governors come and go, so too do their leadership appointments and the expectations of what the system should be doing.

But while state boards are under fire, their role in effecting change has never been more crucial. We need them to move away from a bureaucratic style of operation to focus on (1) cost management rather than revenue enhancement, (2) the core instructional mission rather than pursuit of status (through selective admission, graduate programs, and research), and (3) strategic choices rather than short-term fixes. We need them to ensure that the successful education of undergraduates from all social and economic sectors of our society becomes the dominant priority of all but a few institutions.

Here are some of the things the higher education boards – the buffer agencies – should do:

1. Set an agenda focused on access and success by changing existing budget formulae to reward the behavior we want and need, such as improved graduation rates coupled with a rigorous assessment of learning.
2. Measure what matters, such as progress from elementary school through college and the retention of graduates in the state.
3. Establish a formal relationship with the state’s apparatus for economic development.
4. Establish genuine working relationships with K-12, both at the state level and regionally across the state, on such issues as the Common Core Standards.

“As governors come and go, so too do their leadership appointments and the expectations of what the system should be doing.”

“We need to recognize that the rapid expansion of for-profit postsecondary institutions has raised legitimate concerns about the quality of their offerings. State approval mechanisms are ill-suited to deal with these giant, multi-region institutions.”

5. Take responsibility for all of adult education, including basic literacy and numeracy.
6. Monitor the multiple sources of funds coming into each institution and where they are spent.
7. Report what is being done, the resources used in doing it, and the results achieved. Of course some innovations will fail. It is important to recognize quickly which ones they are, abandon them, and move on. In this way, even failures contain elements of success.
8. Protect the autonomy of the institutions.

Finally, we need to recognize that the rapid expansion of for-profit postsecondary institutions has raised legitimate concerns about the quality of their offerings. State approval mechanisms are ill-suited to deal with these giant, multi-region institutions, which often operate in states in which they have no physical presence. The US Department of Education is attempting to address this problem, but unfortunately it is doing so through bureaucratic actions like defining the “credit hour” and “gainful employment.” The states are in a better position to regulate the quality of these institutions through their licensing authority. They might work through the regional compacts to revisit their procedures and standards for institutional approval.

There are good examples of multi-state cooperation that have proven very valuable: For years, SREB’s Minority Doctoral Grant Program and Academic Common Market have addressed access and achievement issues across state borders, not just within them, and in 1996, the Western Interstate Council on Higher Education (WICHE) states created the Western Governors University to address the pressing problem of access in the region. The states need to act in a coherent way to guard against top-down control that could tie colleges and universities in knots.

“You get kicked from below and punched from above,” said the witty participant at the Japanese symposium on the changing roles of state boards. It’s true. It’s always been true, only now the state boards will be knocked around for new reasons.

From above, the demands are for cost reductions and increased productivity; from below, they are for deregulation and the pursuit of business as usual. Balances can be achieved that meet the demands of each side to some extent. But if the two sides start kicking and punching one another, the results will be damaging and useless brawls. Street fights are not going to help us set a course for the future. Come, let us reason together. ☐

WICHE



Programs and Services Committee Meeting

Monday, October 31, 2011

10:15 - 11:45 am

Aloha Center Ballroom

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

4 Monday 10:15-11:45 am

Monday, October 31, 2011

10:15 - 11:45 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

Programs and Services Committee Meeting

Carl Shaff (NV), chair
Diane Barrans (AK), vice chair
Tom Buchanan (WY), ex officio

Committee vice chair (AK)
Tom Anderes (AZ)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
Joe Garcia (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Robert Kustra (ID)
Clayton Christian (MT)
Committee chair (NV)
Susanna Murphy (NM)
Duaine Espegard (ND)
Tim Nesbitt (OR)
Jack Warner (SD)
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)
Position vacant (WY)

Agenda

Presiding: Carl Shaff, chair
Staff: Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Margo Colalancia, director, Student Exchange Program
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE, Western Academic Leadership Forum, and Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders



Approval of the Programs and Services Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2011 4-3



Approval of the implementation plan: new ways to apply Professional Student Exchange Program support fees – Margo Colalancia 4-7



Approval of standardizing PSEP support fees in physician assistant and physical therapy fields – Margo Colalancia 4-20



Approval of the proposed project to revamp Western Undergraduate Exchange marketing and outreach strategies – Jere Mock and Margo Colalancia 4-23



Approval of the proposed project to implement
a state authorization reciprocity program –
David Longanecker

4-24

Discussion Item:

The Interstate Passport Project – Pat Shea

Information Item:

Student Exchange Program updates – Margo Colalancia

4-32

Other business

Adjournment

ACTION ITEM

Programs and Services Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 17, 2011

Committee Members Present

Carl Shaff (NV), chair
Diane Barrans (AK), vice chair
Tom Buchanan (WY), ex officio
Tom Anderes (AZ)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
Joe Garcia (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Clayton Christian (MT)
Duaine Espeguard (ND)
Tim Nesbitt (OR)
Jack Warner (SD)

Committee Members Absent

Robert Kustra (ID)
Suzanna Murphy (NM)
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)

Guests

Stephanie Butler, Alaska certifying officer
Reyna Iwamoto, Hawai'i certifying officer
Louise Lynch, Arizona certifying officer
Darren Marshall, Utah certifying officer
Jeannine Sherrick, certifying officer
Lisa Shipley, Wyoming certifying officer
Laurie Tobol, Montana certifying officer

Staff Present

Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Margo Colalancia, director, Student Exchange Program
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE, Western Academic
Leadership Forum, and Western Alliance for Community
College Academic Leaders

Chair Shaff called the meeting of the Programs and Services Committee to order.

Commissioner Warner motioned TO APPROVE THE MAY 17, 2010, PROGRAMS AND SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES. Commissioner Barrans seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Jere Mock presented the Programs and Services unit's workplan for FY 2012. Mock said the workplan includes the continuation and growth of WICHE's successful Student Exchange Program that currently serves more than 28,100 students at 172 institutions. The broad array of programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional school levels expand student access and save students nearly \$233 million in tuition savings. The Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) provides access to 10 professional healthcare fields for students in 12 WICHE states. In 2010-11 some 700 students enrolled through PSEP to become allopathic or osteopathic physicians, dentists, veterinarians, physical therapists, occupational therapists, optometrists, podiatrists, physician assistants, and pharmacists. WICHE's Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP) is another important educational resource for the West, allowing master's, graduate certificate, and doctoral students who are residents of the 15 participating states to enroll in some 255 high-quality programs at 47 participating institutions on a resident-tuition basis. The program provides a tremendous opportunity for WICHE states to share distinctive programs and to build their workforce in a variety of disciplines. WRGP now includes 72 healthcare-related programs: graduate nursing degrees, public health, mental health and psychology, audiology and speech pathology, biomedical informatics, and more. Staff will solicit additional programs to join WRGP in the coming year. More than 26,700 students enrolled in public two- and four-year institutions in the West through the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) in 2010-11, saving \$210 million. WUE students pay 150 percent of the enrolling institution's resident tuition at 145 participating campuses. WICHE staff will continue to encourage more institutions to join WUE, including more in California, and will also increase outreach efforts with high school counselors and other organizations to boost awareness of this valuable regional program.

Programs and Services staff also manages several other regional initiatives that promote interinstitutional collaborations in the West. One of these programs is the WICHE Internet Course Exchange – WICHE ICE – which enables institutions to share online courses to expand offerings and reduce costs for institutions. In 2012 ICE will focus on expanding membership and enrollments by building awareness about ICE as a cost-effective tool for addressing institutional budget shortages and reducing course and program duplication. Some of its member institutions will be involved in the new 15-month, \$750,000-grant-funded project to establish the North American

Network of Science Labs Online (NANSLO), which will develop open content courses with remote web-based labs in introductory gateway courses in physics, chemistry, and biology. WICHE is the coordinating partner and fiscal agent for this new initiative, funded by the Next Generation Learning Challenges initiative, with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates and the William and Flora Hewlett foundations. In this project the Colorado Community College System will pilot the replication of an existing web-based laboratory at BCcampus (originating in British Columbia) for use in teaching gateway online courses in biology, chemistry, and physics. Faculty discipline panels, with faculty from community colleges in Montana and Wyoming and from the Colorado School of Mines, will assist in the review of open educational resources to be used in the pilot and advise on the development of a template for expansion of NANSLO to include institutions in other states and provinces.

The Programs and Services workplan also includes several multistate and multi-institution initiatives that foster collaboration, innovation, and cost saving. The Western Academic Leadership Forum (the Forum) gives academic leaders in the WICHE states – provosts, academic vice presidents at bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral-level institutions, and chief executives and chief academic officers for system and state governing boards – a forum for sharing information, resources, and expertise as they address issues of common concern across the region and work together on innovative solutions. The Forum’s 2012 annual meeting will be held in April in Phoenix. A similar organization, the Western Alliance for Community College Academic Leaders (the Alliance), was established by WICHE in 2011 for chief academic leaders from community colleges and technical schools along with academic leaders of systems and state agencies for the two-year sector. The Alliance provides members with a way to share information, expertise, and resources as they address common issues and collaborate on innovative solutions to regional challenges. WICHE serves as secretariat to the Forum and the Alliance.

In the coming year, several of the Forum and the Alliance members will partner to develop a new regional initiative to increase student mobility and reduce educational costs through improved transfer and articulation in the WICHE region. Programs and Services staff will serve as the coordinators of the Interstate Passport Initiative to develop a new “regional passport” that students can use to block-transfer their completed lower-division general education core to other participating institutions in the region.

In FY 2012 WICHE will provide several options for institutions to reduce administrative costs, by continuing its collaboration with the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC) to offer its Master Property Program (MPP) to institutions and higher education systems in the West, helping them save money and obtain comprehensive property insurance coverage tailored to higher education needs. Forty-eight institutions, encompassing more than 100 campuses, are members of the MPP, and their combined property values, nearly \$80 billion, provide significant market leverage. Staff will continue to market the program to institutions in the WICHE region and work with current members. WICHE will also continue its partnership with MHEC to provide discounted purchasing options to higher education institutions, state agencies, county and municipal governments, and other nonprofit organizations that want to buy computers, software, printers and peripherals, and data and voice networking through the MHECtech program. MHECtech staff undertakes the time and expense of extensive competitive procurement processes, enabling participating institutions and organizations to purchase a variety of products and services knowing that the due diligence in selecting the vendor has already been done and that they will benefit from volume discounts.

Commissioner Garcia motioned TO APPROVE THE 2012 WORKPLAN. Commissioner Ogawa seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Margo Colalancia, director of the Student Exchange Program (SEP), presented the “New Ways to Apply Professional Student Exchange Program Support Fees” discussion item. Colalancia explained that PSEP support fees have not been meeting the resident/nonresident tuition differentials of some of our key cooperating programs in public institutions for many years now. The problem is worsening with shrinking state budgets and the significant increases in tuition that we have seen in the last two years. Institutions that are losing revenues on WICHE PSEP students risk pulling out of PSEP. This would narrow students’ choices and limit their access to professional healthcare education. Mock and Colalancia spent the last nine months talking with certifying officers and cooperating institutions to explore solutions, which were presented to the Program and Services Committee.

The committee members discussed two possible options. Option 1 would require that all public institutions credit the support fee against full nonresident tuition and have the student pay the balance. This would help institutions with unmet tuition differential gaps (with students making up for the difference), but it would punish public programs that still have some type of incentive to enroll PSEP students. This erosion of preferential admission for WICHE students is particularly problematic with WICHE’s cooperating veterinary colleges at Colorado State University, Oregon State

University, and Washington State University. Option 2 would be to allow public institutions whose differentials are not met to credit the support fee against full nonresident tuition and have the student pay the balance. Institutions currently benefiting from an incentive would keep it. This would help institutions who have been essentially losing tuition revenues for WICHE students' sake, and it would encourage programs where we are meeting differentials to continue preferentially admitting PSEP students.

Colalancia explained that staff would like to get commissioners' feedback now, so that by November 2011 at the latest, they would know what course of action to take for the next round of support fee increases, which will be presented to commissioners in May 2012 for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 biennium.

Commissioner Harrison cautioned staff to give students as much advanced warning as possible in cases where there would be significant change in their tuition responsibility. Colalancia agreed, but added that it would be best to implement any changes at the same time in both new and continuing institutions; this would make it easier on enrolling institutions, state offices, and WICHE staff.

Commissioner Garcia asked to what degree WICHE students receive preferential admission. Colalancia stated that in veterinary medicine, it was undisputable. Most medical and dental schools preferentially admit PSEP students over the national pool, as well. In other fields it varied; but overall, WICHE students were considered after resident applicant pools but before national pools. Commissioner Barrans agreed that it changes from year to year and added that WICHE applicants had a better chance of being admitted than did nonresidents outside of WICHE.

Commissioners agreed with the staff recommendation to implement the second option, which will help programs losing money (because the incentive is not met) and will let institutions that have an incentive keep it; they shared staff's primary concern of the importance of maintaining preferential admission.

Committee Chair Shaff invited commissioners to proceed with a vote. Commissioner Barrans moved TO ADOPT OPTION 2. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anderes. The agreement was that staff would propose an implementation plan and additional specifics for a final vote in November 2011.

Colalancia also presented the Student Exchange Program's proposal to upgrade the WUE, WRGP, and PSEP databases, used to administer the programs. The cost is estimated at \$60,000. The upgrades are critical as these programs track enrollment of more than 28,000 students (2010-11). Furthermore, all three websites pull information from their respective databases. The three programs account for more than 55 percent of WICHE's web traffic, with 47 percent of the visits attributed to WUE (March 2011). WUE institutions become frustrated with the slow database during enrollment-reporting periods. The PSEP database serves many important functions, including processing and tracking over \$14 million in state investment annually. The WUE and WRGP databases help track financial savings for students, too. Together, the three programs track more than \$232.3 million. Mock explained that the Executive Committee had previously discussed this need and, in principal, approved of it, but had suggested further discussion by the committee and the full commission. President David Longanecker has proposed to use \$100,000 from WICHE reserves to cover the SEP database upgrades and an upgrade of WICHE's contact database using new software called Salesforce.

Commissioner Harrison motioned TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL TO UPGRADE THE DATABASES. Commissioner Warner seconded the motion. The committee's approval went to the full commission for a vote.

Finally, Colalancia gave a brief update on WRGP. Staff reviewed almost 40 nominations for new master's, Ph.D., and graduate certificate programs last fall, and all were approved for fall 2011. Most importantly, WRGP is becoming a growing resource for graduate students in healthcare education and now offers more than 70 programs related to healthcare; these include 10 options in audiology and speech pathology and 25 programs in graduate nursing, among many others.

Pat Shea, director of WICHE ICE, Western Academic Leadership Forum, and Western Alliance for Community College Academic Leaders, described the recent activities of the Forum, which serves the four-year sector, including its annual meeting in April that focused on "The Politics of Student Success – from Readiness to Completion." Several members of the Alliance also participated. The Academic Leaders Toolkit, a joint project of these two groups, made its debut at the meeting. The toolkit is a web-based collection of decision-making tools and processes used by academic leaders in their various roles. It will assist users in finding best practices and lessons learned for more effective leadership. Next

year the Forum members will hold their annual meeting in Arizona, where the Alliance may also hold its first official membership meeting.

The committee also heard a presentation by WCET's deputy director, Russ Poulin, and David Longanecker regarding the federal regulations on state authorization of distance education and possible strategies to develop regional interstate reciprocity agreements. The U.S. Department of Education released regulatory language in October 2010 pertaining to program integrity regulations for federal financial aid and covering a range of issues, including gainful employment, incentive compensation, and credit-hour definition. Institutions offering postsecondary education through distance or correspondence education to students in a state in which they are not physically located or in which they are otherwise subject to state jurisdiction (as determined by the state) are required to comply with any applicable state approval or licensure requirements applicable to distance learning in each state in which they operate. Institutions may decide to seek authorization or to withdraw from some states entirely. WCET launched the State Authorization Network (SAN) to help systems and consortia assist their member institutions in understanding and complying with state regulations. It has also provided guidance and policy advocacy on behalf of institutions through its blog, webcasts, a SAN seminar, and email communications to reduce institutional costs for compliance and protect student access to online educational programs.

ACTION ITEM

Implementation Plan: New Ways to Apply Professional Student Exchange Program Support Fees

At the May 2011 meeting, commissioners serving on the Programs and Services Committee approved a new model for applying support fees for WICHE's Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) at participating public institutions (see Background section, including May discussion item, following this action item). PSEP support fees have not been meeting the resident/nonresident tuition differentials at some of WICHE's key cooperating programs in public institutions for many years now. The problem has worsened since the recession took hold in 2008, and many institutions have raised their tuition. Institutions losing revenues on WICHE PSEP students may be forced to pull out of PSEP, and this is why a change is necessary.

Staff presented committee members with two possible options that would help to ameliorate this situation (detailed in the Background section, below). Committee members voted to approve the second option (the item did not come before the full commission). This option will let public institutions whose differentials are not met by the support fee to credit the fee against full nonresident tuition and have the student pay the balance. This will allow institutions currently benefiting from an incentive to retain the benefit and to continue preferentially admitting PSEP students. It will also help institutions that have been losing tuition revenues for WICHE students' sake. Commissioners shared staff's primary desire to preserve preferential admission for PSEP students.

Committee members requested that WICHE staff propose an implementation plan and timeline for discussion and approval at the November 2011 meeting. Below, you will find the proposed plan, along with draft communications and a notification schedule. WICHE certifying officers have contributed their feedback, along with some of the public institutions whose tuition differentials have not been met in recent years.

Please note that the commissioners will discuss and approve proposed support fee increases for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 biennium in May 2012.

Proposed Implementation Plan

Timeline

WICHE staff proposes to put the new method of applying support fees in effect for the 2013-14 academic year. Continuing students enrolled in programs prior to fall 2013 will be grandfathered in through graduation and will pay resident tuition, as before.

Notification of Cooperating Public Programs and Students

1. Certifying offices will notify continuing students enrolled in public institutions of the change directly, but WICHE staff will also prepare email messages for participating institutions to forward to their WICHE PSEP students. Tentative notification dates: January 2012, July 2012, January 2013, and July 2013. Certifying offices will also notify new applicants applying for PSEP certification in summer 2012 and summer 2013.
2. WICHE staff will notify participating public programs of the coming change in December 2011, pending discussion and approval of the implementation plan at the November 2011 commission meeting.
3. WICHE staff will email and call admissions and financial aid representatives of programs in which students will be paying more for the unmet differential, according to the AY 2011 tuition rate calculations. According to the AY 2010 tuition differentials, 14 programs with enrollments are affected; but more programs could be affected in future years. Tentative notification dates: January 2012 and January 2013.
4. WICHE staff will invite admissions and financial aid staff of public programs to participate in webinars covering this new policy and general best practices in PSEP administration. Tentative webinar dates: March 2012, May-July 2012, January 2013, and May-July 2013.

5. WICHE will explain the new change on its PSEP website and future versions of brochures. Information will be added to the PSEP website in February 2012; changes to PSEP brochures will be made in July 2012. Mention of the change will also be reflected in write-ups for future *Statistical Reports*, beginning with the fall 2011 version, which will be published in late December 2012 or early January 2013.

Summary Notification Schedule			
Date	Who	Group to be Notified	Why
December 2011/ January 2012	WICHE	Email and call public PSEP programs whose students may be affected	Tell them about new method of applying support fees and how it may affect their WICHE students.
January 2012	Certifying offices	Continuing students enrolled in public programs	Inform them they may need to pay more than resident tuition beginning in fall 2013
January/February 2012	WICHE	Update PSEP website copy, AY2011 <i>Statistical Report</i> , and other reports describing PSEP to explain upcoming changes	
March 2012	WICHE	Admissions and financial aid staff of public programs	Host 1st webinar to explain changes
July 2012	Certifying offices and participating programs	Continuing students enrolled in public programs	Inform them they may need to pay more than resident tuition
July 2012	WICHE	Admissions and financial aid staff of public programs	Host 2nd webinar to explain changes
January 2013	Certifying offices and participating programs	Continuing students enrolled in public programs	Inform them they may need to pay more than resident tuition
January 2013	WICHE	Email and call public programs whose students may be affected (2nd notification)	
January 2013	WICHE	Admissions and financial aid staff of public programs	Host 3rd webinar to explain changes
July 2013	Certifying offices and participating programs	Continuing students enrolled in public programs	Inform them they may need to pay more than resident tuition
July 2013	WICHE	Admissions and financial aid staff of public programs	Host 4th webinar to explain changes
Fall 2013	Change takes effect for new PSEP students enrolling in fall 2013. IMPORTANT NOTE: Continuing students enrolled in programs prior to fall 2013 would be grandfathered in through graduation and will pay resident tuition, as before.		

Draft Notification to Programs

To WICHE PSEP Public Programs:

WICHE's Professional Student Exchange Program's (PSEP's) support fees have not been meeting the resident/nonresident tuition differentials of some of our key cooperating programs in public institutions for several years now. The problem is worsening with reduced state budgets in several states and the significant tuition increases that many institutions have implemented over the last few years.

We are writing to let you know that effective AY 2013, programs at participating public institutions that are left with an unmet resident/nonresident tuition differential will have a new option for new PSEP students enrolling in fall

2013 and beyond. Prior to this change in policy, all public programs were required to charge a PSEP student resident tuition, even if the support fee did not adequately cover the resident/nonresident tuition differential.

From AY 2013 forward, public institutions whose differentials are not met will be allowed to credit the support fee against full nonresident tuition and have the new student pay the balance. Alternatively, institutions currently benefiting from an incentive (in cases where the support fee and resident tuition exceeds a program's nonresident tuition) to enroll a WICHE student are still allowed to keep their incentive. Our hope is that this new policy will help programs that have been losing tuition revenues for WICHE students' sake. WICHE also wants to encourage programs where we are meeting differentials to continue preferentially admitting PSEP students over other nonresidents.

It's important to note that we are requesting our partnering programs to grandfather in continuing students enrolled in programs prior to fall 2013 through graduation, so that they will continue to pay resident tuition, as before, to remain consistent with contracts that the continuing student signed with his or her home state, just prior to enrollment.

Please consider the following three scenarios of how this new policy might affect your program. We are also aware that the various cooperating PSEP programs at your institution may be affected differently.

Scenario 1: Recouping Unmet Differential

Joe Smith is a dentistry student at Best Western University (BWU) enrolled through PSEP. Consider the following:

BWU nonresident tuition	\$63,000
<u>BWU resident tuition</u>	<u>\$33,000</u>
Resident/nonresident differential	\$30,000
<u>WICHE's support fee for dentistry</u>	<u>\$28,000</u>
Uncovered difference	\$2,000

Currently, BWU must charge Joe the resident tuition of \$33,000 and absorb the unmet differential of the remaining \$2,000. From AY 2013 forward, BWU will be able to bill Joe for resident tuition (\$33,000) and the unmet differential (\$2,000) and collect a total of \$35,000.

Put more simply, the program can charge Joe nonresident tuition minus the support fee, and Joe will pay the balance:

BWU nonresident tuition	\$63,000
<u>WICHE's support fee for dentistry</u>	<u>-\$28,000</u>
Student balance for tuition	\$35,000

Please note that the program is not obligated to charge the full differential to the student, but it does have that option. WICHE deeply regrets that some students will end up paying more. However, the alternative is to raise the support fees to keep up with the increasing and widening differentials, and our participating states, unfortunately, cannot afford this. If support fees are required to keep pace with the growing differentials, the consequence would be that many fewer students would receive PSEP support.

WICHE will contact students in advance about the change through their state offices, but we also encourage you to contact your WICHE students directly. Please see the attached notification schedule, with suggested dates for your program to build awareness of the coming changes with your PSEP students. WICHE state offices will also require new PSEP students enrolled in public program to sign a statement of understanding that notes they are aware of the upcoming changes and that they may need to pay more than resident tuition if in any year the support fee does not cover the enrolling institution's resident/nonresident tuition differential.

In addition, please forward this information to your financial aid staff members who work with PSEP students so that they can make necessary adjustments to WICHE students' financial aid packages. WICHE will host webinars covering this new policy and general practices in PSEP administration in March 2012, May-July 2012, January 2013, and May-July 2013. We encourage you and your staff to participate in these webinars.

Scenario 2: Maintaining Program Incentive (no change)

Jane Doe is an allopathic medical student at Most Studious University (MSU) enrolled through PSEP. Consider the following:

MSU nonresident tuition	\$60,000
MSU resident/WICHE student tuition	\$30,000
Resident/nonresident differential	\$30,000
WICHE support fee for medicine	\$31,000
Incentive for enrolling WICHE student	\$1,000

WICHE support fees are currently covering the \$30,000 resident/nonresident differential. MSU may continue to charge the student resident tuition and keep the \$1,000 as an incentive for preferential enrollment of PSEP students.

Scenario 3: Private and Self-funded Programs with One Tuition Rate (no change)

Ronald McDonough is a PSEP student enrolled in the physical therapy program at the University of Superior Healthcare Sciences (USHS), which is a private institution. Consider the following:

USHS private tuition	\$50,000
WICHE support fee for PT	\$15,000
WICHE student's balance	\$35,000

In this case USHS will charge Ronald the balance of their private tuition minus the support fee. There is no change in policy for private or self-funded programs (where there is only one tuition level); WICHE support fees should continue to be applied as before.

We appreciate your understanding and cooperation with this new method of applying support fees for public programs. Please contact me at mcolalancia@wiche.edu or 303.541.0214 at any time with your concerns or questions.

Sincerely,
Margo Colalancia
Director
WICHE Student Exchange Program

Draft Notification to Students Who Will be new PSEP Participants in Fall 2013:

Dear WICHE Student:

WICHE's Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) support fees have not been meeting the resident/nonresident tuition differentials of some of our key cooperating programs in public institutions for several years now. The problem is worsening with reduced state budgets in several states and the significant tuition increases that many institutions have implemented over the last few years.

We are writing to let you know that effective AY2013, programs at participating public institutions that are left with an unmet resident/nonresident tuition differential will have a new option. Prior to this change in policy, all public programs were required to charge a PSEP student resident tuition, even if the support fee did not adequately cover the resident/nonresident tuition differential.

From AY2013 forward, public institutions whose differentials are not met will be allowed to credit the support fee against full nonresident tuition and have the new enrolling student pay the balance. Alternatively, institutions currently benefiting from an incentive (in cases where the support fee and resident tuition exceeds a program's nonresident tuition) to enroll a WICHE student are still allowed to keep their incentive. Our hope is that this new policy will help programs that have been losing tuition revenues for WICHE students' sake. WICHE also wants to encourage programs where we are meeting differentials to continue preferentially admitting PSEP students over other nonresidents. We deeply regret that some new students will be adversely affected financially, but the alternative

would be that participating programs would no longer preferentially admit WICHE students. If applicants from WICHE states don't receive admissions offers from programs in the West, student access to affordable professional education programs would be severely reduced.

If you are enrolled at a public institution participating in PSEP, your tuition charges could be affected beginning in fall 2013. Please read the following three scenarios of how this new policy might affect the amount of tuition you owe to your enrolling program.

Scenario 1: Recouping Unmet Differential

Joe Smith is a dentistry student at Best Western University (BWU), enrolled through PSEP. Consider the following:

BWU nonresident tuition	\$63,000
BWU resident tuition	\$33,000
Resident/nonresident differential	\$30,000
<u>WICHE's support fee for dentistry</u>	<u>\$28,000</u>
Uncovered difference	\$2,000

Currently, BWU must charge Joe the resident tuition of \$33,000 and absorb the unmet differential of the remaining \$2,000. From AY 2013 forward, BWU will be able to bill Joe for resident tuition (\$33,000) and the unmet differential (\$2,000) for a total of \$35,000.

More simply put, the program can charge Joe nonresident tuition minus the support fee, and Joe will pay the balance:

BWU nonresident tuition	\$63,000
<u>WICHE's support fee for dentistry</u>	<u>-\$28,000</u>
Student balance for tuition	\$35,000

Please note that the program is not obligated to charge the full differential to the student, but it does have that option. WICHE deeply regrets that some students will end up paying more. However, the alternative is to raise the support fees to keep up with the increasing and widening differentials, and our participating states, unfortunately, cannot afford this. If support fees are required to keep pace with the growing differentials, the consequence would be that many fewer students would receive WICHE PSEP support.

Scenario 2: Maintaining Program Incentive (no change)

Jane Doe is an allopathic medical student at Most Studious University (MSU) enrolled through PSEP. Consider the following:

MSU nonresident tuition	\$60,000
<u>MSU resident/WICHE student tuition</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>
Resident/nonresident differential	\$30,000
<u>WICHE support fee for medicine</u>	<u>\$31,000</u>
Incentive for enrolling WICHE student	\$1,000

WICHE support fees are currently covering the \$30,000 resident/nonresident differential. MSU may continue to charge the student resident tuition and keep the \$1,000 as an incentive for preferential enrollment of PSEP students.

Scenario 3: Private and Self-funded Programs with One Tuition Rate (no change)

Ronald McDonough is PSEP student enrolled in the physical therapy program at the University of Superior Healthcare Sciences (USHS), which is a private institution. Consider the following:

USHS private tuition	\$50,000
<u>WICHE support fee for PT</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
WICHE student's balance	\$35,000

In this case USHS will charge Ronald the balance of their private tuition minus the support fee. There is no change in policy for private or self-funded programs (where there is only one tuition level); WICHE support fees should continue to be applied as before.

In addition, as a new PSEP student during academic year 2013-14, you will be required to sign a Statement of Understanding that indicates you have been notified of the change and its potential implications. Your state certifying office will be sending you these and will keep your signed copy on file, as will the WICHE central office. Please see the sample statement below.

**Statement of Understanding for
WICHE PSEP Students Enrolling at Public Institutions from Fall 2013 Forward**

I, _____, understand that effective fall 2013, if I am enrolled in a public professional healthcare program through WICHE's Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP), I may need to pay more than resident tuition if the WICHE support fee does not cover my program's resident/nonresident tuition differential during any academic year.

Furthermore, I understand that if the WICHE support fee exceeds the resident/nonresident tuition differential of my public program, my enrolling institution/school is allowed to keep it as an incentive for preferentially admitting WICHE students who are nonresidents and who have not paid state taxes used to fund public education. If this is the case, the institution will charge me resident tuition, and they may keep the difference.

I understand that I will need to consult with my enrolling public institution's financial aid office directly, on an annual basis, to know whether I will pay resident tuition, or possibly more if the WICHE support fee does not cover the resident/nonresident tuition differential.

Student's name (please print) _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Student's home state _____

Student's field of study _____

Enrolling institution _____

Email address _____

Cell phone number _____

We appreciate your understanding and cooperation with this new method of applying support fees for public programs. Please contact your state certifying officer or me with any questions. Contact information for your state office is available at www.wiche.edu/psep/cert-off or you can contact me at mcolalancia@wiche.edu.

Sincerely,
Margo Colalancia
Director, WICHE Student Exchange Program

Action Requested

Approval of the proposed implementation plan allowing public institutions to charge new WICHE PSEP students enrolling fall 2013 (and forward) any unmet differential amounts if their resident/nonresident tuition differential is not met.

BACKGROUND for Action Item: PSEP Discussion Item from May 2011

DISCUSSION ITEM

New Ways to Apply Support Fees

Overview

The Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) provides students in 12 Western states (all WICHE states except California, Oregon, and South Dakota) with tuition support and access to professional programs that otherwise would not be available to them because the fields of study are not offered at public institutions in their home states. WICHE has administered PSEP since the 1950s, helping states to educate 14,500 healthcare professionals and helping students to save on their tuition bills. States that use PSEP appropriate public funds to educate students at other institutions within the 15-state WICHE region and at a few institutions outside the region. The states' funds are administered through WICHE and are sent to the enrolling institutions as "support fees" for the WICHE slots; PSEP students usually pay resident tuition at public institutions or reduced tuition at private institutions. Support fees are negotiated biannually between WICHE, the participating states, and the cooperating programs and are approved by the WICHE Commission. Each of the PSEP fields has a different support fee rate, and all of the programs enrolling PSEP students receive the same support fee for their field, with a few minor exceptions for 12-month (versus nine-month) program length in physician assistant and physical therapy.

PSEP support fees are currently set to meet the resident/nonresident tuition differentials of our public cooperating programs. As tuitions rise it is becoming more difficult to increase the support fees in several fields to meet these differentials. This has become especially problematic with public institutions located in Colorado, Utah, and Washington – states with large resident/nonresident tuition spreads. If we increase the support fees to meet these differentials, then the incentives to enroll WICHE PSEP students at other institutions where the differentials are much lower are too generous.

WICHE staff has had conversations with state higher education agency staff who function as PSEP certifying officers, as well as with the deans of the high-demand PSEP programs, to explore whether a different model for applying support fees is needed. *It is important to note that this issue is different from our biennial discussion of how much support fees need to be increased. The information provided here is to help WICHE commissioners discuss some possible solutions to this growing "tuition differential gap" dilemma.* In May 2010 the WICHE Commission approved PSEP support fee levels through academic year 2012. The commissioners will need to approve support fees for AY 2013 and AY 2014 at their May 2012 meeting.

Our highest priority is to protect student access and affordability, a goal that is fundamental to WICHE's mission. Our second goal is to make the seats as affordable as possible for the participating "sending" states, so that they can support as many students as possible to build their healthcare workforces. A third goal is to provide PSEP students with enrollment options by having several institutions enroll PSEP students within each field so that students can apply to the programs that most closely align with their academic and professional interests. Equally important is our goal of maintaining PSEP fiscal and operational models that are efficient to administer; easy to communicate to students, state policymakers, and institutional administrators; and enable states to anticipate future costs for budgeting purposes.

**PSEP Support Fees
for the 2010, 2011, and 2012 Academic Years**

Field	AY 2010	AY 2011	AY 2012
Group A			
Dentistry	\$22,700	\$23,000	\$23,400
Medicine	29,300	29,700	30,200
Occupational Therapy	11,900	12,100	12,300
Optometry	15,600	15,800	16,100
Osteopathic Medicine	19,400	19,700	20,000
Physical Therapy	10,700	10,900	11,000
Physician Assistant	11,700	11,900	12,000
Podiatry	13,500	13,700	13,900
Veterinary Medicine	29,100	29,500	30,000
Group B			
Pharmacy	\$6,900	\$7,000	\$7,100

Our current support fee approach tries to balance these sometimes conflicting goals. For example, if we tip the scale in favor of states' fiscal needs and try to curtail future support fee increases, we would subsequently reduce or eliminate the financial incentive for our enrolling institutions by paying too little; preference for WICHE students will erode; and applicants from the participating WICHE states will no longer be offered admission over equally qualified applicants from outside of the Western region. Staff believes this will ultimately harm our students, our states, and our region. If we opt to contract with only a few institutions that would enroll PSEP students at a discounted rate, we would reduce student choice, and we could risk the future viability of PSEP if the smaller group of enrolling institutions later opt out of the program.

Which fields and programs could be affected? Public institutions enrolling students in dentistry, allopathic medicine, occupational therapy, physical therapy, physician assistant, and veterinary medicine. The support fees in most of these fields are not keeping up with the resident/nonresident tuition differentials at many of the participating institutions.

Which fields would not be affected? Students studying osteopathic medicine, optometry, and podiatry would not be affected because WICHE is only working with private institutions in those fields. States supporting only in these fields include Colorado and Idaho (optometry), and Washington (osteopathic medicine and optometry). In addition, pharmacy is not affected, as public institutions enrolling our students already have the option of crediting the support fee against the nonresident tuition because the fee is so low. The majority of the pharmacy programs already exercise their right to do this, but some have generously continued to charge WICHE students resident tuition and absorb the unmet differential.

Some Options for Commissioners to Consider

The two most straightforward options are:

- **Option 1:** *Require* all public institutions to credit the support fee to the student's full nonresident tuition and have the student pay the balance. This is already done at WICHE's cooperating private programs and by some pharmacy programs at public institutions. In some cases institutions would be better off and students would be worse off. In other cases institutions would be worse off and students would be better off.
- **Option 2:** *Allow* public institutions to credit the support fee to the student's full nonresident tuition and have the student pay the balance, *only for those institutions where the support fee is not meeting the program's tuition differential*. The result would be that no participating institutions would incur lost tuition revenues (the "differential gap") by enrolling PSEP students; this approach would likely enable us to sustain institutions' participation in our program. If the program's tuition differential is being met, the institution would collect resident tuition from the student and receive the support fee, keeping the incentive (as they do now), thus preserving preferential admission for PSEP students.

After careful consideration and extensive discussion with WICHE certifying officers and deans of some of the key cooperating programs, WICHE staff members believe that Option 2 would be the simplest solution. We invite commissioners to read the reasons why in the pages that follow.

The Balancing Act: Institutional Gain vs. Student Pain vs. Preservation of Student Access

Both options have pros and cons. Where one of the new methods improves the programs' situation (stopping lost tuition revenue), it would be accomplished by placing a greater financial burden on the PSEP students. However, staff believes that given the constraints within which we're operating, the added student burden, although unfortunate, is not unreasonable.

Chart 1 illustrates this dilemma using 2010 tuition and fee and support fee rates. To simplify the illustration, we are only listing programs where the tuition differential is currently unmet and where WICHE students are enrolled during the 2010-11 academic year. If we were to allow institutions to charge unmet differentials to the students, 60 students would collectively have to shoulder an additional \$176,385 in tuition costs; on an individual basis, the added tuition costs would range from \$2,603 up to \$7,500. Most of these institutions have few PSEP students enrolled, with the University of Colorado Denver's School of Dentistry as the exception. It enrolls 39 PSEP students and forgoes \$2,603 per student (a total of \$101,517 for the current academic year). The majority of students enrolled there are

from Arizona (14) and New Mexico (15). The University of Washington experiences a similar loss of \$3,480 per PSEP student, but enrolls fewer students (seven) and lost a total of \$24,360 this year.

**Chart 1.
Recovering Lost Higher Education Institution (HEI) Revenue
and Increased Cost to Student (AY 2010 Rates)**

Field / Institution	Number of PSEP Students	Current PSEP Student Resident Tuition and Fees	PSEP Tuition and Fees Under Proposed Model *	Change (Student Cost Increase or HEI Gain) **	Institutional Revenue Difference between Current Model and Options 1 and 2
Dentistry					
U. of Colorado, Denver	39	\$38,115	\$40,718	\$2,603	\$101,517
U. of Washington	7	\$33,214	\$36,694	\$3,480	\$24,360
U. of Nevada, Las Vegas	1	\$49,217	\$53,517	\$4,300	\$4,300
Medicine					
U. of New Mexico	2	\$19,133	\$20,010	\$877	\$1,754
Occupational Therapy					
Idaho State U.	0	\$14,626	\$16,102	\$1,476	\$0
U. of New Mexico	0	\$14,358	\$15,624	\$1,266	\$0
U. of Washington	0	\$15,966	\$21,852	\$5,886	\$0
Physician Assistant					
U. of Colorado, Denver	3	\$21,903	\$25,530	\$3,627	\$10,881
Idaho State U.	1	\$33,698	\$35,855	\$2,157	\$2,157
Physical Therapy					
California State U., Fresno	0	\$9,325	\$9,785	\$460	\$0
U. of Colorado, Denver	2	\$21,654	\$27,203	\$5,549	\$11,098
U. of Montana	1	\$11,731	\$15,108	\$3,377	\$3,377
U. of Utah	3	\$21,530	\$24,677	\$3,147	\$9,441
U. of Washington	1	\$20,150	\$27,650	\$7,500	\$7,500
TOTAL STUDENTS	60			TOTAL	\$176,385

Notes:

* Equal to resident tuition and fees plus PSEP support fee plus the current shortfall or "differential gap."

** This amount represents the current shortfall or "differential gap".

Depending on the state's residency rules and institutional policy, some programs will allow nonresidents in professional programs to petition for residency for their second year and beyond. This is not the case at the University of Colorado Denver or the University of Washington. Both have a "once a nonresident, always a nonresident" policy, and they can legitimately argue that these unmet differentials are forgone revenue to their schools. As much as the programs and the institutions operating them want to remain true to the region and help their neighbors, in the end they must meet their operating expenses. If they are not receiving any incentives and are in fact losing money, what is their motivation to extend preferential admission to students from the WICHE states?

In the field of veterinary medicine, there is strong preferential admission for WICHE students. Our cooperating institutions (Colorado State University, Oregon State University, and Washington State University) hold special admissions committee meetings to select candidates from among WICHE applicants. After allocating seats that must be held for their in-state residents, WICHE applicants are the next to be selected, before students from the national pool. Our colleges of veterinary medicine tell us that they prefer to enroll WICHE students over applicants from the national pool.

If we exercised Option 1 and asked all WICHE schools to fully apply the support fee and have students pay the difference, the participating veterinary colleges, which all receive some level of incentive (ranging from \$200 per student at WSU to \$10,900 per student at OSU), would completely lose their incentives to enroll WICHE applicants. WICHE students would pay less than resident students for tuition. This sounds attractive but the loss of incentives would completely erode preferential admission for WICHE students. If an applicant does not receive an offer of admission at a WICHE school, their chance of pursuing their professional career is greatly diminished when they are competing in a much larger national pool. Many students tell us that their gratitude for PSEP is not only because of the financial assistance, but to a greater extent, because they are thankful for an offer of admission to a professional school.

Chart 2 below illustrates the potential lost revenue if our cooperating programs were obligated to pass current incentives along to the student. The institutions would be worse off, and the students would be better off, but we would likely see a drop in the number of offers made to WICHE students. Ultimately, students could lose out if we implement this model.

Chart 2.					
Institutions that Would Lose Incentives to Enroll PSEP Students (AY 2010)					
Institution	Field	Number of PSEP Students	Annual Revenue Lost per PSEP Student	Total Annual Revenue Loss (# of Students x Lost Revenue)	Can Students Apply for In-state Residency?
Range of Potential Loss: \$0-\$99,999					
1. University of California, San Francisco	Dentistry	2	\$10,455	\$20,910	YES
	Medicine	1	\$17,055	\$17,055	YES
2. University of California, Los Angeles	Dentistry	2	\$13,250	\$26,500	YES
3. University of Colorado Denver	Medicine	11	\$3,729	\$41,019	NO
4. University of Hawaii at Manoa	Medicine	1	\$116	\$116	NO
5. University of Nevada, Reno	Medicine	2	\$6,848	\$13,696	NO
6. Oregon State University	Veterinary Med.	9	\$10,908	\$98,172	NO
7. University of Utah	Physician Assistant	1	\$2,664	\$2,664	YES
8. Eastern Washington University	Occup. Therapy	3	\$1,193	\$3,579	YES
	Physical Therapy	4	\$3,714	\$14,856	YES
9. Washington State University	Veterinary Med.	62	\$198	\$12,276	YES
Range of Potential Loss: \$100,000 +					
10. Colorado State University	Veterinary Med.	139	\$1,000	\$139,000	NO
11. University of North Dakota	Medicine	4	\$8,775	\$35,100	YES
	Physical Therapy	8	\$8,982	\$71,856	YES
12. Oregon Health & Sciences University	Dentistry	15	\$4,193	\$62,895	NO
	Medicine	7	\$15,619	\$109,333	NO
TOTALS		271		\$669,027	

Chart 3 shows us averages of what PSEP students are paying by field under the current model and how much more (or less) they would pay if we required all public institutions to credit 100 percent of the support fee to students' accounts and have students pay the balance. It's important to note, however, that this illustration is not weighted to show where enrollments are concentrated, so it does not give the full picture. The chart is helpful to show us the average student responsibility for tuition in each field, and the average percentage of their tuition that is covered by the support fee.

**Chart 3.
Average Paid by PSEP Student and Average Covered by Support Fees**

	Public Programs					Private Programs (no change proposed)	
	Avg. Amount Student Pays Under Current Model	Avg. Proposed Student Responsibility in dollars	Avg. Difference that Student Would Pay More (or Less) *	Avg. Percent of Student Responsibility for Tuition	Avg. Percent of Tuition that Support Fee Covers	Avg. Student Responsibility for Tuition	Avg. Percent of Tuition that Support Fee Covers
Dentistry	\$46,150	\$43,230	(\$2,919)	65.34%	34.66%	\$45,030	35.46%
Medicine	\$28,845	\$17,751	(\$11,093)	37.16%	62.84%	\$18,143	62.00%
Occupational Therapy	\$14,814	\$16,404	\$1,590	55.90%	44.10%	\$24,284	33.89%
Optometry (privates only, N/C) *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$16,313	49.22%
*Osteopathic Med. (privates only, N/C) *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$28,188	40.83%
Pharmacy (Group B) (no change) *	\$26,439	\$26,439	\$0	78.50%	21.50%	\$37,126	18.76%
Physical Therapy	\$17,165	\$17,764	\$598	53.74%	46.26%	\$23,680	37.72%
Physician Assistant	\$29,312	\$30,352	\$1,040	65.76%	34.24%	\$21,153	41.52%
Podiatry (privates only, N/C) *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$18,367	42.43%
Veterinary Medicine	\$20,485	\$16,450	(\$4,035)	35.07%	64.93%	n/a	n/a
Average				55.92%	44.08%		40.20%
Median				55.90%	44.10%		40.83%

* No changes proposed for fields where all cooperating programs are private OR in pharmacy which is a "Group B" field.

Note: Out-of-region schools were not considered in this analysis.

Important Considerations

If WICHE decides to change how support fees are applied either by requiring public programs to apply the support fee to the full nonresident tuition and have the student pay the balance or by giving programs the option of holding the student responsible for the unmet balance (the differential gap) so that they will not lose revenue (but also allowing them to keep an incentive if they currently have one), there are additional issues that must be considered.

Some have suggested we consider establishing a different support fee for each participating institution that would respond to their differential. However, deviation from a standard support fee rate for each field would become a budgeting nightmare for sending states and would severely complicate administration of the program. Ultimately, the new proposed model must be fair to all participating programs; be simple to administer; use standard fee rates by field (no variation between institutions in the same field); and allow states to easily budget for it on a biennial basis.

In an effort to help preserve preferential enrollment, we also considered the possibility of paying a small premium to programs in each field that enrolled the greatest number of WICHE students each year. Calculation of the premium reward formula would be complex and difficult to explain to participating institutions, much less to the state legislatures that approve budgets, as well as to WICHE's auditor. It would be simpler and more transparent to simply pay a higher but reasonable support fee for each student to begin with.

If WICHE changes the way support fees are applied, depending on which option is chosen, we will need to give schools and students ample notification before implementation. Some of our programs that are earning incentives by enrolling our students are partially offering those incentives back to our students in the form of scholarships. If the incentive ceases (which it would under Option 1), then the scholarships will end. And in cases where students would pay more, they will need sufficient notice to apply for additional financial aid. Option 2 would require less notice for implementation than Option 1.

Finally, to facilitate administration of the program and minimize any confusion for students and the administrators of their enrolling institutions, it would be easiest to begin the change for both new and continuing students in the same year. This way, new and continuing students would pay the same tuition, and institutions would not need to create two different coding and billing systems for WICHE PSEP students.

Discussions with Certifying Officers

WICHE staff discussed options at length with certifying officers. All appreciate the complexity of the problem and recognize that there are no ideal solutions. While states would like to keep support fee increases to a minimum so that they can fund more students, they also recognize that if incentives are completely eroded, especially in veterinary medicine, then fewer applicants will be admitted and their state workforce will be weakened.

Several officers expressed their concern with diminishing support fees' negative effect on student preferential admission to professional programs. Their state legislatures, however, may not fully appreciate the value of preferential admission and may want to fund many students for as little as possible.

The Value of Preferential Admission through WICHE's PSEP: Comments from Students and Graduates

"I knew from a young age that I would be pursuing a career in medicine, and WICHE's PSEP was always a critical piece of the application puzzle. Without WICHE preference out-of-state applicants have little chance of getting admitted into most of the medical schools around the country. I was able to mark 'WICHE certified' on my applications, and it helped me secure a position at the University of North Dakota. I am now pursuing a general surgery residency at a Level 1 trauma center. WICHE plays a vital role in educating physicians who will return to Montana and support the future of the profession."

– Rachel Ott, M.D., Montana resident, Class of 2010,
University of North Dakota School of Medicine

"WICHE's PSEP has allowed me to pursue my aspirations of becoming an osteopathic physician and surgeon. Thanks to its long-standing partnerships with medical programs in the West, WICHE gave me preferential admission at a number of medical schools, facilitating matriculation into the school of my choice. Furthermore, the reduced tuition through PSEP has immensely reduced the debt I am accruing while I study. Without both of these, I would not be in medical school right now! Thanks to WICHE, I'm learning medicine and loving it, and am excited to return to Wyoming to practice after I graduate."

– Joseph, Wyoming resident, Class of 2014,
Western University of the Health Sciences, Osteopathic Medicine

"The cost of veterinary school is substantial for anyone, but for students from humble backgrounds, especially those that want to return to their home states and towns, the high cost can be a deal breaker. I would have had to seriously reconsider my dream of becoming a veterinarian without WICHE PSEP support. And the preferential admission that WICHE students receive substantially increases our odds of getting accepted into vet school as out-of-state residents. I am truly grateful for the support I've received and hope that Montana will continue to fund this vital program."

– Katherine, Montana resident, Class of 2013,
Washington State University, College of Veterinary Medicine

"Attending a professional school is a huge commitment for a student: physically, mentally, and financially. You are committing to a career by investing four years of your time and all your resources. And if the program of your choice is not available in your home state, that makes it even more difficult and expensive. WICHE's PSEP gave me access to a great education, and I didn't have to worry about sacrificing the school I wanted because I couldn't afford it. It's allowed me to get the most of my education and to fulfill my aspirations of becoming a dentist."

– Mark, Arizona resident, Class of 2012,
University of Colorado, School of Dental Medicine

One certifying officer, who also works as a prehealth advisor, speculated that as long as WICHE met the differentials of the participating schools (though it might not exceed them), WICHE candidates would likely continue to receive some preferential admission because admissions committees have more experience with Western undergraduate institutions and are more apt to trust the value of applicants' scores from those institutions (as opposed to institutions located outside of the West, with which they have less of a track record).

Concern for Student Access to Colleges of Veterinary Medicine

Veterinary medicine accounts for WICHE's largest PSEP enrollment at 30 percent (210 out of 693 students). Thanks to the cooperative admissions procedure and the close collaboration among our three participating Colleges of Veterinary Medicine (CVMs), it's undisputable that WICHE applicants receive preferential admission to our cooperating programs. For this reason WICHE staff interviewed the three deans of veterinary medicine at Colorado State University (CSU), Oregon State University (OSU) and Washington State University (WSU) to gain their perspective on any possible changes in how WICHE might apply support fees in the future.

Bryan Slinker, dean of WSU's CVM, remarked that as long as the support fee remained close to the differential, the CVM would continue to show preference to WICHE applicants. It is important to note that WSU has a lenient residency policy that allows nonresidents to petition for Washington residency after their first year in the program. Deans Cyril Clarke (of OSU) and Lance Perryman (of CSU) said that although they like the idea of regional cooperation and have been very satisfied with WICHE students, if all financial incentive to enroll WICHE students dried up, they were not sure they could continue to provide preference to them. In veterinary medicine, PSEP students are considered before the national pool at all three schools. Competitive WICHE applicants receive offers of admission even though they may be less qualified, overall, than many applicants from the larger national pool. Students enrolled at CSU and OSU are not allowed to petition for the resident rate beginning their second year and must pay nonresident tuition throughout their enrollment.

Conclusion

At this time WICHE staff members believe that Option 2 would be the most effective solution. Staff looks forward to the commissioners' discussion on this issue for additional perspective. Staff will use the commissioners' points to frame a future action item that could change the way support fees are applied to PSEP students' tuition when they are enrolled in the public program, if the commissioners so decide. The "tuition differential gap" dilemma is a complicated issue, and it is a challenge to please all parties. Working from the WICHE commissioners' recommendations resulting from this discussion, staff anticipates proposing a recommendation of compromise that will preserve the collective good of our WICHE states' healthcare workforce, our Western institutions that provide professional education for our residents lacking programs in their home state, and our future healthcare professionals who serve the Western region.

ACTION ITEM

Standardizing PSEP Support Fees in Physician Assistant and Physical Therapy Fields

Currently, support fees rates vary by program length for physician assistant (PA) and physical therapy (PT) programs. Historically, these different rates evolved because WICHE was trying to meet tuition differentials across programs whose lengths varied considerably. PA and PT are the only PSEP fields with variable rates; support fees in all the other fields have remained standardized, even though some fields now have added summer sessions. Using variable support fee rates for each PA and PT program complicates budgeting for the states, students, and their enrolling programs. Furthermore, it creates administrative challenges for the WICHE central office.

To reestablish equity across all PSEP fields and to simplify program administration, WICHE staff proposes to standardize the fee rates and disbursement patterns for physician assistant and physical therapy. This is an ideal time to make this change because as of the 2013-14 academic year, meeting tuition differentials at public programs will not be as critical as in years past; institutions not receiving the full fee differential will be allowed to charge the WICHE student the difference.

Physician Assistant (AK, AZ, NV, and WY)

The WICHE states that support physician assistant (PA) students are: Alaska, Arizona, Nevada, and Wyoming. Forty-four students are enrolled through WICHE in AY 2011; and collectively the supporting states have invested \$555,345. Thirty-two students are enrolled in private programs, compared to 12 enrolled in public programs. WICHE works with 14 cooperating physician assistant programs.

There are two types of physician assistant programs: nine-month programs, which receive a support fee of \$11,900 per student; and 12-month programs, which receive a support fee of \$15,867 per student (AY 2011 rates). All of WICHE's cooperating physician assistant programs are now 12-month programs in years one and two; in year three their length varies from one quarter to a full 12 months. The disbursement pattern for these programs is the 12-month rate in year one and year two, and nothing in year three, due to the 24-month maximum of support allowed for physician assistant studies.

There are two private program exceptions: Loma Linda University (LLU) and University of Southern California (USC). Neither program has any PSEP students enrolled in AY 2011. LLU and USC's program structure is as follows: nine months in year one; 12 months in year two; and three months in year three. Over three years they receive the same total amount of support fees as the other 12-month two- or three-year programs.

WICHE staff proposes a minor administrative change that will not cost the states anything. We propose to pay LLU and USC the 12-month rate for the first two years and nothing in year three, as we do for the other 12 programs. This will facilitate consistent budgeting for students, schools, our states, and WICHE staff. WICHE staff proposes to implement this change in fall 2013 and will notify the participating programs and certifying officers in December 2012.

Physical Therapy (AK, HI, and WY)

The WICHE states that support physical therapy students are: Alaska, Hawaii, and Wyoming. Thirty-two students are enrolled through WICHE in AY 2011; and collectively the supporting states are investing \$414,195. WICHE works with 20 cooperating programs. In AY 2011 the majority of the students (18) are enrolled in public PT programs, compared to 14 enrolled in private programs.

Currently, WICHE pays most PT programs at the 12-month rate (a \$14,533 support fee per student) for year one and year two students, and then the lower nine-month rate (\$10,900) for year three students. Pacific University and University of Puget Sound receive the \$10,900 rate per student for all three years because they are nine-month programs during all three years. Eastern Washington University, Idaho State University, and University of New Mexico are 12-month programs during years one and two, but they also receive the nine-month rate because they charge all nonresident PT students resident tuition during years one and two. Finally, the University of the Pacific's (UOP) two-year accelerated program receives \$16,350 for each student enrolled each year.

These complicated fee variations for PT are confusing to our sending states because they must budget different amounts for the student, depending on the student's year and program. It's also confusing for financial aid offices at an institution because WICHE students in different years of their program receive different support fee amounts for the same academic year. Understandably, these complicated variations also create administrative challenges for WICHE staff.

WICHE staff proposes to standardize the rate for all three years (except for UOP's two-year accelerated program). WICHE staff proposes a standardized annual rate of \$13,322 in AY 2011 terms. To calculate this we totaled what most PT programs get over a three-year period and then divided it by three:

Year 1: \$14,533 (12-month rate)
 Year 2: \$14,533 (12-month rate)
 Year 3: \$10,900 (nine-month rate)
 TOTAL: \$39,966 divided by 3 = \$13,322 per year

The chart below illustrates that standardization of PT support fees would mean that seven programs would receive \$7,266 more in support fees for each student enrolled over a three-year period. Three of the programs that will receive more in support fees are private. Of the four public institutions, two would still incur a loss (Idaho State University and University of New Mexico), but it will be less of a loss than it is now. Eastern Washington's current loss will turn into a small incentive of \$3,683 over three years (calculated at the current AY 2011 terms), but this could change in future years as tuition and WICHE support fee rates change. The overall estimated increased cost to states would be \$72,660 over three years, or \$24,220 per year, or \$756 per student per year if spread out over the total number of enrolled students (32).

**Proposed Standardization of Support Fees
 Physical Therapy: Illustration in AY 2011 Rates**

(Supporting states: Alaska, Hawaii, Wyoming)

Total (public and private) = 32								
PUBLIC	Number of WICHE Students (A)	Current Nonresident Tuition & Fees (Total All 3 Years) (B)	Resident Support Fees Total for All 3 Years	Tuition & Fees (Current WICHE Student Rate) (C)	Standard Fee Total for All 3 Years (\$13,322 x 3)	Additional Cost to State (per Student)	Total Increased Cost to State	Will Public Institution's Incentive Increase if Support Fee Increases?
Ca. St. U., Fresno	0	\$67,350	\$32,700	\$33,870	\$39,966	\$7,266	\$0	Yes, now incentive @ \$6,486
U. Colorado Denver	1	110,376	39,966	56,744	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	NO CHANGE
Idaho St. U.	2	87,225	32,700	39,147	\$39,966	\$7,266	\$14,532	No, still loss @ \$8,112
U. Montana	1	92,360	39,966	39,256	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	NO CHANGE
U. New Mexico	0	87,893	32,700	40,346	\$39,966	\$7,266	\$0	No, still loss @ \$7,551
U. North Dakota	9	60,310	39,966	44,969	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	NO CHANGE
U. Utah	3	118,950	39,966	57,141	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	NO CHANGE
E. Washington U.	1	81,706	32,700	45,423	\$39,966	\$7,266	\$7,266	Yes, now incentive @ \$3,683
U. Washington	1	113,142	39,966	59,137	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	NO CHANGE
Total public	18							
	AVERAGE	\$91,035		\$46,226		TOTAL	\$21,798	
PRIVATE	Number of WICHE Students (A)	Full Private Tuition & Fees (Total All 3 Years) (B)	Current Support Fees Total for All 3 Years	Current Tuition & Fees Paid by WICHE Student	Standard fee Total for All 3 Years (\$13,322 x 3)	Additional Cost to State (per Student)	Total Increased Cost to State	
A. T. Still U.	0	\$84,315	39,966	\$44,349	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
Chapman U. (no response)	1	?	39,966	?	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
Loma Linda U.	0	95,156	39,966	\$55,190	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
Mt. St. Mary's College	0	93,687	39,966	\$53,721	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
Samuel Merritt U.	0	92,860	39,966	\$52,894	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
U. So. California	4	146,733	39,966	\$106,767	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
U. of the Pacific (2-yr accel. pgm.)	2	109,020	32,700	\$76,320	\$39,966	\$7,266	\$14,532	n/a
Western U.	0	100,745	39,966	\$60,779	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
Regis U.	2	113,989	39,966	\$74,023	\$39,966	\$0	\$0	n/a
Pacific U.	5	91,481	32,700	\$58,781	\$39,966	\$7,266	\$36,330	n/a
U. Puget Sound	0	78,000	32,700	\$45,300	\$39,966	\$7,266	\$0	n/a
Total private	14							
	AVERAGE	\$100,599		\$62,812		TOTAL	\$50,862	
TOTAL INCREASE TO STATES, PUBLIC & PRIVATE PROGRAMS							\$72,660	

Notes: Support fees for physical therapy vary: 9-month rate = \$14,533; 2-year program accelerated fee = \$16,350. CSU Fresno and Chapman U. have not responded to our AY 2011 tuition and fees survey.

WICHE staff and the certifying officers believe that with the approved changes in the way support fees are applied (a process that will be implemented in 2013), this is the ideal time to standardize physical therapy and physician assistant support fees. The minimal increase in cost per student will be worth the benefits of simplification. Budgeting for students, states, schools will be simplified; and WICHE's administration of the program will also be easier.

Action Requested

Approval to standardize physician assistant and physical therapy support fees and disbursement patterns, effective fall 2013.

ACTION ITEM

Proposed Project:

WUE 2.0: Revamping Western Undergraduate Exchange Marketing and Outreach Strategies

Staff requests approval to seek, receive, and expend funds for a project that will enhance WICHE's marketing and outreach activities to expand access to higher education via the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE). On September 26 staff submitted a grant proposal to Lumina Foundation's grant competition "Envisioning the Next Generation of Student Supports." The competition, announced on August 26, 2011, is designed to help nonprofit education agencies and institutions investigate better ways to reach prospective college students using innovative technology and will provide five planning grants for initiatives focused on low-income, first-generation, underrepresented minority students, as well as adult learners. The WICHE proposal requests a one-year planning grant of \$200,000, the maximum grant amount to be funded. The project will begin in mid-December, if we are awarded a grant.

Relationship to WICHE Mission

The program directly supports WICHE's mission to expand educational access and excellence in the West by improving WICHE's outreach to students interested in pursuing postsecondary education. WICHE's proposal focuses on increasing communication about college enrollment with students in the WICHE region, particularly low-income students, underrepresented students of color, and first-generation learners who face significant academic, financial, and social barriers on the road to college.

Project Description

WUE enrollments have grown an average of 9.5 percent annually since the program began in 1987. We are working to increase the number of participating institutions and enrollments, especially in low-growth states with additional capacity. If awarded the Lumina grant, WICHE will use the funds to work with California State University, East Bay (CSU EB) in partnership with four other institutions committed to enrolling more low-income and first-generation students (Bismarck State College, Colorado State University Fort Collins, Montana Tech of the University of Montana, and Portland State University), and two organizations, Naviance (which operates a college admissions portal used by high school students, their parents, and high school counselors), and AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination – a national middle and high school program that promotes academic rigor and prepares disadvantaged and first-generation students for college). CSU EB is doing some innovative admissions work using social media, texting, and scanning of QR (quick response) codes, a matrix bar code that can be used to connect prospective students (using their smart phones) through the application and admissions process up to the time of enrollment. CSU EB has agreed to serve as a lead pilot institution and will assist the four other WUE institutions in conducting a similar pilot on the effectiveness of these tools. WICHE and its partners will use the results of the pilot to improve WUE's current outreach to students. WICHE will also improve the searchability of the WUE database and add new features to the site, which might include YouTube videos, webinars for different audiences, PowerPoints for counselors, and more. Ultimately, WICHE's goal is to do a better job of getting the word out about WUE to the students who need it most.

Staff and Fiscal Impact

If funded, WICHE will receive funding for .74 FTE of staff salaries and benefits and associated rent, phone, and IT support costs (this includes .15 FTE for Margo Colalancia, .09 FTE for Jere Mock, .30 FTE for administrative support, and .20 for a database programmer). No new staff will be hired for the project. Of the \$200,000 grant, \$63,023 will cover staffing costs (and WICHE will contribute \$59,214 in FTE for communications staff working on the project, as well as additional database programming support). Other grant funds will support partner travel expenses for project meetings; consultants who will develop mobile applications and YouTube videos and conduct a usability study for the WUE website; and some staffing support for CSU EB's social media director (.20 FTE).

Action Requested

Approval to seek, receive, and expend funds to support WICHE as the administrator and fiscal agent for the proposed project.

ACTION ITEM

WICHE Action Regarding State Authorization of Out-of-state Institutions

At the May 2011 meeting, the commission received a letter from Stephanie Jacobson, chair of the Western Academic Leadership Forum (the Forum), requesting that WICHE “create reciprocity among WICHE states as it relates to distance education, in response to regulations distributed by the U.S. Department of Education that require colleges and universities to obtain authorization to operate in each state where a student is enrolled” (see attached letter) and offering assistance in establishing such a process. At your request WICHE President David Longanecker responded to Jacobson (letter attached), describing the efforts in which WICHE was already involved, through WCET, and the efforts we anticipate taking in the near future. Since that time WICHE has been significantly involved, through Russ Poulin’s continuous engagement and the president’s episodic involvement, in the various national discussions of the issues and proposed actions regarding state authorization.

At the national level there are currently two major efforts underway. One is being coordinated by the Council of State Governments (CSG) and the President’s Forum and envisions a new national compact to provide interstate reciprocity. The president’s assessment of this effort, as it has evolved to date, is that it would be redundant, replicating the role legitimately played by the four existing interstate compacts, including WICHE; that it would be administratively burdensome on institutions and expensive to operate; and that because the entire postsecondary community would not be included (it would focus only on public institutions, leaving private nonprofit and for-profit higher education in regulatory limbo), it would not adequately address the issue.

The second effort, spearheaded by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities (ALCU), has greater promise, but it is not yet underway. This effort anticipates creating a national steering committee that would develop a comprehensive national (not federal) solution to the state authorization issues.

It is not clear that solutions from these national efforts will be available in time for institutions and states to be prepared for and in compliance with U.S. Department of Education regulations by the implementation deadline – July 1, 2013.

Based on work Russ Poulin has done, recommendations from WICHE staff, and the president’s perspectives on what the West needs in this regard, we propose that WICHE take the lead in developing a regional solution that would include the following four components.

1) Create a Review and Complaint Process to Assist States that Need It

Issue: There are WICHE states that have minimal or no authorization review processes. Those with the fewest regulations are Hawaii, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. California, Colorado, and Utah are not far behind or have little ability to staff their review processes. In discussing solutions to the state authorization issue, state regulators have said that they do not wish to enter into reciprocal agreements with states that do not “adequately” review institutions. States without review processes risk being left out of reciprocal agreements that are based upon mutual recognition of approval processes.

In addition to state approval requirements, the U.S. Department of Education has given states until June 30, 2013, to develop a third-party complaint process for institutions that are approved by a state. Hawaii, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming are WICHE states that do not have complaint processes or have processes that might not meet the expectations of the federal regulation.

Service: WICHE could develop services to assist the states without review processes and complaint processes. The work would include:

- Developing a set of review standards and processes that would be acceptable to the higher education leadership in the participating states.
- Serving as the centralized secretariat for the review process for the participating states. WICHE will make recommendations, but decisions must still be made by each state.
- Serving as the centralized secretariat to handle third-party complaints for the participating states. WICHE will collect the complaints, will assist in resolving simpler issues, and will refer all actions to each state.

2) Create an Interstate Database of Approvals, Complaints, and Actions

WICHE would create a database that allows states to share information about institutions operating or seeking to operate in a WICHE state. The database could include information about institutions seeking approval, complaints filed by students, and actions (approvals, reviews, discipline) taken by a state regarding an institution. This database could have two interfaces:

- Internal: Confidential or “in process” information would be shared only among the regulators in the participating WICHE states. Open record laws in participating states would need to be consulted.
- Public: Information on actions by states and statistics on complaints can be shared with students. Participating states can determine which information can be shared openly.

3) Adapt, Join, or Create a Reciprocal Agreement

Regardless of which plan we choose, we need to:

- Develop the agreement and promote it among states.
- Take into account financial considerations for states. For example, will a state lose funding because of an agreement? What financial model is needed to maintain the centralized services?
- Model legislation will need to be developed as quickly as possible so that it will be available, if desired, for the 2012 legislative session.
- Develop model legislation as quickly as possible so that it will be available, if desired, for the 2012 legislative session. Some states will need to pass legislation to change their regulations so that they could join the agreement.
- Understand that some states will decide not to join or will take a long time to join.
- Examine possible options:

a) *Adapt to another reciprocal agreement*

- Eventually, we could move to interregional reciprocity. The more similar we make the agreement, the more we increase the likelihood of creating interregional agreements.
- The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) is contemplating a similar approach.
- SREB is already in the process of updating its Electronic Campus agreement. Institutions must agree to SREB’s “Principles of Good Practice” to be listed in the Electronic Campus.
- A serious limitation of partnering with SREB, however, is that it allows only regionally accredited public or not-for-profit institutions to participate in its exchange; and the exchange includes only online education.
- SREB is interested in working with us to create a similar agreement. The New England Board of Higher Education is also interested. The Midwestern Higher Education Compact is not.

b) *Join a reciprocal agreement*

- The Presidents’ Forum of Excelsior College and the Council of State Governments is creating a model compact agreement.
- Russ Poulin is on the drafting team for this project.
- The current discussions about minimum standards might end up with expectations that are too great.
- A serious limitation of this approach is that it appears focused on serving only regionally accredited public and not-for-profit institutions.

c) *Create a reciprocal agreement*

- This would take a great deal of work and would require external funding.
- WICHE, however, is uniquely situated to provide leadership in this area.
 - We have requests to do so from the higher education community (the Forum).
 - We have a request to do so from members of the Legislative Advisory Committee.
 - We have already demonstrated leadership through Russ Poulin’s efforts, as well as the president’s.
- But the role envisioned for WICHE would depart, in significant ways, from the role we have played in the past.
 - We would be managing a process that was more regulatory than traditional service-oriented.
 - This process, upon implementation, would logically operate on a fee-for-service basis.

4) Explore Interim Agreements

While the reciprocal agreements are being formed, can we get states to agree to one or all of the following interim agreements? These agreements will be temporary until the full reciprocal agreement is in place.

- Institutions participating in a financial aid consortium agreement that was in place prior to October 30, 2010, do not require approval, as long as they meet certain reporting requirements.
- Public and nonprofit institutions that enroll fewer than 10 students per year would not require approval, as long as they meet certain reporting requirements. Alternatively, we could make a bolder proposal that public institutions be considered approved until the reciprocal agreement is in place.

Action Requested

The president is requesting that the commission authorize staff to seek funding for this four-stage effort and to constitute a steering committee of stellar stakeholders, including representation from the Forum, the Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders, and WCET, to assist in developing and implementing the services identified above.



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ALASKA

Michael Driscoll
University of Alaska – Anchorage

ARIZONA

Stephanie Jacobson, WALF Chair
Arizona Board of Regents

CALIFORNIA

Ephraim Smith
California State University

COLORADO

Alan Lamborn
Colorado State University

HAWAII

Linda Johnsrud
University of Hawaii System

IDAHO

Douglas Baker
University of Idaho

MONTANA

Sylvia Moore
Montana University System

NEVADA

Bill Cathey
University of Nevada, Reno

NEW MEXICO

Wendy Wilkins, WALF Vice Chair
New Mexico State University

NORTH DAKOTA

Michel Hillman
North Dakota University System

OREGON

Sona Andrews
Oregon University System

SOUTH DAKOTA

Sam Gingerich
South Dakota Board of Regents

UTAH

Phyllis (Teddi) Safman
Utah State Board of Regents

WASHINGTON

Jane Sherman
Washington State University

WYOMING

Myron B. Allen
University of Wyoming

May 9, 2011

Commissioners

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
c/o David Longanecker, President
3035 Center Green Drive
Boulder, CO 80301

Dear Commissioners:

The Western Academic Leadership Forum (the Forum) asks for your support and action to create reciprocity among WICHE states as it relates to distance education in response to regulations¹ distributed by the US Department of Education that require colleges and universities to obtain authorization to operate in each state where a student is enrolled.

Virtually all institutions of higher education have been developing courses that are delivered to any location. Students enroll in courses that meet their needs, regardless of the origin of those courses. Institutions have not restricted access based on students' locations of residence. The new regulations require that additional and sometimes lengthy and expensive steps be taken before students from other states may be served.

The Forum is an organization of chief academic officers for systems, governing and coordinating boards, and public colleges and universities in WICHE states, formed to exchange ideas and information, share resources and expertise, and collaborate on regional initiatives. Much of the responsibility for complying with these regulations will fall on the academic affairs divisions of our institutions. We can see the following effects emerging from this regulation:

1. Institutions will likely limit their distance offerings so that critical programs are not available to students in some states or some locations. Higher education will become less accessible – serving to defeat the intentions of the current federal administration.

¹ 34 CFR, PART 600—INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED § 600.9 State authorization.... (c) *If an institution is offering postsecondary education through distance or correspondence education to students in a State in which it is not physically located or in which it is otherwise subject to State jurisdiction as determined by the State, the institution must meet any State requirements for it to be legally offering postsecondary distance or correspondence education in that State. An institution must be able to document to the Secretary the State's approval upon request.*

2. Institutions will likely deny admission and enrollment to students from certain states where authorization is expensive or cumbersome. US higher education would become more available (and affordable) to foreign students than to US students.
3. Collaborative partnerships between institutions in different states that should be encouraged will be more difficult.

Additional impacts include substantial costs and significant effort to obtain approvals and to track the locations of students, who are increasingly mobile. See Federal Requirements for Distance Education—Approval to Operate in Other States attached. Other effects summarized by WCET may be found on its website. This legislation is clearly at odds with the national agenda for improving college access and completion.

With the delay of federal enforcement of compliance until July 1, 2014 we have time (but not a lot of it) to work together as WICHE states so that institutions and students are not hampered by individual state regulations, and that gains in student access and program completion through the use of technology are not reversed, while using well-established regional accreditation standards to ensure quality education. We ask that the WICHE commissioners be proponents in each of our states to adopt reciprocity agreements among all the WICHE states such that an institution in a WICHE state can demonstrate proof of good standing with its regional accrediting body as the criteria by which reciprocity is granted. The sooner these arrangements can be made, the sooner it will ensure that students from all our WICHE states have access to the courses they need and it will eliminate the costly and time consuming process institutions need to undertake for authorization. We also encourage you to engage in a national dialog with states outside of WICHE to facilitate the offering of distance education courses.

We are ready to assist in any way that you may find useful, including, but not limited to, creating draft documents for your consideration providing information on the federal regulations and the differences between the current authorization processes in our WICHE states. We thank you in advance for your consideration of this issue and our concerns. Please contact us with questions.

We appreciate all that you do for our WICHE states in improving higher education.

Very truly yours,



Stephanie Jacobson
Chair, Western Academic Leadership Forum

Cc: David Longanecker, WICHE

² WCET <http://wcet.wiche.edu/advance/state-approval>

Federal Requirements for Distance Education - Approval to Operate in Other States

Comments on a new federal regulation that takes effect on July 1, 2014

University of Alaska Anchorage

Background:

The “state approval” language originally proposed in June 2010 by USDOE can be found in the [Federal Register](#) beginning on page 34812. The final changes to that language were released on October 29, 2010 and can be found in the [Federal Register](#), beginning on page 66858.

34 CFR, PART 600—INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED § 600.9 State authorization. (P. 66946)

*... (c) If an institution is offering postsecondary education through distance or correspondence education to students in a State in which it is not physically located or in which it is otherwise subject to State jurisdiction as determined by the State, the institution must meet any State requirements for it to be legally offering postsecondary distance or correspondence education in that State. An institution must be able to document to the Secretary the State’s approval upon request.
(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1001 and 1002)*

Difficulties with this regulation:

1. There is no value added. No improved access or quality supported by this regulation.
2. The terms and intentions of the regulation are not well defined and the timeline for implementation is too short for a reasonable response by institutions or governing state agencies.
3. Institutions that are offering distance courses are serving students all over the world. Some are in the 50 US states, others are foreign students, and others are US students in foreign countries such as armed service members in Iraq or Afghanistan.
4. This regulation would likely result in denial of admission and enrollment to students from certain states. For example, would an institution pay the \$28,000 fee required to obtain state approval and allow one student from Massachusetts to enroll in one course? At the same time, foreign students from China or Germany could enroll in courses and be admitted to programs with no cost to the university. US higher education would become more available (and affordable) to foreign students than to US students.
5. Institutions will likely limit their distance offerings so that critical programs are not available to students in some states or some locations. Higher education will become less accessible – serving to defeat the intentions of the current administration.
6. Each state has separate requirements, procedures and costs for approval, and differing timelines for application and renewal of authorization. The cost of fees alone for obtaining approvals from 40 states was estimated at over \$150K by one institution. This cost is compounded by staff effort required to learn the individual state processes, make the applications and renew approvals on a regular basis. Student locations would also have to be tracked more closely.
7. Students are mobile and may enroll while residing in one state and then move to another. Would the teaching institution need to obtain two approvals for one student?
8. Collaborative partnerships between institutions in different states would be more difficult. Institutions collaborating with an institution in another state, for example, would have to apply for authorization in another state, pay the fee, and then renew as required.



Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

3035 Center Green Drive Suite 200 Boulder, CO 80301-2204 303.541.0200 (ph) 303.541.0291 (fax)

June 20, 2011

Stephanie Jacobson
Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs
Arizona Board of Regents
2020 N. Central Avenue, Suite 230
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4593

Dear Stephanie and Members of WALF:

The Commission has asked me to respond to your letter of May 9, 2011. Thank you very much for the letter. The issue you raised regarding the relationship between the federal government and the states regarding authorization of institutions to operate is very important to WICHE. For that reason we have committed substantial attention and resources to the issue for some time. The timing of your letter could hardly have been better because it coincided with one of the semi-annual meetings of the Commission, allowing us to discuss this issue more broadly with our entire governing body and to receive its advice.

While we do not agree entirely with the difficulties you ascribe to the regulation on the attachment to your letter, we agree in whole with the issues reflected in the body of the letter. We concur that the regulation as currently drafted and interpreted would likely result in some institutions reducing universal access to their on-line offerings, certainly in states that make it difficult or expensive for institutions delivering education from outside the states' boundaries, and that the result would be an unfortunate reduction of access to legitimate educational offerings.

Perhaps most importantly, we concur that the best solution to this issue is for states to find ways to work collaboratively through reciprocal agreements to recognize the legitimacy of each other's institutional approval. Through our WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET) we began working late last year with the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), the University of Wyoming, and American Distance Education Consortium to better understand the set of issues surrounding this federal regulation, the commonalities and differences between states in the regulation of out-of-state institutions, and the interests of our member states and the institutions within those states. We established within WCET a State Authorization Network (SAN), the 28 members of which work with us to better understand the latest developments, to discern how best to deal with developments as they arrive, and to assist us in working with the various national entities that have become engaged in this area of inquiry. Information about the activities of WCET and SAN can be found on the WCET website wcet.wiche.edu.

www.wiche.edu

ALASKA ARIZONA CALIFORNIA COLORADO HAWAII IDAHO MONTANA NEVADA NEW MEXICO
NORTH DAKOTA OREGON SOUTH DAKOTA UTAH WASHINGTON WYOMING

June 20, 2011
Page 2

Since you wrote your letter two additional major developments have occurred and we are working closely with regard to both. First, the State Higher Education Executive Officers Organization (SHEEO) has become very active in the work with the Department of Education on this issue and is pursuing a detailed examination of the various existing state level efforts, so that all interested parties have better evidence upon which to base their reactions to various ideas. We had done an initial cursory inventory, but the SHEEO effort, working with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), will be much more comprehensive and will help greatly in shaping the ultimate implementation of the Department of Education's regulation of state authorization, enforcement of which has been delayed until July 1, 2014. Second, a Lumina Foundation funded collaborative effort between an organization known as The Presidents' Forum and the Council of State Governments has issued preliminary rubrics for establishing interstate reciprocity in state authorization. The final report from this collaborative effort will be available within the next few months and we hope will complement our own efforts in this regard. And finally, we had been following closely the Southern Regional Education Board's work to upgrade its Electronic Campus agreement to address the state authorization issue because this SREB effort may serve as a model for regional interstate collaboration and reciprocity.

We appreciated the April 20 letter from the Department of Education, which delays full implementation and enforcement of these regulations until July 1, 2014; that is, as long as institutions demonstrate a good faith effort to seek state authorization in all states in which they serve students. We do not believe, however, that either states or institutions should delay serious work on the issue of state authorization of out-of-state institutions. This legitimate area of state authority and responsibility has not been embraced responsibly or equally by all states, which has impeded interstate collaboration. Neither have all educational institutions or accrediting organizations equally or responsibly addressed legitimate issues with respect to the delivery of on-line services and consumer protection. We believe, however, that there is sufficient momentum to achieve good public policy serving the public good at this time, and we will continue to work toward this through our efforts within WCET.

We welcome your willingness to assist in this effort. We will continue to focus WICHE's efforts through WCET and fully intend to assure that the institutions, associated state agencies, and citizens of the West affected by this set of issues are well served. This likely could involve regional reciprocity, as suggested in your letter, or may even be more expansive, depending upon the results of the various related efforts that are going on around the country. I look forward to continuing to work with you and the membership of WALF on this set of issues.

Sincerely,



David A. Longanecker
President

cc: Joseph Garcia, Colorado Lieutenant Governor and 2011 WICHE Chair

INFORMATION ITEM

Student Exchange Program Update

Western Undergraduate Exchange. The Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) is a regional tuition-reciprocity agreement, whereby students from WICHE states can enroll in participating two- and four-year public institutions at 150 percent of the enrolling institution's resident tuition. WUE will celebrate its 25th anniversary in 2012 and is the largest program of its kind in the nation.

Despite difficult economic times in the West, the program continues to grow. In 2010-11 some 26,700 WUE students saved \$210.8 million in tuition costs. Students can choose from 147 participating WUE institutions. WUE institutions report their WUE enrollments through mid October; WICHE staff will have estimates of the 2011-12 academic year enrollments for the November 2011 commission meeting. We anticipate that enrollments will continue to increase.

Western Regional Graduate Program. The Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP) is an outstanding educational resource for the West that allows master's, Ph.D., and graduate certificate students who are residents of the 15 participating states to enroll in some 250 high-quality programs at 47 participating institutions on a resident tuition basis. In fall 2010 almost 700 students enrolled through WRGP. Staff is still finalizing fall 2011 enrollment numbers for WRGP programs but anticipates an increase again this year. We estimate that WRGP students saved an average of \$10,587 each in the 2010-11 academic year.

WRGP is a tuition-reciprocity arrangement similar to WUE, whereby students can enroll directly in a program through WRGP and are not dependent upon the approval of their home state funding to participate. It is a tremendous opportunity for WICHE states to share distinctive programs (and the faculty who teach them) and build their workforce in a variety of disciplines, particularly healthcare. More than 70 WRGP programs are healthcare-related, spanning the fields of graduate nursing, mental health, public health, speech language pathology and audiology, and other areas. To be eligible for WRGP, programs that aren't related to health must be "distinctive," meaning they must be offered at no more than four institutions in the WICHE region (exclusive of California). Staff recently completed an "Ask WICHE" FAQ for prospective WRGP students, accessible from the WICHE and WRGP websites.

In September 2011 staff invited public institutions in the WICHE region to nominate their graduate programs for participation in the WRGP network. Notification was sent to graduate deans, provosts, academic vice presidents, WICHE state higher education executive officers and chief academic officers, certifying officers, and interested department chairs. The nomination deadline is November 1, 2011; staff will report on the nominations at the November meeting. WICHE has emphasized to department chairs the importance of coordinating with their graduate departments prior to embarking on the application process. Nominations information and forms are available on the WRGP website (www.wiche.edu/wrgp). WICHE is most interested in reviewing nominations for high-need and emerging field programs, including: professional science master's (PSMs); graduate certificate programs in emerging fields; microtechnology and nanotechnology; green building and building energy conservation; emerging media and communications; biotechnology and bioinformatics; computer and cyber security; alternative energy technology; homeland security; and healthcare fields not offered through WICHE's PSEP.

Professional Student Exchange Program. Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) students have access to professional degree programs in 10 fields, all of them related to healthcare: medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, physical therapy, occupational therapy, optometry, podiatry, osteopathic medicine, physician assistant, and pharmacy. Each state determines the fields and the number of students it will support. During the 2011-12 academic year, 680 students enrolled through PSEP, with support fees totaling some \$14.2 million. The economic recession continues to adversely affect the number of students supported through PSEP, despite the continued need for healthcare professionals. At the time of this writing, there were 13 fewer students supported and approximately \$43,254 less in support fees than in 2010-11. Staff will present final numbers at the November commission meeting after all PSEP contract revisions have been submitted in early October.

WICHE's Veterinary Medicine Advisory Council met in Montana in June 2012. Discussion items included Colorado State University's (CSU's) invitation to preveterinary advisors to become ex-officio participants on the admissions committee for their state's WICHE PSEP applicants. The goal is to gain state input into the admissions process. CSU is doing this as a pilot for the WICHE states initially; depending on the results, our other partner institutions (Oregon State University and Washington State University) may consider a similar approach.

Programs and Services Regional Initiatives

WICHE Internet Course Exchange

The WICHE Internet Course Exchange (WICHE ICE) is a robust administrative tool designed to support collaboration among institutions offering online courses. Through ICE participating institutions expand their students' access to high-quality online courses and programs taught by other member institutions. Seamlessly, students enroll, obtain advising, and use financial aid from their home campus, which transcripts the course. Currently, there are 12 members; nine are institutions and three are consortia, giving ICE an overall impact on more than 30 institutions. Both two-year and four-year institutions may participate.

Acting as the broker for the exchange of course and student information and funding among the members, WICHE ICE charges a 15 percent administrative fee for its services. Members pay annual dues and may participate as either an enrolling institution (EI), a teaching institution (TI), or both. They may engage in one or all three of the exchanges.

- Seat exchange. Members with excess capacity in online courses may offer seats in them to other members at an agreed-upon common wholesale price. For FY 2011 the price is set at \$150 per credit hour for undergraduate courses and \$200 per credit hour for graduate courses. The EI is encouraged to offer these imported seats to its students at its regular tuition so that the exchange is transparent for the student. Since these seats would otherwise be empty, the TI earns additional revenue.
- Course exchange. Members may contract with other members to create and supply a new online course or an entire section of an existing online course. The wholesale price and the number of enrollments are negotiated by the institutions involved. Again, the EI is encouraged to offer these imported seats to its students at its regular tuition so that the exchange is transparent for the student. Since the EI counts the FTE for the students it enrolls in these exchange courses but has no expenses for course development or an instructor, it may also earn additional revenue.
- Program exchange. Members may contract with other members to jointly develop and deliver a full program. In this exchange the members agree both to a negotiated wholesale price (the price one institution charges another institution for a seat) and a common retail price (the price institutions charge a student for a seat) for enrolling in courses in the program.

In March 2011 staff was notified that our consortium proposal to create the North American Network of Science Labs Online (NANSLO) was one of 29 proposals selected for funding under the Next Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC) competition. NGLC received more than 600 preproposals, and 50 organizations or consortia were asked to submit full proposals. NGLC is a multiyear, collaborative initiative focused on identifying and accelerating the growth of effective education technology, particularly early-stage innovations, that can help improve college readiness and completion in the U.S. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation helped design the NGLC and fund the initiative. NANSLO received a 15-month grant of \$749,994 (the maximum grant was \$750,000). WICHE is the fiscal agent for the grant, and WICHE ICE is the coordinating partner, with Pat Shea, director of WICHE ICE, serving as the principal investigator for the grant and Catherine Weldon serving as project coordinator.

NANSLO provides a technological solution that will address many of the barriers that prevent low-income, first-generation college students who are at risk of failing to complete their degrees or pursue science-based careers due to challenges such as work and family obligations or living in rural areas that limit their access to traditional classes. The project builds on the success of the open educational science courseware and the Remote Web-based Science Laboratory (RWSL) developed by members of BCcampus, a consortium of 25 postsecondary institutions, located in British Columbia. BCcampus and the Colorado Community College System (CCCS) are WICHE's major partners for this work. BCcampus will provide web-based science lab equipment, infrastructure, and setup recommendations to WICHE and CCCS. CCCS is composed of 13 community colleges, which will pilot NANSLO during the grant period.

NANSLO will support integration of RWSL technology and open science courseware in three gatekeeper, first-semester courses: biology, physics, and chemistry. The labs for these courses at the 13 Colorado campuses will be modeled after those developed by BCcampus, including its science lab equipment, infrastructure, and setup recommendations. BCcampus licensed these courses for reuse and sharing via Creative Commons. Through the formation of discipline panels, the open courses will be revised and enhanced to produce adaptable open versions of the courses, ready for use by anyone, as well as localized versions specific to BC and CCCS needs. The RWSL in British Columbia will

be replicated in Colorado and a system put in place that allows students at all participating institutions to use both RWSLs for their labs. Faculty and enrolled students will be trained in the use of RWSLs.

The initiative incorporates online learning and RWSL, which uses open source software and a robotic interface to allow students to use their Internet browser to access and control actual lab equipment and perform lab exercises in real time while obtaining real-world data that is as valid as data collected in a traditional laboratory. The labs are not virtual or simulated; students will log onto the website of a remotely located science lab and request control of remote instruments through an interface, including instrument and camera controls. Through the use of structured instructor-student and student-student interaction, RWSL technology and real data, lab kits, and other delivery strategies, NANSLO enables learners to practice scientific observation, experimentation, data analysis, and logical thinking. The physics course will be launched in spring 2012, and the biology and chemistry courses will be launched in summer 2012. Their staggered start will allow CCCS to have all equipment purchased and installed for the RWSLs.

Five other institutional partners are participating in NANSLO. Montana State University-Bozeman and the University of Wyoming were selected to represent members of WICHE ICE and Montana State University-Great Falls College of Technology and Laramie County Community College (WY) were selected to represent members of the Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders (the Alliance). Faculty and academic administrators from these institutions, as well as from the Colorado School of Mines, will serve as members of NANSLO's advisory board and discipline panels, and their campuses may be future sites for expansion of NANSLO beyond the grant period. The advisory board will oversee a robust evaluation of the courses, including student learning outcomes, faculty use, and articulation and transfer. The board will review and approve all deliverables, including an environmental scan of remote science labs in the U.S. and Canada, with a description of their tools and scalability; plans to ensure NANSLO is sustainable beyond the immediate scale, with a how-to adoption manual with case studies about the implementation of these courses; and a template for scaling the use of the remote labs across all institutions collaborating in NANSLO.

In September 2011 the partners convened at North Island College in British Columbia for a two-day workshop. This provided an opportunity for the three discipline panels – one for each subject and consisting of faculty members from each participating institution – to discuss and make decisions about the curriculum for the open courses and to see a demo and test out the RWSL experiments.

This international project has the potential to remove barriers to access experienced by at-risk students and help change how students engage in science through deeper learning. In addition, all courses, software, manuals, and other deliverables developed by NANSLO will be openly licensed to encourage the widespread adoption of these courses and RWSL.

ICE also continues to pursue opportunities to support existing and newly developing online programs that are struggling because of declining budgets. By partnering across institutions, the participants ensure the financial viability of certain online courses and programs. This is especially true for niche subject areas, where a single institution's enrollment in a certain course or program is low. Aggregating enrollment across two or more institutions can make these courses or programs sustainable. Areas of interest include social work, STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) education, Native American studies, business, foreign languages, and energy. The Nursing Education Xchange (NEXus) continues to use ICE to make more online courses that respond to workforce needs available to students at their home institutions.

Another avenue of interest being explored this year is a partnership between ICE and the Online Consortium of Independent Colleges and Universities (OCICU). More than 80 independent nonprofit institutions participate in OCICU. Most are very small and cannot offer the wide selection of online courses available through larger state schools. At the same time, the OCICU schools offer some unique courses in specialty areas not available at state schools. A one-year pilot beginning in fall 2011 would allow three institutions in each organization to purchase extra capacity in courses offered via the other's members at the established rate used by the selling organization for its members. If the pilot is successful, ICE and OCICU will discuss expanding the relationship to more of their members.

ICE may also be involved in the support of the new industrial assessment center (IAC), based at Boise State University (BSU). In September U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu announced that it would award BSU \$1.5 million over five years as one of 24 proposals funded to train undergraduate- and graduate-level engineering students in manufacturing efficiency. Members of the Idaho IAC include Boise State University, Brigham Young University-Idaho, Idaho State University, Northwest Nazarene University, and University of Idaho. ICE could be used to support this multi-institutional network in addressing the challenge of offering relevant industrial energy efficiency coursework

for students at each institution without significant duplication of effort. Through ICE, IAC could leverage the best talent and knowledge at the IAC-partner universities and improve access to all students throughout the region. The real strength of this model is that it is seamless to the student. That is, Boise State students could enroll at Boise State for a course delivered by an Idaho State University instructor. This effort may serve as a model that could be applied across all IAC's to develop broader and richer learning networks.

The WICHE ICE website (www.wiche.edu/ice) provides much more information about how the program works, as well as new resources for members. A listserv supports communication among members while a secure encrypted database accessible via the web supports the exchange. ICE members include:

- Bismarck State College (ND)
- Boise State University (ID)
- Lewis-Clark State College (ID)
- Montana State University, Bozeman
- Montana Tech of the University of Montana
- Montana University System
- Northern Arizona University
- North Dakota University System Online
- Regis University (CO)
- South Dakota System of Higher Education
- University of Alaska Anchorage
- University of Wyoming

Western Academic Leadership Forum

The Western Academic Leadership Forum (the Forum) gives academic leaders in the WICHE states a venue for sharing information, resources, and expertise as they address issues of common concern across the region and work together on innovative solutions. This group consists of provosts; academic vice presidents at bachelor's, master's, and doctoral-level institutions; and chief executives and chief academic officers for system and state coordinating and governing boards. It is funded primarily via membership dues, with additional funding provided by sponsors of the annual meeting. The Forum will hold its next meeting April 18-20 in Phoenix.

The Academic Leaders Toolkit (<http://alt.wiche.edu>), which debuted in spring 2011, is a joint project of the Forum and the Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders (the Alliance). This web-based repository contains profiles of successful decision-making tools and processes used by academic leaders. Tools in a broad range of categories – such as program evaluation, creation, and elimination; faculty recruitment and retention; and student outcomes assessment – help academic leaders better address their increasing range of responsibilities. The toolkit is searchable by category, state, and type of institution or organization.

This fall the Forum (www.wiche.edu/walf) will kick off its reading program giving academic leaders an opportunity to share perspectives on recently published books and papers. Current members include:

Alaska

- Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education
- University of Alaska Anchorage
- University of Alaska Southeast
- University of Alaska System

Arizona

- Arizona Board of Regents

California

- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
- California State University system

Colorado

- Metropolitan State College of Denver
- Colorado State University, Fort Collins
- Colorado State University, Pueblo

Idaho

- Boise State University
- Lewis-Clark State College
- University of Idaho

Montana

- Montana State University, Bozeman
- The University of Montana
- Montana University System

Nevada

- Nevada State College
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- University of Nevada, Reno

New Mexico

- New Mexico State University

North Dakota

- Minot State University
- North Dakota State University
- North Dakota University System
- University of North Dakota
- Valley City State University

Oregon

- Oregon State University
- Oregon University System
- Pacific University
- Portland State University
- The University of Oregon

South Dakota

- Black Hills State University
- Dakota State University
- Northern State University
- South Dakota Board of Regents
- South Dakota School of Mines and Technology

Utah

- Utah State Board of Regents

Washington

- Central Washington University
- Eastern Washington University
- Washington State University
- University of Washington Educational Outreach

Wyoming

- University of Wyoming

Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders

The members of the Executive Committee of the Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders (the Alliance – www.wiche.edu/waccal) met in July 2011 to discuss the launch of its first membership year. The Alliance, modeled after the Western Academic Leadership Forum, provides academic leaders of two-year schools and their related systems and state coordinating and governing boards with a venue for sharing information, resources, and expertise among community colleges and technical schools. Together, the members address issues of common concern across the region and work together on innovative solutions. Like the Forum, it is funded from membership dues and grants.

During its July meeting, the Executive Committee adopted bylaws and held an election of officers. It appointed members to serve on the Oversight Committee of the Academic Leaders Toolkit (discussed above) and identified two primary areas of activity for this year: holding their first annual membership meeting in Phoenix in April 2012, in conjunction with the Forum’s annual meeting; and creating a members-only workspace on the Alliance website, where they can share information and work collaboratively on various tasks. The theme of their annual meeting will be “Change by Design @ edu.”

Charter members with representatives on the Alliance Executive Committee are:

Alaska: University of Alaska Fairbanks

Arizona: Maricopa Community Colleges

California: California Community Colleges

Colorado: Colorado Community College System

Hawai’i: University of Hawai’i System

Idaho: College of Southern Idaho

Montana: Montana University System

Nevada: Great Basin College

New Mexico: Santa Fe Community College

North Dakota: Williston State College

Oregon: Oregon Board of Education

South Dakota: Lake Area Technical Institute

Utah: Salt Lake Community College

Washington: Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

Wyoming: Laramie County Community College

Interstate Passport Initiative

The Interstate Passport Initiative is a grassroots-originated effort by academic leaders in the WICHE states to advance policies and practices supporting friction-free transfer for students in the region. Under the umbrella of this initiative, we envision a set of related regional projects, which would take place during an approximate five-year time span. Participation at the institution, system, or state levels will be purely voluntary. Some may choose to participate in some projects and not in others, or in none at all. WICHE, at the request of the academic leaders involved in the Forum and the Alliance, serves as the facilitator for this initiative.

The initial concept for the Interstate Passport Initiative was proposed by members of the Alliance at their meeting in July 2010. On their behalf WICHE submitted a Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) proposal later that month but it was not funded. During a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Forum in fall 2010, some members indicated an interest in further exploring this idea. WICHE convened a meeting of representatives from the two organizations, as well as additional transfer and articulation experts in the WICHE states in February 24-25, 2011. The meeting was cochaired by Michel Hillman, vice chancellor for academic and student affairs at the North Dakota University System and a member of the Forum’s Executive Committee, and Peter Quigley, associate vice president of academic affairs for the University of Hawai’i System and a member of the Alliance executive committee. These academic leaders continue to cochair the initiative.

A draft vision resulted from that meeting, outlining some possible goals and next steps, including the recommendation that a task force be appointed to provide further guidance. Hillman and Quigley made follow-up presentations in April and May to the executive committees of their respective organizations. Both supported the establishment of a task force, whose members would include one individual from each WICHE state involved in the February meeting, to further refine the goals and objectives for this initiative and then report back to the two organizations.

The task force identified six goals for the initiative, to be addressed in a series of projects. These include:

- Goal 1: Provide data and information to understand the status of the general education core and its relationship to state transfer policies and patterns in the 15 WICHE states, the numbers of students who transfer among the WICHE states, the role of outcomes in defining the core, the process by which change in policy occurs in each pilot state, and other matters important to understanding the baseline circumstances relevant to this project.
- Goal 2: Conduct a pilot project in five WICHE states to establish block transfer agreements within and among those states for the lower-division general education core, based on successful integration of LEAP's (Liberal Education and America's Promise's) essential learning outcomes, developed by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).
- Goal 3: Identify the implications for institutional and state policy for a transfer framework based on learning outcomes for further research and projects.
- Goal 4: Establish a regional repository for agreements among institutions allowing students with A.A. and A.S. degrees to assume junior status upon admission with their general education completed.
- Goal 5: Conduct a pilot project to identify and establish pathways across the region for students to complete the last 60 hours of their major.
- Goal 6: Conduct a pilot project to identify and establish pathways across the region for students transferring with an A.A.S. degree to a B.A.S. program.

In July members of the task force worked with WICHE staff to submit a proposal addressing the first three goals to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. WICHE requested a grant of \$550,000 for this work to be conducted over a two year period and we expect to receive notification about the grant in mid-October. The proposal, if funded, calls for a regional committee representing the participating entities to oversee this process and grant "Interstate Passport status" to those successfully aligning with the outcomes. Institutions and systems in California, Hawai'i, Oregon, North Dakota, and Utah would participate in the pilot. Students who complete the general education requirements at one institution would then be free to take their "passport" to any other participating institution for friction-free acceptance. This new student-centric model would facilitate transfer and articulation among institutions across the region, giving students more freedom to choose where to finish their degrees.

Institutions included in the proposal are:

- California: California State University, Sacramento and Cosumnes River College.
- Hawai'i: Leeward Community College and University of Hawai'i West Oahu.
- North Dakota: Bismarck State College, Dakota College at Bottineau, Dickinson State University, Lake Region State College, Mayville State University, Minot State University, North Dakota State University, North Dakota State College of Science, University of North Dakota, Valley City State University, Williston State College.
- Eastern Oregon University and Columbia Gorge Community College; University of Oregon and Lane Community College.
- Utah: Dixie State College of Utah, Salt Lake Community College, Snow College, Southern Utah University, The University of Utah, Utah State University, Utah Valley University, and Weber State University.

Pat Shea would serve as the principal investigator for the project. Two new part-time staff positions would be created: a .50 FTE researcher/project manager and a .40 administrative assistant. The grant would support six other part-time positions: five would be filled by individuals in the pilot states, who would act as facilitators, and a project evaluator. Over the two-year life of the project, WICHE would earn \$35,621 from the grant in indirect and contribute \$55,656 in in-kind support to the project.

Gaining Online Accessible Learning through Self-Study

WICHE is a partner in a three-year grant effort (January 2011-December 2013) sponsored by the FIPSE. The Gaining Online Accessible Learning through Self-Study (GOALS) project capitalizes on the products of an existing GOALS project and encourages top administrators to engage in self-study and continuously improve their institution's web accessibility. This information will help the GOALS partners to create blueprints that will help promote adoption of improved institutional web accessibility in higher education.

One set of blueprints will focus on aligning institutional web accessibility with regional accreditation. The GOALS Consortium will identify ways in which web accessibility is, or could be, expressed in regional accreditation materials; create new materials with a consortium partner, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC); and create materials and processes to assist review committees in assessing institutional web accessibility. A second set of blueprints will help support institutional adoption of web accessibility and to support institutions that wish to engage in the GOALS self-study process. These materials will focus on developing workshops, training materials, and templates that institutions can use to evaluate and improve accessibility across their web presence. Another objective of this set of blueprints will be to develop and conduct a cost and economic resource analysis of web accessibility to assist institutions in understanding the costs and benefits associated with including web accessibility into initial development and in retrofitting existing websites.

The GOALS Consortium has six members, led by the National Center on Disability and Access to Education at Utah State University, and including: Michigan Community College Virtual Learning Collaborative; SACSCOC; Southern Regional Education Board; WICHE; and WebAim, a web-accessibility nonprofit at Utah State University. WICHE will be working with its consortium partners in the development and dissemination of materials and information, as well as in the recruitment of 45 field test and case study sites.

Master Property Program

WICHE offers participation in the Midwestern Higher Education Compact's Master Property Program (MPP) to colleges and universities in the West. Institutional members benefit from comprehensive property insurance coverage tailored to their specific needs, while improving their risk management and asset protection strategies. The program is available to two-year, four-year, public, and private institutions of higher education, subject to approval by the MPP leadership committee. The base program rates are typically below industry averages, which helps members to reduce their insurance costs while improving their asset protection. Members also have the opportunity to earn annual dividends, based on the consortium's comprehensive loss ratios. Currently, 50 MPP institutions have total insured values of \$79 billion.

MPP members collectively have achieved savings of approximately \$65 million in premiums and dividends (the estimated savings for the 2010-11 period is \$9.9 million). The MHEC program was created in 1994; WICHE has partnered with MHEC in offering the program since 2004. The New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE) joined the MPP in 2009. The program is currently underwritten by Lexington and is jointly administered by Marsh and Captive Resources under the direction of a leadership committee representative of the participating insured institutions. Craig Kispert, associate vice president for business and planning at Seattle Pacific University, and Laura Peterson, risk manager at the University of Wyoming, represent WICHE member institutions on the MPP leadership committee.

Seven institutions and two systems (with 14 campuses) in the WICHE region are members of the Master Property Program:

- Colorado College
- Lewis and Clark College (OR)
- Nevada System of Higher Education:
 - Community College of Southern Nevada
 - Desert Research Institute
 - Great Basin College
 - Nevada State College at Henderson
 - Truckee Meadows Community College
 - University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 - University of Nevada, Reno
 - Western Nevada Community College

- Pima County Community College system – six campuses and four learning and education centers (AZ)
- Reed College (OR)
- Seattle Pacific University (WA)
- Westminster College (UT)
- Willamette University (OR)
- University of Wyoming

Representatives of the member institutions, including risk managers and facilities managers, will attend the Master Property Program's annual all-insureds meeting and loss control workshop on March 6-8, 2012, in St. Louis. The workshop focuses on facilities and risk management issues relevant to higher education; speakers will include national experts in insurance, construction, facilities management, energy conservation, engineering, fire and disaster prevention, property inspections, appraisals, claims handling, and loss prevention.

WICHE staff continues to work with the program administrators to provide information on the MHEC/ WICHE/NEBHE insurance programs to interested institutions. Jere Mock and several members of the MPP Leadership Committee met with the chancellor of the Oregon University System and his risk management staff on October 12 to discuss the program and with other risk managers from institutions in the West who attended the 2012 University Risk Management Insurance Association annual meeting in Portland.

WICHE Partners with MHEC to Provide Discounted Purchasing Options

WICHE also partners with the Midwestern Higher Education Compact on its MHECTech program, which enables colleges and universities in the Midwest and West to purchase off competitively bid purchasing agreements to contain or reduce their purchasing costs. WICHE-region institutions are eligible to purchase computers at discounted rates under the MHECTech contracts with Dell, Fujitsu, Oracle (Sun), Systemax Computers (also known as Global, GovED and CompUSA); Dell and Xerox printers and peripherals; and data networking offered by Juniper Networks.

Several of the purchasing agreements are also available to K-12 organizations; local, county, and state governments; and nonprofit organizations. The agreements aggregate volume purchases to lower product costs and reduce the time institutions must spend developing and conducting bids themselves. MHEC undertakes the time and expense of the RFP process, and institutions can purchase the goods or services knowing that the due diligence in selecting the vendor has already been done. The MHECTech website (www.mhectechnet.org), as well as WICHE's website, provide details on the vendors, contracts and eligible entities.



Issue Analysis and Research Committee Meeting

Monday, October 31, 2011

10:15 - 11:45 am

Aloha Center 155/165

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Monday, October 31, 2011

10:15 - 11:45 am
Aloha Center 155/165

Issue Analysis and Research Committee Meeting

Robert Burns (SD), chair
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (WA), vice chair
Tom Buchanan (WY), ex officio
Joe Garcia (CO), ex officio

Susan Anderson (AK)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Christopher Cabaldon (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Steven Wheelwright (HI)
Duane Nellis (ID)
Kim Gillan (MT)
Jane Nichols (NV)
José Garcia (NM)
Bill Goetz (ND)
Ryan Deckert (OR)
Committee chair (SD)
William Sederburg (UT)
Committee vice chair (WA)
Position vacant (WY)

Agenda

Presiding: Robert Burns (SD), chair

Staff: Brian Prescott, director of policy research
Cheryl Graves, administrative assistant



Approval of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2011 5-3



Approval of a project on teacher preparation and professional development related to the Common Core State Standards 5-6



Approval of a project on building capacity to support state college completion goals 5-7

Information Items:

Unit update:
Research analyst

Project on Colorado's College Opportunity Fund (response to RFP from state auditor's office)

Project on Washington's Opportunity Scholarship Program

Discussion Items:

Annual update to *Benchmarks: WICHE Region 2011*

Tuition and Fees in Public Higher Education in the West: 2011-2012

Update on *Knocking at the College Door*

- Methodological review
- Publication content and timeline

Update on *Policy Insights* related to undocumented students

Proposed project to implement a state authorization reciprocity program [Tab 4, pg 24]

Progress toward FY 2012 workplan (highlights):

- *Facilitating Development of a Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange* project
- *Educational Equity and Postsecondary Student Success: A Center for Urban Education and WICHE Partnership for Policy Research and Analysis* project
- Adult College Completion Network
- College Access Challenge Grant (CACG) Consortium and Network
- WICHE's Higher Education Policy Database and Policy Publications Clearinghouse

Other business

Adjournment

ACTION ITEM

Issue Analysis and Research Committee Minutes

Monday, May 17, 2011

Committee Members Present

Robert Burns (SD), chair
Susan Anderson (AK)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Christopher Cabaldon (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Duane Nellis (ID)
Kim Gillan (MT)
William Goetz (ND)
Debbie Hammons (WY)

Committee Members Absent

Steven Wheelwright (HI)
Jane Nichols (NV)
José Garcia (NM)
Ryan Deckert (OR)
William Sederburg (UT)
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (WA), vice chair

Staff Present

Patrick Lane, project coordinator, Policy Analysis and Research
David Longanecker, president
Demarée Michelau, director of policy analysis, Policy Analysis and Research
Russell Poulin, deputy director, research and analysis, WCET
Brian Prescott, director of policy research, Policy Analysis and Research

Guests Present

Jimmy Clark, HCM Strategists

Chair Burns convened the Issue Analysis and Research Committee on May 17, 2011; roll was called, and a quorum was established.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of the November 9, 2010, Issue Analysis and Research Committee Meeting Minutes

Chair Burns asked members to review the minutes from the November 9, 2010, committee meeting. Commissioner Hammons motioned TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 9, 2010, ISSUE ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE MEETING. Commissioner Cabaldon seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEM

Approval of the FY 2012 Workplan Relating to the Policy Analysis and Research Unit

Chair Burns asked members to review the proposed FY 2012 workplan items that relate to the Issue Analysis and Research Committee and asked staff to provide relevant background information.

Michelau asked committee members for feedback on the issue of campus safety and security. She said that a commissioner has asked staff to investigate how WICHE may be able to help institutions develop campus safety and security response plans. She noted that the Issue Analysis and Research Committee and the Programs and Services Committee are both reviewing whether and how they could address the issue and asked committee members which unit they felt could best address the issue. Commissioner Munn asked for a clarification of the differences between the Policy Analysis and Research unit and the Programs and Services unit. Michelau responded that the Policy Analysis and Research unit tends to focus on policy levers, while Programs and Services manages programs that actually deliver services, although there can be some overlap.

Commissioner Nellis said that the issue of guns on campus is an important one. Commissioner Hammons suggested that this is a difficult and controversial issue, and in many states WICHE's input, as an outside organization, may not be well received. Commissioner Nellis said that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) works closely with institutions to audit their emergency response plans. Although these audits and plans are not public documents, the

review is thorough and the partnership between campuses and DHS may fill the needs in question. He said that it may be beneficial to inform other commissioners about this process.

Commissioner Gillan echoed Commissioner Hammons' point that guns are a highly contentious issue, and WICHE's involvement would not likely change any minds. She suggested that it may be more beneficial for Policy Analysis and Research to provide background on the range of policies in place in other states.

Commissioner Munn noted that this type of resource may already be available. Commissioner Cabaldon asked about the process for setting priorities and whether this issue was important for the unit to address. Chair Burns noted that DHS seems to have addressed the broader issue of campus safety and security, and Commissioner Munn suggested that a cursory examination of the available resources related to guns on campus would not take significant time and could meet the needs of commissioners.

Michelau then presented a draft outline of a data and policy brief on the challenges policymakers face in addressing issues related to undocumented students. Commissioner Munn suggested that the Policy Analysis and Research unit could focus on the demographics of the issue and how policies toward undocumented students may impact the West in the future, compared to other regions. He also suggested that staff examine whether broadening the analysis beyond undocumented Latino students is worthwhile or whether other groups of undocumented students are large enough to affect the policy landscape.

Longanecker and Poulin arrived to provide a description of the state authorization regulations and WICHE's activities in relation to it. Chair Burns asked Longanecker and Poulin to provide background for committee members on the issue of state authorization of distance education providers. Longanecker reviewed a letter from the Western Academic Leadership Forum to commissioners and outlined his proposed response. He said that WICHE is continuing to work on the issue with partners, including the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) and the Southern Regional Education Board. Poulin noted that there is some relief in that the U.S. Department of Education will not take enforcement actions until 2014 against institutions that have not obtained authorization. Committee members agreed with the proposed response. Commissioner Cabaldon asked that Longanecker and Poulin keep commissioners apprised of developments before the next commission meeting.

Chair Burns informed committee members that due to grant regulations, the unit could not pursue the Western Consortium for Accelerated Learning Opportunities (WCALO) project, as proposed in the workplan because of limitations regarding WICHE's ability to subgrant to states. Commissioner Goetz motioned TO STRIKE THE WCALO PROJECT FROM THE WORKPLAN. Commissioner Cabaldon seconded the motion. The committee unanimously voted to strike the WCALO project from the workplan.

Commissioner Munn noted that the completion agenda is on the workplan in both the "Existing Activities" and "On the Horizon" sections. Commissioner Anderson motioned TO STRIKE THE COMPLETION AGENDA FROM THE "ON THE HORIZON" SECTION. Commissioner Lorenz seconded the motion. The committee unanimously voted to strike the completion agenda item from the "On the Horizon" section.

Commissioners Munn and Cabaldon asked that staff review how information about projects is presented to the committee. Commissioner Munn asked that in the future, they receive more information on the scope and timeline for proposed projects. He said this would be useful, particularly in cases where committee members are asked to approve new projects. Commissioner Cabaldon asked for more information about the unit's priorities. Commissioner Gillan agreed, saying it would be useful to have a better idea of what are major and minor activities. They both proposed staff investigate using some fairly objective measure of priority and provide more information on projects.

Commissioner Nellis noted that the soldiers and students project would be helpful for Idaho institutions and asked about the status. Michelau reported that the unit is still seeking funding for the effort and is planning to approach the Walmart Foundation.

Commissioner Cabaldon motioned TO APPROVE THE WORKPLAN SECTIONS RELATED TO THE ISSUE ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE, AS AMENDED. Commissioner Nellis seconded the motion. The committee unanimously voted to approve of the Issue Analysis and Research workplan as amended.

INFORMATION ITEM

Unit Staffing

Prescott informed commissioners that staff will begin the process of hiring a new member for the unit to replace Brandi Van Horn, who recently left to pursue another opportunity. Additionally, the unit has hired Dustin Weeden as an intern for the summer.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Additional Unit Updates

Prescott informed committee members that the unit is carrying out a review of the methodology for developing the *Knocking at the College Door* demographic projections. The unit has found a consultant to write a white paper that will inform discussions within a technical advisory panel and a panel of end users, both of which have yet to be appointed.

Prescott then advised the committee that there has been growing interest among National Center for Higher Education Management Systems and SHEEO to find a single solution to making policy-relevant higher education data available online. Progress in these talks has been slow, but they are still moving forward. In the meantime the online data resources are being updated.

Prescott next reported that WICHE's bid to partner with the University of Pennsylvania in the competition for a National Center for Postsecondary Education and Employment was not selected for funding.

Michelau then provided very brief updates on additional current projects.

Chair Burns adjourned the meeting at 9:30 am.

ACTION ITEM

Proposed Project:

Teacher Preparation and Professional Development Related to the Common Core State Standards

WICHE proposes a project that will work with Western states to prepare preservice and veteran teachers to teach to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English/language arts and mathematics.

Relationship to WICHE Mission

This project will assist interested states in the WICHE region to prepare teachers at varying stages in their careers to teach to the CCSS in an effort to prepare all students for college and careers.

Background

Created through an initiative led by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers, the CCSS in English/language arts and mathematics align college and work expectations through the rigorous content and the application of knowledge via the demonstration of higher-order skills. In September 2010 the U.S. Department of Education awarded significant grants to two consortia of states – the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) – to develop K-12 assessments to measure student progress toward the CCSS. Through a small grant (\$42,000) from Carnegie Corporation of New York, WICHE, in partnership with the American Council on Education (ACE) and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), hosted two meetings on the implications of the CCSS on higher education in the West. Three primary themes emerged from these two meetings, as well as a discussion with state higher education executive officers from the WICHE region.

1. There is work to be done in the West for higher education to accept the CCSS as an indicator of college readiness.
2. States and institutions need assistance in developing a curricular response to the CCSS.
3. WICHE states face the dual challenge of preparing preservice and in-service teachers to teach to the newly adopted standards.

Project Description

Obvious from our work to date, one of the significant challenges to the success of the CCSS will be the capability of teachers to know and understand the standards and how to most effectively use the newly developed assessment tools for “just in time” curricular adjustments. WICHE, as a regional resource, is in a unique position to assist institutions and inexpensively transition these changes into their teacher education curriculum for both preservice and in-service teachers. The intent is to work with interested states in pooling teacher preparation and professional development resources, including collaborative training and curriculum as well as effective professional development tools. WICHE staff will consult with the assessment consortia and recognized teacher education leaders to develop a solid curriculum for teacher education and professional development training that states may use during this transitional period.

Staff and Fiscal Impact

The total budget of the proposed project is unknown at this point. The possible intended funding sources are Carnegie Corporation of New York and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. As the Policy staff more firmly conceptualizes the work involved, it will update the commission.

Action Requested

Approval to seek funding to support WICHE’s leadership of this project.

ACTION ITEM

Proposed Project:

Building Capacity to Support State College Completion Plans

WICHE proposes to continue work it has been doing over the last two years in partnership with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) at the University of Southern California. WICHE will serve as a subcontractor on a project to progress the equity agenda in state-level policymaking and its implementation at the campus level. It will enable the two organizations to work collaboratively to make racial/ethnic equity more transparent in states' policy and programmatic efforts to increase degree completion. The project will familiarize state leaders with tools and techniques to enable them to better monitor the state of equity in college completion, create a cohort of professionals with these capabilities, and strengthen the development and use of benchmarks and metrics for assessing and tracking equity in college completion.

Relationship to WICHE Mission

This project directly supports WICHE's mission to promote access and success in postsecondary education of underrepresented populations.

Background

WICHE has been a partner on a Ford Foundation project entitled Educational Equity and Postsecondary Student Success: A CUE and WICHE Partnership for Policy Research and Analysis since October 2009. During this project WICHE worked with data from Nevada to prepare analyses of how students in Nevada's public institutions progressed through milestones and success points, disaggregated by race/ethnicity. CUE and WICHE subsequently worked with staff at the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to disseminate the findings to campuses, regents, and others and to facilitate dialogues about how to use the findings in improving policy and practice for the purpose of reducing equity gaps and enhancing overall performance.

As this project is winding down, CUE has received interest from the Ford Foundation, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation, which are interested in supporting additional work consistent with these goals and extending CUE's and WICHE's involvement in closing educational gaps in more states. CUE expects to submit a proposal by the end of September.

Project Description

Just as the nation and the individual states focus greater attention to the goal of expanding educational attainment as a necessary ingredient for economic prosperity and security, the fastest-growing populations are those which have persistently lower levels of educational attainment. Shrinking that gap has become ever more important as a result, and to do so states and postsecondary institutions could benefit from more intentional, equity-based structures, processes, and tools.

The primary goal of this new project is to collaborate with CUE in order to support policy and programmatic efforts targeted at degree completion by working with states and institutions to build capacity for equity-minded analysis, encourage and sustain purposeful interrogation of relevant data and information, and foster critical inquiry that can build on the strengths of academic values. This project will also incorporate and capitalize on similar national initiatives already occurring in many states, including efforts such as Complete College America. Ultimately, the project aims to identify and scale up strategies that have worked to reduce equity gaps at smaller scales and to focus on reducing those gaps with cost-effective strategies.

Staff and Fiscal Impact

The project is expected to defray at least a portion of the personnel and related costs of one staff member in the Policy Analysis and Research unit, as well as a smaller share of the personnel costs of WICHE's president. It is expected that the contract will also cover travel and other expenses related to WICHE's involvement in the grant.

Action Requested

Approval to receive and expend funds to support WICHE's involvement as a partner in this project.

Summary of Issue Analysis and Research Committee FY 2012 Workplan Activities

Existing Activities

Adult College Completion Network. WICHE manages a learning network to support Lumina's Adult Degree Completion Initiative called the Adult College Completion (ACC) Network. The ACC Network unites organizations and agencies working to increase college completion by adults with prior college credits but no degree. Key components include: 1) an interactive website (www.adultcollegecompletion.org); 2) meetings and conferences for grantees and others invited to participate in network activities; 3) webinars to highlight effective strategies for serving adults; 4) briefs and reports on lessons learned; 5) a repository of higher education policies related to adult learners; 6) a listserv to expedite network communications; 7) presentations at regional/national meetings; 8) social and communications media use to engage grantees and other stakeholders in discussions about adult degree completion; and 9) activities to be determined as the network develops in consultation with Lumina Foundation (e.g., hosted "lab" visits to best-practice locations and leveraging activities with programs such as the College Access Challenge Grant Consortium and Network).

Annual Tuition and Fees report. WICHE's Policy Analysis and Research unit annually produces a report detailing tuition and fees charges for every public institution in the West. The report includes charges for resident and nonresident graduate and undergraduate students in a number of tables, allowing for easy comparisons and some historical information. The unit has made several changes over the years to ensure a higher quality of data and is always looking for ways to make the report more usable and effective. The 2010-11 edition incorporated a number of changes designed to: reduce the number of tables overall and reduce duplication, add enrollment-weighted averages to state and institution-type tables to ensure that the report could better reflect the prices typical students face, and make the data publicly available in an Excel format online.

Non-traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners. With funding from Lumina Foundation for Education, *Non-traditional No More* has worked with Arkansas, Colorado, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, and South Dakota to identify their "ready adult" population – those adults who are close to having enough credits to obtain a degree but have not yet returned to college. The project employs two strategies: 1) identifying ready adults; and 2) building a path to college success. The first strategy is designed to help states and institutions identify their ready adults. This work includes mining state data systems and engaging partnerships with other public or private data system partners to identify each state's ready adults. The second strategy focuses on academic policies, financial aid/financing, student support services, and communications (marketing and information strategies designed to reach out to the ready adult population). Work continues with North Dakota on this project.

Legislative Advisory Committee. WICHE created the Legislative Advisory Committee (LAC) in 1995 to inform the WICHE Commission and staff about significant legislative issues related to higher education and provide input on WICHE initiatives. In addition, WICHE staff serves the LAC by informing members about emerging policy issues in the West. The LAC meets annually, and members are invited to various WICHE activities, such as regional and national policy forums.

State Policy Inventory Database Online. The State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIDO), the nation's only online searchable database of higher education policies, provides state and national policymakers, education leaders, practitioners, and education consumers with an inventory of state-level policies and resources in key policy issue areas related to access and success in higher education. WICHE staff is in the process of rebuilding and retooling this resource, which will be called WICHE's Higher Education Policy Database and launched in December 2011.

Knocking at the College Door: Projections of High School Graduates by State and Race/Ethnicity methodology review and expansion. *Knocking* is widely used throughout the nation by postsecondary institutions, state agencies, legislatures, governors' offices, K-12 schools, media, libraries, businesses, and others interested in the future size and composition of enrollment demand for higher education. In the wake of the most recent edition's publication in March 2008, Policy Analysis and Research unit staff have made numerous presentations on its findings (and related demographic information) and continue to respond to media and other inquiries. With support from its traditional partners, ACT and the College Board, the unit has begun a project to

review the methodology, examine how its analyses could be extended to be of greater use to the education and policy communities that use it, and prepare the next edition of the publication.

College Access Challenge Grant Consortium and Network. The College Access Challenge Grant (CACG) is a federally funded formula grant program designed to increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enroll and succeed in postsecondary education. In 2010 Congress passed the Student Financial Aid and Responsibility Act, which increased annual funding for the CACG program from \$66 million to \$150 million, boosted the minimum annual grant award to \$1.5 million, and extended the program through FY 2014. States can participate in WICHE's activities through the consortium, which involves WICHE administering the state program, or through the network, which is a collaborative council composed of designated staff from each of the states. While the level of WICHE-related services differ, both options allow CACG states the opportunity to learn from each other, share best practices and lessons learned, and examine current evidence-based research. The CACG Consortium is composed of Alaska and Idaho, and the CACG Network is made up of the consortium states plus Nevada, North Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. States are still welcome to join the consortium or network.

Facilitating Development of a Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange. The principal objective of this project is to pilot a data exchange among several states, allowing for more comprehensive analyses of the production, stock, and flows of human capital through a regional, multistate approach. Working initially with four member states – Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Hawai'i – WICHE is coordinating efforts to develop the necessary architecture for the exchange of data, effectively govern the exchange, produce standard reports, and ensure the protection of privacy. This project complements the many efforts underway, stimulated by the infusion of \$400 million in federal grants over the last several years and many more millions in philanthropic support, to develop statewide longitudinal data systems. Specifically, it will focus on answering two principal policy questions with evidence drawn from the participating states: 1) How are former high school students from participating states performing in postsecondary education and the workforce in participating states? and 2) How are former postsecondary students from participating states performing in the workforce in participating states? In doing so the multistate data exchange will provide rich information about the stock and flow of skills and abilities (represented by education and training) of various populations within a given state; gaps in attainment and employment between population groups based on demography and socioeconomic status; and the mobility of the U.S. population across state borders.

Exploration of issues related to undocumented students. WICHE staff is preparing a policy brief examining data, policies, and issues related to undocumented students and how they are shaping the landscape of education and workforce in the West. Given the keen interest in this topic, the Policy unit will continue to monitor and track how the policy landscape shifts over time.

Benchmarks: WICHE Region. This annual document tracks 15 indicators of progress toward improving access and success, affordability, and higher education finance from a regional perspective.

Electronic Fact Book: Policy Indicators for Higher Education. This online repository of data relevant to higher education policy is regularly updated. Its domains include access, affordability, demographics, economic indicators, faculty, finance, preparation, progression, and workforce. Data are provided at the state level for all WICHE states.

Policy Insights. *Policy Insights* is a short report series covering a wide array of timely higher education policy issues.

Electronic Policy Alerts and Stat Alerts. *Policy* and *Stat Alerts* are WICHE's periodic e-mail notices of new policy and data-related reports.

Policy Publications Clearinghouse. The Policy unit maintains a database of policy publications in a continuing effort to serve as a clearinghouse for the WICHE states. The documents include studies, reports, surveys and policy briefs published by various research and public policy organizations.

Western Policy Exchanges. Reports on the meetings and discussions among the West's key leaders in higher education policy issues.

New Directions

Technical assistance with state financial aid program design and funding (single-state support, as requested). The Policy Analysis and Research unit has become recognized as an expert on the “shared responsibility” model for distributing need-based financial aid, as well as other state grant aid funding approaches. We occasionally receive requests to assist states with rethinking their program design. Such projects are typically done on a contract basis, depending on how well they fit in with existing workload.

Support for Washington’s Opportunity Scholarship Program. In 2010 Washington enacted a new financial aid program that uniquely intermingles public and private funds and oversight in order to incentivize students from low- and middle-income families to pursue baccalaureate degrees in a STEM field. Working with NCHEMS, WICHE expects to provide an assessment framework for the state and its partners (principally Microsoft and Boeing) to evaluate the success of the program, as well as to consult on how to most effectively implement the design under the constraints of the statute.

On the Horizon

Teacher preparation and professional development related to the Common Core State Standards. WICHE is proposing a project that will work with Western states to prepare preservice and veteran teachers to teach to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English/language arts and mathematics. This project will assist interested states in the WICHE region to prepare teachers at varying stages in their careers to teach to the CCSS in an effort to be prepared all students for college and careers.

Serving Student Soldiers of the West: Policy and Practice Solutions. With many veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq, states and postsecondary institutions are faced with how to best serve them at a time of increased demand for higher education and tight fiscal budgets. WICHE is proposing a project that will work to increase access to and success in higher education for military students and their families in the Western region. Specifically, the project aims to increase awareness of state and institutional policymakers about the demographics, needs, and challenges of the military population in higher education; identify state and institutional policies that create barriers to or enhance access and success for military students and their families; and assist states and institutions in developing clear, seamless degree pathways for military personnel, veterans, and their families.

Research and analysis of outcome-based funding approaches. Increasingly, states are recognizing that enrollment-based funding formulas do not create particularly powerful incentives for institutions to prioritize degree/certificate completion. Several states are making adjustments (or are considering doing so) in their financing strategies to reward institutions for retaining and graduating students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds. The Policy Analysis and Research unit is interested in researching how such policies have impacted educational attainment, as data allow.

Exploring strategies for improving the delivery of remedial and developmental education. Remedial education is currently very expensive for states and institutions, and the results are unsatisfactory. WICHE intends to develop a project that would build on current emerging practices in the field to help states more effectively and efficiently target remedial education to students, particularly adult learners.

Building capacity to support state college completion plans. Continuing a partnership with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) at the University of Southern California, WICHE is planning a new project to help states and postsecondary institutions focus attention on how to shrink educational attainment gaps. This proposed project will build off a prior effort supported by the Ford Foundation, under which the two organizations worked collaboratively with the state of Nevada and its higher education data to identify where along educational pathways students from underrepresented populations were more likely to leak out and to use that information to spark conversations about policies and practices that held the promise of closing such gaps. The new project will extend that work to additional WICHE states.

Identifying the most effective college persistence and success projects and working to bring them to scale. As the United States responds to the current economic crisis and the increased demand for a more educated workforce, many are looking to postsecondary education and training for solutions. For the last several years, multiple

college access and success initiatives have been implemented at both state and institutional levels. The evidence from these initiatives strongly suggests that proactive interventions can substantially improve student success. Despite this, American higher education has been slow to adopt proven strategies. And as a result, educational attainment, as measured by degree completion, remains constrained. WICHE is seeking funding to launch a program that identifies the most effective – and cost-effective – college persistence and success projects and brings them to scale.

Developing more effective web portals. WICHE and WCET have examined state web portals designed to help students navigate the transfer process. Future work will build on this effort.

Policy and Mental Health Program collaboration on recidivism reduction in the prison population. State corrections policy has endured significant changes in the past 25 years. While historically based in a belief that those who are incarcerated should be rehabilitated if possible, the 1980s brought a significant shift in philosophy to one that focused more on punishment than on rehabilitation. State policymakers heeded the call to be “tough on crime” and passed much more punitive legislation, including mandatory sentencing and “three strikes, you’re out” laws, which over time have resulted in increased pressure on state budgets. In 2001, however, there was yet another shift in public opinion. The 9/11 attacks propelled terrorism onto the forefront of the public’s mind. Public Agenda reports that in 2006, 80 percent of Americans felt that defending the U.S. against terrorism should be a top priority for Congress, while 62 percent felt that reducing crime should be. With corrections making up a larger share of state budgets and the public no longer focused as much on crime, the time might be right for state policymakers to revisit their stance on the issue. WICHE is exploring a project related to reducing recidivism through higher education in an effort to develop more effective and sustainable policy resulting in reduced pressure on state budgets, less crime, and in some cases, maybe even economic development strategies.

Workforce credentialing systems. ACT has been pushing a National Workforce Readiness Certificate based on its WorkKeys assessments (and there exist similar initiatives). The Policy Analysis and Research unit has been trying to stay abreast of such developments and would be interested both in helping states forge stronger ties between postsecondary education and the business community through the development of a common language surrounding competency that this activity helps promote, as well as in conducting research on the efficacy of such efforts.

Forging collaborations between Western higher education agencies and institutions and state department of labor and workforce development. The Policy Analysis and Research unit has in the past worked with states to highlight higher education’s workforce development mission. It has also sought to help states strengthen the connection between the activities of their higher education institutions and their workforce development training programs. We hope to build upon that body of work by promoting a more explicit focus on how state workforce needs can be met specifically through better service to racial/ethnic minorities and other underrepresented populations. It is apparent that in many states, failure to adequately prepare these fast-growing populations in high-demand fields (not just get them a degree) could severely impair their economic prosperity in the long run. At the same time, the fast-growing, traditionally underrepresented populations present an opportunity to meet workforce demands, if only states could find scalable models of particular effectiveness. Additionally, there are too few resources available to states to help them understand not only how to dismantle silos to their respective workforce development and higher education but also how state-level and federal policies related to the two areas can be made to be complementary. The Policy Analysis and Research unit is interested in pursuing the capacity to build upon its expertise in these areas as part of the project targeting underrepresented populations.

Expanding the Rocky Mountain Collaborative to Transform the Health Professions Workforce initiative. Building off a successful meeting in April 2009 of representatives from six WICHE states, this effort is aimed at helping states expand the pipeline of underrepresented populations into health professions fields. Pending our ability to secure additional funding, WICHE would be interested in replicating the meeting, including lessons learned, in other member states.

Assessing the landscape for state policy on student-learning outcomes. International benchmarking is an increasingly valuable source of information in a globally competitive marketplace, as shown by the visibility and perceived relevance of the educational attainment figures released by Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Likewise, the public is demanding to know what they are getting out of higher education, increasingly in terms of learning outcomes. And with heightened attention to increasing graduation rates and numbers, concern has risen about whether such pressures could lead to reductions in the quality of education offered and received. While the current efforts to enhance state-level student record databases will provide much better information on the quantity of higher education’s output, these efforts will do little to address issues of quality. Yet it will be just as

important for states, institutions, and students themselves to know whether students are learning what they need to know and to be able to do. The next wave of policy will almost certainly focus on issues of measuring and improving student learning.



Self-funded Units Committee Meeting

Monday, October 31, 2011

10:15 - 11:45 am

President's Conference Room

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Monday, October 31, 2011

10:15 - 11:45 am
President's Conference Room

Self-funded Units Committee Meeting

Position vacant, chair
Jim Hansen (SD), vice chair
Joe Garcia (CO), ex officio
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT), ex officio

Jim Johnsen (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Michael Kirst (CA)
Position vacant (CO)
Roberta Richards (HI)
Mike Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
Joseph Hardy (NV)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Dave Nething (ND)
Camille Preus (OR)
Committee vice chair (SD)
Peter Knudson (UT)
Don Bennett (WA)
Tom Buchanan (WY)

Agenda

Presiding: Jim Hansen (SD), vice chair

Staff:

Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET
Mollie McGill, deputy director, WCET
Louis Fox, senior associate, Technology & Innovation
Dennis Mohatt, vice president for behavioral health and director,
Mental Health Program



Approval of the Self-funded Units Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2011 6-3



Developing the Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework 6-5

Information Items – WCET

Staff:

Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET
Mollie McGill, deputy director, WCET

Update on major WCET activities:

- WCET focus areas for FY 2012
- Predictive Analytics Reporting proof of concept project
- Federal activities: state authorization of distance education
- Proposed project to implement a state authorization reciprocity program [Tab 4, p. 24]
- Research: Managing Online Education survey, University Professional and Continuing Education Association survey
- Learner progress data for adult learners
- Salesforce implementation

Budget update

Information Items – Technology & Innovation

Staff: Louis Fox, senior associate

Update on Technology & Innovation activities:

- National Research and Education Network initiatives
- Global Environment for Network Innovations (GENI)
- United States Unified Community Anchor Network (U.S. UCAN)
- GigU
- USA Ignite

Mental Health Program and Technology & Innovation projects

- Alaska Psychiatric Institute: e-psych
- South Dakota: Sinte Gleska University system of care project
- Health and Human Services: national rural health information technology training programs

Information Items – Mental Health Program

Staff: Dennis Mohatt

Program update:

- New project update: SAMHSA/HRSA (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration/Health Services Administration) Center for Integrated Health Solutions

Other business

Adjournment

ACTION ITEM

Self-Funded Units Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 17, 2011

Committee Members Present

Kaye Howe (CO), committee chair
Jim Hansen (SD), committee cochair
Jim Johnsen (AK)
Michael Kirst (CA)
Roberta Richards (HI)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
Dave Nething (ND)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Camille Preus (OR)
Don Bennett (WA)

Committee Members Absent

Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Mike Rush (ID)
Joseph Hardy (NV)
Peter Knudson (UT)
Tom Buchanan (WY)

Staff Present

Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET
Mollie McGill, deputy director, WCET
Russ Poulin, deputy director, WCET
Louis Fox, senior associate, Technology & Innovation
Dennis Mohatt, vice president for behavioral health
and director, Mental Health Program

Commissioner Howe called the meeting to order.

A motion TO APPROVE THE SELF-FUNDED UNITS COMMITTEE MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 8, 2010, was made by Commissioner Hansen and seconded by Commissioner Stearns. The motion was approved unanimously.

A motion TO APPROVE THE SELF-FUNDED UNITS WORKPLAN was made by Commissioner Nething and seconded by Commissioner Hansen. The motion was approved unanimously.

David Longanecker and Russ Poulin provided an overview of recent federal regulations pertaining to the states' authorization of out-of-state educational providers. The Western Academic Leadership Forum held its annual meeting in April and prepared a letter to the commission endorsing some WICHE-led action to promote interstate reciprocity on this matter. Longanecker and Poulin noted there are several national organizations, including WCET, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), Presidents' Forum, and State Higher Education Executive Officers that are actively engaged with the U.S. Department of Education and working to establish some short-term and longer-term remedies to ease the burden on both institutions and regulators. For example, WICHE authorizes institutions that are already participating in some existing interstate agreement, such as WICHE ICE (Internet Course Exchange). Following some discussion, Chair Howe thanked Longanecker and Poulin for the update, adding that WICHE seems to be moving in a good direction.

Wagner introduced her report, noting this has been a banner year for WCET. The next year is on course to be even better. She highlighted the projection that WCET will be on solid financial footing in FY12. Her report focused on several major initiatives that are bringing renewed national attention to the organization and thus attracting new institutional members. The expansion of WCET's revenues from membership dues is critical to the organization's ability to provide a full suite of services to members. External grant funds augment revenue through indirect cost recovery and a slight reassignment of staff, but a goal is to retain WCET's core staff to focus on core member services. That said, WCET is thrilled to announce a new six-month grant, funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

The Predictive Analytics Reporting (PAR) Framework project is a six-month, \$1 million grant to demonstrate the effective use of predictive analytic methods for improving student outcomes. The goal is to identify variables that influence student retention and progression and guide decision making that improves postsecondary student completion. Much of the grant's funds will support a new project team, as well as providing support to the six institutions participating in this pilot phase. The project end date is December 31, 2011, by which time WCET anticipates a positive commitment from the Gates Foundation for a full, three-year project to expand the initiative to 16 additional institutions. Wagner added that the initial project is a proof-of-concept effort, and most exciting will be the collaboration among institutions across sectors.

The State Authorization Network (SAN) is a fee-based network of higher education statewide or systemwide consortia (with some individual institutions), offering an information exchange about how institutions are navigating the new state authorization regulation. SAN participation requires membership in WCET, which has resulted in the addition of 10 new members.

WCET will partner with Casey Green of the Campus Computing Project to administer the third annual Managing Online Education (MOE) survey. The MOE survey focuses on management, infrastructure, and trends within campuses relative to hybrid, online, and distance education. Commissioner Kirst commented that the data generalize results across all institutional types (from research universities to local community colleges) and suggested it would be useful to be able to examine the survey data by institutional type.

Wagner referred commissioners to the *Trusteeship* magazine article as another example of how WCET's work is gaining further national attention.

WCET has secured 24 new members since January 1, and the current membership campaign is expected to bring in new members from public, private/nonprofit, and private/for-profit institutions, as well as new sponsorship opportunities with companies serving the e-learning market. Other WCET services include the member-driven common interest groups, the October 2011 member meeting, webcasts, and robust member-to-member listserv exchanges.

Mental Health Program

Mohatt provided a brief update on the Mental Health Program. FY11 has been very productive, and the unit has engaged in projects across the WICHE West, including initiatives in Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, and Wyoming. Projects have also included work with a national impact, as well as projects in several non-WICHE states, including Texas, Kansas, and Missouri.

The Mental Health Program exceeded revenue projections for FY11. It anticipates ending the year with revenue in excess of \$2.7 million and should generate a year-end positive fund balance of over \$200,000. All previous deficits have been retired, and targeted reserves have been established. FY12 is expected to track about the same for the program.

Mohatt reported that two professional staff had transitioned out of the program in the past few months. During the second-quarter of FY11, the unit hired two part-time support staff: Sabrina Tang as an administrative assistant and Joanne Brothers as a budget coordinator.

The Mental Health Program has two new major projects. First, a new technical assistance project with Doña Ana County (Las Cruces, NM) supports the development of a communitywide crisis intervention system. The tasks include the coordination of community members in mental health first aid and health/mental health providers in trauma informed care. This is a \$300,000 project spanning both FY11 and FY12.

Second, the Mental Health Program will be the colead for workforce/professional development for the new federal initiative to establish a national Center for Integrated Health Solutions. This center focuses upon the integration of primary and behavioral healthcare systems of care. While there are many tasks associated with this new, five-year initiative, of special interest for WICHE is the program's development of a learning community for interested participants in the West and coordination of a national dialogue with academic leaders in behavioral health and general medicine training programs around curriculum changes needed to support integrated care practice.

Technology and Innovation

Fox gave a brief overview of the e-psych effort that he and Mohatt are collaborating on with the Alaska Psychiatric Institute. WICHE's e-psych efforts have the potential to support rural psychiatric care throughout underserved rural communities in the West.

Fox also reported that he has retired from his leadership role with the K-20 Initiative of Internet2, which he directed for a number of years. Over this past year, he has continued to represent WICHE on several broadband network projects that will impact the West and assisted the U.S. Department of Commerce with several technical assistance workshops for minority-serving institutions and consortia to inform them of broadband development funding opportunities.

ACTION ITEM

Developing the Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework

Developing the Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework (DPAR) is the second part of a three-part plan to create a single, federated, aggregated data resource, consisting of de-identified and anonymized student records from multiple U.S. postsecondary institutions. DPAR builds upon the success of the Predictive Analytics Framework proof of concept project (PAR Framework POC), funded by a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (announced during the May 2011 WICHE Commission meeting). During the six-month proof of concept project, WCET and six member institutions demonstrated that it is possible to create a shared data model for evaluating points of student loss and momentum in online-learning programs across a variety of postsecondary institutional types. DPAR is proposed to extend that work, focusing on achieving the following outcomes:

1. Refine the data model developed during the PAR Framework POC to add variables within and across institutions.
2. Develop solutions for increasing the number of valid, reliable reports that can be produced during an academic year.
3. Recruit 12 new partners to the PAR Framework project, bring the total number of participating institutions to 18.
4. Integrate the new data sets, new variables, and all 18 institutional partners into the PAR Framework.
5. Continue to build the knowledge base of what it takes to prepare an institution for contributing their student records to the federated data aggregation effort.
6. Continue to look for information that identifies points of student loss, points of student momentum, and opportunities to develop remediation strategies that reduce impact due to threats of loss and maximize opportunities for increasing momentum.

This project is intended to take place over a 20-month period of time. We anticipate that the budget for this project will be approximately \$5.6 million.

Background

From June to December 2011, WCET and its six partner institutions (American Public University System, Colorado Community College System, Rio Salado College, University of Hawai'i System, University of Illinois-Springfield, University of Phoenix) successfully federated hundreds of thousands of de-identified and anonymized student records that feature millions of course records to create a single unified data set. To do this PAR partners obtained institutional permissions in the form of a single signed memorandum of understanding (MOU). Partners also obtained institutional research board (IRB) approvals from each institution. A battery of descriptive, inferential, and predictive statistical analyses are now being applied to the single data source, utilizing techniques that are looking to identify points of student loss (variables affecting when students drop out of school) and points of student momentum (when students are likely to be motivated to achieve.) We expect to be able to report upon the results at this commission meeting. In anticipation of the results, we are preparing for the next round of development, in which we will increase the number of schools whose data are included within the unified cored data set; refine the data model being used to drive analyses; and establish strategies to assist institutions reduce loss and maximize momentum.

Relationship to WICHE Mission

This project directly responds to WICHE's accountability mission. It also responds directly to WCET's mission of accelerating the adoption of learning technology innovations.

Project Description

During this proposed 20-month project, WCET will continue to provide project direction, project management, messaging and promotion, and fiduciary oversight. Twelve new institutional partners – WCET members – will join the PAR Framework project, bringing the total number of U.S. institutions agreeing to share their de-identified and anonymized student records to 18.

Core project staff and founding partners will guide new institutions on the processes of MOU and IRB clearances and will orient new partners to the data code book to facilitate the preparation of institutional records for contribution to the common core data set.

The six founding PAR Framework partners will continue to refine the data model jointly created during the PAR POC, adding new variables and refining interpretations of others. Revisions to variables and code book will be introduced to new partners as they are developed, so that the data sets of the 12 new institutions and the founding six institutions are integrated. Descriptive, inferential, and predictive statistical analysis will be applied to the expanded data set, looking for points of student loss and momentum.

One of the key outcomes for this project will be finding a solution or set of solutions for increasing the number of data pulls that can be meaningfully produced in an academic year, across all institutions that are contributing records to the core data set.

Staff and Fiscal Impact

The budget for this project is still being developed. We anticipate that we will request approximately \$5.6 million from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to fund a 20-month project involving WCET as the managing partner, supporting 18 WCET member institutions in the “big data” work. As was the case with the PAR Framework POC project, WICHE will receive an indirect payment of 15 percent of the grant for administrative service, fiduciary oversight, and staff support. WCET will receive funding to pay for contract staff associated with project direction, management, and evaluation, as well as principal investigators. A small percentage of salary contributions to all WCET staff will reflect the need that core staff will have to integrate PAR Framework aspects within the WCET organization and menu of member services.

Action Requested

Approval of request to seek funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for the Developing the Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework project

WICHE



Lunch and Presentation

Monday, October 31, 2011

11:45 am - 1:00 pm

Aloha Center Ballroom

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

7 Monday 11:45 am-1:00 pm

Monday, October 31, 2011

11:45 am - 1.00 pm

Aloha Center Ballroom

**Lunch and Presentation:
Higher Education In Hawai'i: Unique Challenges, Unique Opportunities**

Hawai'i! What a unique state: the only island state, 2,500 miles and two time zones from California, and the capital of Polynesia and Polynesian culture. Each of these circumstances presents Hawai'i with unique challenges and opportunities

After lunch M.R.C. Greenwood, president of the University of Hawai'i – and possibly Governor Neil Abercrombie, as well – will join the commission to discuss higher education in Hawai'i. M.R.C. Greenwood has been president of the University of Hawai'i since 2009, having come from the University of California System. The University of Hawai'i System includes the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (the state's major research institution), two baccalaureate campuses (Hilo and West O'ahu), and seven community college campuses (four on O'ahu, one each on Hawai'i, Kaua'i, and Maui). Governor Abercrombie was elected in 2010 after serving the State of Hawai'i in Congress for 21 years. Prior to this he served as a professor of American studies and sociology at the University of Hawai'i.

With leaders possessing this level of knowledge about higher education and its service to the public good, Hawai'i is uniquely positioned to address the myriad issues and challenges facing the state and higher education in these difficult financial times. You will hear about some of the unique challenges facing Hawai'i and the innovative approaches underway at the University of Hawai'i to address these issues.

Speaker: M.R.C. Greenwood, president, University of Hawai'i

Biographical Information on the Speaker

M.R.C. Greenwood became the first woman to serve as the University of Hawai'i's president in 2009. Previously, Greenwood served as provost and senior vice president of academic affairs with the University of California System. She has served as an associate director and consultant for the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Greenwood is also an expert on obesity and diabetes and served as the director of the Foods for Health Initiative, chair of the Graduate Group in Nutritional Biology, and distinguished professor of nutrition and internal medicine at the University of California Davis. She received her Ph.D. from The Rockefeller University.



WICHE



Plenary Session II: The Use of Technology in the New Normal of Higher Education

Monday, October 31, 2011

1:30 - 3:00 pm

Aloha Center Ballroom

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Monday, October 31, 2011

1:30 - 2:00 pm

Aloha Center Ballroom

**Plenary Session II:
The Use of Technology in the New Normal of Higher
Education**

Much of WICHE's past discussions about the use of technology in higher education have focused on instructional delivery. This has been both appropriate and important to the organization because of the work of the WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies (WCET), which has focused primarily on the ways in which states and institutions can better manage, develop, finance, and assure quality in the delivery of technology-based or -enhanced instruction.

Technology-based or -enhanced instruction can only be delivered well, however, if our institutions, states, and nation have the technological capacity to "carry" the delivery of services. David Lassner's presentation will focus our attention on how well American higher education is positioned to use technology in the new normal we face. Do we have the infrastructure within our institutions – both administrative and hardware – to most effectively use technology to increase our productivity? Do we have the Internet highway throughout our states and nation to most effectively take our instruction and research activities beyond the boundaries of our campuses?

Hawai'i is perhaps the most logical state in which to have this discussion because of the unique geographic challenges in linking a state composed of multiple islands and also because of the leadership Hawai'i has demonstrated in providing broad access to high-speed Internet connectivity. Lassner is without doubt the right person to present this set of issues, not only because of his work in Hawai'i, including competing successfully for one of the largest American Recovery and Reinvestment Act state grants to enhance Hawai'i's capacity, but also because of his national leadership.

Speaker: David Lassner, vice president for information technology and chief information officer, University of Hawai'i.

2:00 - 3:00 pm

**Facilitated Discussion on the Use of Technology in the
New Normal of Higher Education**

Facilitator: Louis Fox, senior associate, WICHE Technology and Innovation

Biographical Information on the Speaker and Facilitator

Louis Fox divides his time among three organizations. At WICHE he is a senior associate, overseeing the Technology & Innovation initiative. At Duke University he's senior advisor for global information technology.

And at the Pacific Northwest Gigapop, he's director of strategic relations. Formerly, Fox was a faculty member and administrator at the University of Washington for 22 years.

David Lassner is the founding vice president for IT and chief information officer for the University of Hawai'i, the state's higher education system, composed of 10 campuses and seven education centers serving over 60,000 students on six islands. He is also a member of the university's Graduate Faculty and has taught online and in person in computer science, communications, business, and education.

Lassner has played an active leadership role in a variety of local, national, and international ICT organizations. He chaired Hawai'i's Broadband Task Force and served on the boards of its High Technology Development Corporation and the Hawai'i Public Broadcasting Authority, a PBS affiliate. He has served on the boards of Internet2; was a founding board member of the Kualu Foundation; and has served on and chaired the board of the Pacific Telecommunications Council. He currently serves on the board of the Pacific Northwest GigaPop; on the administrative committee for the new Gig.U initiative; and on the project board for the Kualu Financial System. He is the current chair of the board of Educause, the major professional association for IT in higher education.

Lassner led successful statewide U.S. Department of Commerce proposals that are interconnecting every public school, library, community college, and university in Hawai'i with fiber optics; almost 700 new public computers will be deployed in libraries and community colleges on six islands. He has also received three recent awards from the National Science Foundation, focused on intrastate, national, and international research and education networking. Lassner is principal investigator for the Maui High Performance Computing Center and co-PI for the Pacific Disaster Center, major Department of Defense programs.

Lassner earned his A.B. summa cum laude in economics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where he also earned an M.S. in computer science as a university fellow. He spent a year as a research fellow at the East-West Center in Honolulu and earned his Ph.D. in communication and information sciences from the University of Hawai'i. He has been recognized by Internet2 with the Richard Rose Award and as a Distinguished Alumnus of the University of Hawai'i.

No stranger to WICHE, Lassner was a founding member of the original WCET Steering Committee and was twice elected chair during his 15 years of service. He was recognized by WCET in 2000 with the Richard Jonsen Award.

WICHE



Polynesian Cultural Center

Monday, October 31, 2011

5:00 - 9:00 pm

Polynesian Cultural Center

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

9 Monday 5:00-9:00 pm

Monday, October 31, 2011

5:00 - 9.00 pm

Polynesian Cultural Center – please meet in the Turtle Bay lobby at 4:30 pm for transportation to the Polynesian Cultural Center

Luau and Evening Show at the Polynesian Cultural Center

The Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC) and Brigham Young University – Hawaii (BYU-H) were founded by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Each year over 700 BYU-H students support their education by working at the PCC, considered to be one of the most unique work-study programs in higher education. Approximately 500 of these students participate in the International Work Opportunity Returnability Kuleana program for students who would otherwise not have an opportunity to pursue a postsecondary education. Since opening in 1963, the PCC has provided almost \$178 million in total financial assistance to BYU-H and its students and has attracted 35 million visitors to the small North Shore community of Laie.



WICHE



Committee of the Whole Business Session

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

8:45 - 9:45 am

Aloha Center Ballroom

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

8:45 - 9:45 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

Committee of the Whole – Business Session

Agenda

Reconvene Committee of the Whole: Joe Garcia, chair

Report and recommended action of the Audit Committee:
Tom Buchanan, committee chair and immediate past
WICHE chair



FY 2011 audit report (separate document)

Report and recommended action of the Executive Committee:
Joe Garcia, WICHE chair

Report and recommended action of the Programs and Services
Committee: Carl Shaff, committee chair



Approval of the implementation plan:
new ways to apply Professional Student
Exchange Program support fees [Tab 4]



Approval of standardizing PSEP support fees
in physician assistant and physical therapy
fields [Tab 4]



Approval of the proposed project to revamp
Western Undergraduate Exchange marketing
and outreach strategies [Tab 4]



Approval of the proposed project to implement
a state authorization reciprocity program [Tab 4]

Report and recommended action of the Issue Analysis and
Research Committee: Robert Burns, committee chair



Approval of a project on teacher preparation
and professional development related to
the Common Core State Standards [Tab 5]



Approval of a project on building capacity
to support state college completion goals [Tab 5]

Report and recommended action of the Self-funded Units
Committee: Jim Hansen, committee vice chair



Approval for developing the Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework [Tab 6]

Committee of the Whole Action and Discussion Items



Approval of endorsement of the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability’s guidelines, detailed in “Assuring Quality, Accounting for Learning: Guidelines for Gathering and Reporting Evidence of Student Learning and Using It To Improve Outcomes,” and approval of the proposed WICHE endorsement process

10-3

Update on WICHE’s budget 10-12

Update on WICHE dues 10-15

Report on the Legislative Advisory Committee annual meeting – Senator Dave Nething, LAC member



Election of chair, vice chair, and immediate past chair as officers of the WICHE Commission

Remarks of outgoing chair

Remarks of new chair

Selection of 2012 committee members

Meeting evaluation (electronic)
(<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FQ7JQPM>)

Other business

Adjourn Committee of the Whole business session

ACTION ITEM

Endorsement of the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability's Guidelines, Detailed in "Assuring Quality, Accounting for Learning: Guidelines for Gathering and Reporting Evidence of Student Learning and Using It To Improve Outcomes" and Approval of Proposed WICHE Endorsement Process

The New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability, composed of significant national leadership organizations in higher education, seeks WICHE's endorsement of the organization's statement "Assuring Quality, Accounting for Learning: Guidelines for Gathering and Reporting Evidence of Student Learning and Using It To Improve Outcomes." Staff has reviewed the statement and believes that this endorsement request should be approved. This new alliance intends to use the statement to guide its actions and those of its member institutions, in order to improve the quality and utility of student-learning outcomes measures.

This item is being brought to the full commission for its review and approval at the request of the three WICHE officers. At the current time, WICHE has no official procedure for review and approval of requests for endorsement. In the past President David Longanecker, as chief executive officer, has generally made a decision as to whether the organization should or should not endorse a request; examples included endorsement of the work of the Data Quality Campaign (DQC) and endorsement of Excellencia's Latino College Completion Project. The officers' request that this endorsement be approved by the full commission suggests the need for more clarity on how future requests for endorsements should be handled.

Given that these endorsements will carry the imprimatur of WICHE, the president concurs that they should be approved by the commission. The dilemma is that on occasion organizations seeking endorsement may not be able to wait until the next biannual commission meeting. The president's recommendation, therefore, would be that we handle this in the same way other commission actions are handled: all actions will be handled by the Committee of the Whole at the biannual meetings unless more timely action is required, in which case the action can be taken on behalf of the Committee of the Whole by the Executive Committee.

Action Requested

Approval of endorsement of the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability's guidelines, detailed in "Assuring Quality, Accounting for Learning: Guidelines for Gathering and Reporting Evidence of Student Learning and Using It To Improve Outcomes," and approval of the proposed WICHE endorsement process.

Assuring Quality, Accounting for Learning: Guidelines for Gathering and Reporting Evidence of Student Learning and Using It To Improve Outcomes

The U.S. government recently made a commitment to lead the world in postsecondary degree achievement. This is a necessary and laudable goal that is critical to economic competitiveness, equal opportunity, and a healthy democracy.¹

Success in the 21st-century knowledge economy will require greater levels of formal education. Employer surveys indicate increased emphasis on hiring individuals with postsecondary degrees and a higher level of skills and knowledge. College graduates entering the workforce will increasingly be asked to apply a broader range of skills, think critically, solve problems, utilize existing knowledge, and learn on the job.²

By at least one estimate, the United States by 2018 will have several million fewer degree recipients than the economy needs. Closing this gap requires that more college students gain the knowledge and skills to become productive workers. It also requires that colleges and universities enroll and graduate students from previously underrepresented populations, including minority group, first-generation, and non-traditional-age students.³ Higher education's commitment to access must include a commitment to helping students succeed in achieving degrees.

The value of a college education is not primarily economic. The experience, skills, and knowledge students develop through higher education contributes to their personal development and promotes their engagement in a democratic society. Breadth of knowledge, appreciation of diverse backgrounds and points of view, and analytical and problem-solving abilities all contribute to a student's capacity for individual growth and responsible citizenship. Personal and family health and rates of civic and political participation are strongly correlated with levels of education.⁴

The achievement of these educational, economic, and political goals requires sustained attention to the quality of student learning. Awarding more degrees will only be meaningful if those degrees reflect a high level of student accomplishment. Persistence and learning are linked. Paying close attention to student engagement in learning and learning outcomes will likely help students remain enrolled and graduate.⁵

The primary responsibility for assessing and improving student learning falls on colleges and universities. Those granting educational credentials must assure that students have developed the requisite knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that prepare them for work, life, and responsible citizenship. U.S. higher education must focus on both quantity and quality—increasing graduation rates and the learning represented in the degree.

The New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability promotes and supports higher education's efforts to gather, report on, and use evidence of student learning to improve outcomes in U.S. undergraduate education. The Alliance envisions a self-directed professional higher education community that produces an increasing number of college graduates with high-quality degrees. This, in turn, will support and increase public confidence in the quality of undergraduate education provided by U.S. colleges and universities.⁶

To aid in this effort, the Alliance has developed specific guidelines that set forth basic professional responsibilities for higher education in assessing and improving collegiate learning. These guidelines are a distillation of the good work that has already been done in higher education in defining goals, understanding students' experiences and success, and assessing outcomes. The higher education organizations and institutions that endorse these principles encourage those working in higher education to : set ambitious goals for learning, gather evidence about how well goals are being achieved, use this evidence for improvement, and report results both within institutions and to the public. The Alliance invites other organizations, institutions, and individuals to join in this effort.

Guidelines for Assuring Quality and Accounting for Learning

Set Ambitious Goals

There is already substantial overlap in the many statements about what the intended outcomes of undergraduate education ought to be.⁷ This general consensus includes: the development of appropriate levels of knowledge and skills; the ability to integrate and apply knowledge to a variety of problems; and the acquisition of intellectual and social habits and dispositions in preparation for productive, responsible citizenship. Learning goals may vary according to an institution's mission, resources, student population, and community setting, but they typically include: acquiring both broad learning and specialized knowledge; developing intellectual and practical skills; developing a sense of personal and social responsibility; and integrating and applying learning.

Each college and university is encouraged to articulate its specific goals for student learning and prominently announce these goals to various stakeholders and the public. Similarly, the major academic divisions and cocurricular departments within an institution are encouraged to state their goals and their connection to the broader institutional aims and to the constituencies they seek to serve. Faculty members, staff, and administrators should understand the relationship of their work to these learning goals. Students should also understand and be able to articulate the relationship of their coursework and cocurricular experiences to the learning goals.

Colleges and universities and their major programs can use the following guidelines to determine the degree to which they are setting ambitious goals:

- The institution's statements of learning outcomes clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon the completion of each undergraduate degree.
- The outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and are stated in a way that allows levels of achievement to be assessed against an externally informed or benchmarked level of achievement or assessed and compared with those of similar institutions.
- Institutional practices, such as program review, are in place to ensure that curricular and cocurricular goals are aligned with intended learning outcomes.
- The institution and its major academic and cocurricular units can identify places in the curriculum or cocurriculum where students encounter or are expected or required to achieve the stated outcomes.
- Learning outcome statements are presented in prominent locations and in ways that are easily understood by interested audiences.

Gather Evidence of Student Learning

Systematic processes for gathering evidence allow colleges and universities to discover how well students are progressing toward the institution's overall and programmatic learning outcomes. Evidence-gathering efforts that are ongoing, sustainable, and integrated into the work of faculty and staff can suggest where the institution is succeeding and where improvement is needed.

Gathering evidence concerning the degree to which students are actively engaged in academically challenging work can also suggest ways in which student learning can be enhanced. There are significant differences within colleges and universities in the degree of academic engagement among students. Similarly, disaggregation and comparison of results by gender, race/ethnicity, and other variables permits an institution to monitor educational equity.⁸ Evidence of how well students are achieving learning outcomes (i.e., "What is 'good enough?'") against

externally informed or benchmarked assessments or against similar colleges and universities, where appropriate and possible, provides useful comparisons. At the same time, it is critical to keep in mind that the objective of comparison is not ranking but improvement.

Colleges and universities and their major programs can use the following guidelines to determine how effectively they are gathering evidence of student learning:

- Policies and procedures are in place that describe when, how, and how frequently learning outcomes will be assessed.
- Assessment processes are ongoing, sustainable, and integrated into the work of faculty, administrators, and staff.
- Evidence includes results that can be assessed against an externally informed or benchmarked level of achievement or compared with those of other institutions and programs.
- Evidence also includes assessments of levels of engagement in academically challenging work and active learning practices.
- Results can be used to examine differences in performance among significant subgroups of students, such as minority group, first-generation, and non-traditional-age students.

Use Evidence to Improve Student Learning

The purpose of gathering evidence of student learning is to use it to assure quality in student learning and to improve it.⁹ Using evidence effectively requires a plan that makes the analysis and use of evidence a prominent and consequential factor in the institution's strategic planning and program review processes. Discussions about evidence can lead to recommendations for institutional improvement and taking action when appropriate and feasible. The cycle of making evidence-based changes in programs and practices promotes continuous review, evaluation, and reporting of institutional action and improvement.

Colleges and universities and their major programs can use the following guidelines to determine how effectively they are using evidence to improve student learning:

- Well-articulated policies and procedures are in place for using evidence to improve student learning at appropriate levels of the institution.
- Evidence is used to make recommendations for improvement of academic programs and cocurricular programs.
- There is an established process for discussing and analyzing these recommendations and moving from recommendation to action. Where feasible and appropriate, key recommendations for improvement are implemented.
- The impact of evidence-based changes in programs and practices is reviewed and evaluated regularly.

Report Evidence and Results

Reporting evidence and results of student learning to both internal and external constituents strengthens the institution's commitment to improving programs and services that contribute to a high level of student accomplishment. Assessments of student learning can be shared with internal constituents (e.g., faculty members, staff, administrators, students) in a variety of ways, including through regularly scheduled and well-publicized meetings, which can lead to changes in program and pedagogy. The institution's governing board should receive regular reports about the assessment of student learning and efforts to use evidence to improve programs. In addition, an institution can ensure transparency and accountability to the public by developing on its website a highly visible and easily accessible location that highlights evidence of student learning, its use, and other institutional indicators (e.g., retention rates, time to degree).

In recent years, significant steps have been taken toward greater transparency in reporting results for students.^x Associations representing both public and private institutions have developed reporting templates that provide important information about institutional demographics, persistence, and completion, as well as information about student experience and learning outcomes.¹⁰ Such templates aid understanding by using uniform definitions and reporting conventions. Colleges and universities should evaluate such templates and use them to support internal discussion and communication to the public.

Colleges and universities and their major programs can use the following guidelines to determine how effectively they are reporting evidence and results:

- Regular procedures are in place for sharing evidence of student learning with on- and off-campus groups.
- On-campus reporting includes regularly scheduled meetings, publications, and other mechanisms that are accessible to all relevant campus constituencies (e.g., faculty, staff, administrators, students, the governing body).
- Reporting to external constituencies via the institutional website includes evidence of learning as well as additional descriptive information and indicators of institutional performance (e.g. retention rates, time to degree).
- Reporting on student learning outcomes is both accessible to and appropriate for the relevant audience, whether on or off campus.
- The results of evidence-based changes in programs and practices are reported to appropriate internal and external constituencies.

A Public Trust, The Public Good

We in higher education continue to learn about effective educational practices. There are many examples of institutions that have made positive changes in programs and pedagogy. Now, we must demonstrate to ourselves and to the larger public that we are systematically gathering and reporting on evidence of student learning and using it to improve educational outcomes. Evidence-based understanding and improvement of practices will indicate how effectively colleges and universities are achieving ambitious goals for students.

For many generations, U.S. colleges and universities have been respected at home and admired and imitated abroad for their combination of wide diversity, broad access, and high quality. Our institutions of higher educa-

tion have provided students with opportunities to grow intellectually and socially, and in doing so have helped our society advance and prosper. The substantial direct and indirect state, federal, and philanthropic financial support for higher education indicates how crucial this system is to our economic, cultural, and political future.

Higher education has been entrusted with an important social responsibility. This responsibility calls for a commitment to see that all students reach high standards and fulfill their potential. Doing so requires us to gather and report on evidence of student learning and use it to improve student learning outcomes. If colleges and universities focus on evidence-based improvement of student learning outcomes, they will be true to their societal responsibilities and serve the common good. Our students and our nation deserve nothing less.

The members of the Board of Directors of the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability endorse these guidelines and recommend that associations, institutions, and individuals in and concerned with higher education also publicly endorse them.

Molly Corbett Broad
President, American Council on Education

Walter Bumphus
President and CEO, American Association of Community Colleges

W. Robert Connor
Senior Scholar, The Teagle Foundation

Judith Eaton, *Chair*
President, Council for Higher Education Accreditation

Richard Ekman
President, Council of Independent Colleges

Peter Ewell
Vice President, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

Paul Lingenfelter
President, State Higher Education Executive Officers

Sylvia Manning
President, The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association

David Paris, *ex officio*
Executive Director, New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability

Carol Geary Schneider
President, Association of American Colleges and Universities

David Shulenburg
Senior Fellow, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

Endnotes:

- ¹ The White House. (2009). Excerpts of the President's remarks in Warren, Michigan and fact sheet on the American graduation initiative. Retrieved March 10, 2011, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/excerpts-of-the-presidents-remarks-in-warren-michigan-and-fact-sheet-on-the-american-graduation-initiative/> .
- ² Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2007). *College learning for the new global century: A report from the national leadership council for liberal education & America's promise*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- ³ Carnevale, A. P., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2010). *Help wanted: Projections of employment and education demand 2008-2018*. Washington, DC: Georgetown Center on Education and the Workforce.
- ⁴ Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. See also Campbell, David E. 2006. *Why we vote: How schools and communities shape our civic life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- ⁵ Tinto, V. (2000). Linking learning and leaving: Exploring the role of the college classroom in student departure. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Reworking the student departure puzzle* (pp. 81-94). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press. See also Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2010). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). A mandate for reform. In R. Arum & J. Roksa, *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011).
- ⁶ Association of American Colleges & Universities and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2008). *New leadership for student learning and accountability: A statement of principles, commitments to action*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Print.
- ⁷ There are several national efforts to define educational outcomes, including the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the standards in *CAS professional standards for higher education* published by the Council for the Advancement of Standards. Similarly, a number of books and articles have discussed desirable student learning outcomes, such as Keeling, R. P. (Ed.). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and American College Personnel Association and Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 58-81. The Lumina Foundation has recently published *The degree qualifications profile* articulating what students "should be expected to know and be able to do once they earn their degrees."
- ⁸ Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. See also Brownwell, J.E. & Swaner, Lynn E. (2010). *Five high-impact practices: Research on learning outcomes, completion, and quality*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- ⁹ Banta, T.W., Jones, E.A., & Black, K.E. (2009). *Designing effective assessment: Principles and profiles of good practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. See also Maki, P.L. (2004). *Assessing for Learning: Building a sustainable commitment across the institution*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, and Wehlburg, C. M. (2008). *Promoting integrated and transformative assessment: A deeper focus on student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- ¹⁰ The Voluntary System of Accountability. (2008). Overview of the college portrait. Retrieved March 10, 2011, from <<http://www.voluntarysystem.org/docs/cp/CollegePortraitOverview.pdf>>. See also, University and College Accountability Network (2008). Retrieved March 10, 2011, from <http://www.ucan-network.org/>.

GUIDELINES ENDORSEMENT AND SOLICITATION LIST, AS OF 10/7/11

Current endorsements (23):

- * American College Personnel Association
- * American Association of Community Colleges
- * American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- * Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education
- * Association of American Colleges and Universities
- * Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL)
- * Association of Institutional Researchers
- * Community College Survey of Student Engagement
- * Council for the Advancement of Standards
- * Council for Aid to Education
- * Council for Higher Education Accreditation
- * Council of Independent Colleges
- * Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions
- * Higher Education Data Services
- * Higher Education Research Institute
- * Institute for Higher Education Policy
- * Midwestern Higher Education Compact
- * NASPA – Student Affairs administrators in Higher Education
- * National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
- * National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment
- * National Survey of Student Engagement National Advisory Board
- * New England Resource Center for Higher Education
- * State Higher Education Executive Officers

Current solicitations (awaiting action) (20):

- * American Chemical Society
- * American Historical Association
- * American Mathematical Association
- * American Philosophical Association
- * American Political Science Association
- * American Psychological Association
- * American Sociological Association
- * Association of American Universities
- * Association of Community College Trustees
- * Business Higher Education Forum
- * Committee for Economic Development
- * Education Trust
- * EDUCAUSE
- * Modern Language Association
- * National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU)
- * National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education
- * New England Board of Higher Education
- * Society for College and University Planning
- * Southern Regional Education Board
- * Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

DISCUSSION ITEM

Update on WICHE's Budget

WICHE did not budget for any deficits for FY 2011 and did not realize any in the general fund, as you can see on the report titled *General Fund Budget Comparing FY 2011 with FY 2012*. However, as can be seen on the report *Program Area Revenue and Expense Summary*, two of our program areas did realize a loss, but even that did not cause WICHE to realize a deficit in FY 2011.

Prior to the State Higher Education Policy Center (SHEPC) contributions, all WICHE programs combined resulted in a gain in net assets of \$115,887. When WICHE is combined with the State Higher Education Policy Center (SHEPC), then the combined financial statement shows a gain of \$257,694, most of which is in minority contributions to equity at SHEPC.

Programs and Services, Policy Analysis and Research, the Professional Student Exchange program (PSEP), and the Compact for Faculty Diversity all experienced small gains or no changes. No change is the normal result for programs like PSEP or the Bridges to the Professoriate, which are not designed to do anything other than pay their expenses.

The Mental Health Program experienced a gain of \$75,904. Since they began the year with a fund balance of \$42,435, they have increased their fund balance to \$118,339.

WCET experienced a loss of \$172,804. Since they began the year with a fund balance of \$200,149, they are now at a fund balance of \$27,345.

The Technology & Innovation initiative began the year with a fund balance of \$50,000. They returned \$30,000 to the WICHE general fund, which caused them to experience a loss of \$31,312. They now have a fund balance of \$18,688.

The general fund began the year with a reserve of \$1,325,821, of which a total of \$25,037 was spent by action of the commission. The reserve ended the year at \$1,300,784, as seen on the report titled *General Fund Budget Comparing FY 2011 with FY 2012*.

Looking Ahead to Fiscal Year 2012

Again, WICHE did not budget for a deficit for FY 2012. Due to the tight economy, WICHE did not budget for any increases to revenue and did budget a 1.3 percent decrease in expenditures. It will be a challenge in all our program areas to manage these budgets, which have little or no room for excess spending.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
General Fund Budget
Comparing FY 2011 with FY 2012
Revenue and Expenditures

	FY 2011				FY 2012				
	FY 2011 Budget	FY 2011 Actual	Actual Higher or (Lower) than Budget		FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Budget Higher or (Lower) than FY 2011 Budget		FY 2012 Budget Higher or (Lower) than FY 2011 Actual	
Revenue									
4102 Indirect Cost Reimbursements	\$260,000	\$458,517	\$198,517	76.4%	\$260,000	\$0	0.0%	(\$198,517)	-43.3%
4104 Indirect Cost Sharing-WICHE	(\$60,000)	(\$129,572)	(\$69,572)	116.0%	(\$60,000)	\$0	0.0%	\$69,572	-53.7%
4201 Members/Fees States/Institutions	\$1,875,000	\$1,875,000	\$0	0.0%	\$1,875,000	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
4202 California Delinquent Dues	\$87,000	\$0	(\$87,000)	100.0%	\$87,000	\$0	0.0%	\$87,000	
4300 Interest	\$20,000	\$15,127	(\$4,873)	-24.4%	\$20,000	\$0	0.0%	\$4,873	32.2%
4400 Publication Sales & Refunds	\$50	\$0	(\$50)	100.0%	\$50	\$0	0.0%	\$50	
4600 Other Income	\$10,000	\$2,157	(\$7,843)	-78.4%	\$10,000	\$0	0.0%	\$7,843	363.7%
4850 Credit Card Transaction Rev. / Units	\$1,000	\$0	(\$1,000)	100.0%	\$1,000	\$0	0.0%	\$1,000	
4900 Interfund Transfers		\$30,000	\$30,000			\$0		(\$30,000)	-100.0%
Total Revenue	\$2,193,050	\$2,251,229	\$58,179	2.7%	\$2,193,050	\$0	0.0%	(\$58,179)	-2.6%
Expenditures									
0102 Student Exchange Program	\$300,092	\$282,570	(\$17,522)	-5.8%	\$299,897	(\$195)	-0.1%	\$17,327	6.1%
0104 Policy Analysis & Research	\$308,146	\$224,286	(\$83,860)	-27.2%	\$313,609	\$5,463	1.8%	\$89,323	39.8%
0105 Communications & Public Affairs	\$435,605	\$404,427	(\$31,177)	-7.2%	\$428,467	(\$7,137)	-1.6%	\$24,040	5.9%
0107 Technology & Innovation	\$29,686	\$31,309	\$1,623	5.5%	\$13,800	(\$15,886)	-53.5%	(\$17,509)	-55.9%
0110 President's Office	\$355,120	\$326,684	(\$28,436)	-8.0%	\$351,892	(\$3,229)	-0.9%	\$25,208	7.7%
0111 Commission Meeting Expense	\$129,975	\$137,954	\$7,979	6.1%	\$133,660	\$3,684	2.8%	(\$4,294)	-3.1%
0112 Administrative Services	\$435,923	\$372,678	(\$63,245)	-14.5%	\$444,213	\$8,290	1.9%	\$71,535	19.2%
0115 Miscellaneous Gen. Fund	\$160,001	\$166,253	\$6,252	3.9%	\$164,801	\$4,800	3.0%	(\$1,452)	-0.9%
0116 Program Development	\$13,502	\$5,379	(\$8,123)	-60.2%	\$15,000	\$1,498	11.1%	\$9,621	178.9%
0130 Expense California Unpaid Dues		\$87,000	\$87,000			\$0		(\$87,000)	-100.0%
0131 LAC Meeting	\$25,000	\$0	(\$25,000)	100.0%		(\$25,000)	-100.0%	\$0	
Total Expenditures	\$2,193,050	\$2,038,541	(\$154,509)	-7.0%	\$2,165,338	(\$27,712)	-1.3%	\$126,797	6.2%
Surplus (Deficit) for the Fiscal Year	\$0	\$212,688	\$212,688		\$27,712	(\$27,712)		\$68,618	
Reserves at Beginning of Year									
1 Minimum Reserve	\$263,166	\$263,166	\$0	0.0%	\$259,841	(\$3,325)	-1.3%	(\$3,325)	-1.3%
2 Reserve for Facility Payments	\$194,000	\$194,000	\$0	0.0%	\$192,000	(\$2,000)	-1.0%	(\$2,000)	-1.0%
3 Reserve for Unexpected Shortfall	\$219,305	\$219,305	\$0	0.0%	\$216,534	(\$2,771)	-1.3%	(\$2,771)	-1.3%
4 Reserve required for CECFA Bond.	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$0	0.0%	\$70,000	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
5 Reserve Available for Dedication	\$579,350	\$579,350	\$0	0.0%	\$562,409	(\$16,941)	-2.9%	(\$16,941)	-2.9%
Reserves at Beginning of Year	\$1,325,821	\$1,325,821	\$0	0.0%	\$1,300,784	(\$25,037)	-6.5%	(\$25,037)	-6.5%
Reserves Dedicated during Year									
6 Designated for Internet 2 Installation	\$38,000	\$38,000	\$0	0.0%					
7 Deferred Compensation / President	\$7,725	\$7,725	\$0	0.0%	\$16,194	(\$8,469)	-109.6%	(\$8,469)	109.6%
8 Carryover from FY11 to FY12 only.	\$0	\$92,000	(\$92,000)						
9 IT Development projects.	\$0	\$100,000	(\$100,000)						
10 Deficit (Surplus) for the Fiscal Year above	\$0	(\$212,688)	\$212,688	5808.2%	(\$27,712)	\$27,712	5433.2%	(\$184,976)	87.0%
Reserves Dedicated during the Fiscal Year	\$45,725	\$25,037	\$20,688	5808.2%	(\$11,518)	\$19,243	5433.2%	(\$193,445)	-22.7%
Reserves at End of Year	\$1,280,096	\$1,300,784	\$20,688		\$1,312,302	(\$5,794)		(\$218,482)	

- (a) FY 2011 Dues set by Commission to \$130K in May 2008; and reduced by Commission to \$125K in May 2009. In May 2010, Commission set FY 2012 Dues to \$125K and FY 2013 Dues to \$131K. If half of the WICHE states do not project revenue increases by the Nov 2011 meeting, then the FY 2013 dues will remain at \$125K for the fourth straight year.
- (b) California unpaid Dues.
- (c) In discussion with Auditors at end of FY2011, it was decided to expense the continuing accounts receivable for the unpaid 2005 California Dues.
- (d) Minimum reserve set by the commission is 12% of Budgeted Expenses. Set May 2000.
- (e) Facility Payments reserve set by commission at 6 months of cost. Set May 2007.
- (f) Unexpected Shortfall reserve set by commission at 10% of Budgeted Expenses. To be used only if anticipated funding does not materialize. Set May 2007.
- (g) CECFA Bond reserve. Legal requirement of bond financing.
- (h) Internet 2 installation into WICHE offices approved by Commission at May 2010 meeting.
- (i) Deferred compensation plan for President approved by Commission at the November 2010 meeting.
- (j) Adopted at the May 2011 Commission meeting. One time carryover for budgeted expenses not made in the current year. \$25K SPIDO, \$20K PSEP, \$10K Commission Meeting, \$25K LAC meeting, \$12K Staff bonus.
- (k) Adopted at the May 2011 Commission meeting. Special allocation for additional programming to update software needed to keep current.

Program Area Revenue and Expense Summary for FY 2011

	Programs & Services	Policy Analysis	PSEP & Bridges	Mental Health	WCET	Innovation & Technology
Revenue						
Membership Dues and Fees	\$ 164,036			\$ 111,000	\$ 442,842	
Conference Registration Fees	\$ 3,250				\$ 257,158	
Grants and Contracts	\$ 625,951	\$ 1,021,264	\$ 195,001	\$ 1,958,131	\$ 390,382	\$ 110,847
Indirect Cost Sharing				\$ (10,527)	\$ 4,633	\$ 9,702
Interest		\$ 375			\$ 101	
Miscellaneous Income	\$ 15,977	\$ 16,546		\$ 60,346	\$ 20,381	
General Fund Allocation	\$ 435,605	\$ 308,146	\$ 300,092			\$ (30,000)
Total Revenue	\$ 1,244,819	\$ 1,346,331	\$ 495,093	\$ 2,118,950	\$ 1,115,497	\$ 90,549
Expenses						
Salaries	\$ 305,785	\$ 405,507	\$ 191,138	\$ 547,113	\$ 346,658	\$ 43,909
Benefits	\$ 107,433	\$ 147,326	\$ 58,714	\$ 194,331	\$ 124,032	\$ 18,640
Audit, Legal & Consulting	\$ 37,148	\$ 190,275	\$ 600	\$ 328,053	\$ 17,135	\$ 33,900
Subcontracts	\$ 556,617	\$ 33,479	\$ 44,000	\$ 266,811	\$ 414,649	
Travel	\$ 72,455	\$ 266,658	\$ 124,870	\$ 362,570	\$ 202,661	\$ 8,096
Printing and Copying	\$ 3,238	\$ 15,863	\$ 4,183	\$ 21,413	\$ 5,521	\$ 1
Rent	\$ 36,006	\$ 55,962	\$ 19,683	\$ 62,846	\$ 38,260	\$ 100
Computer/Network	\$ 34,511	\$ 43,112	\$ 15,263	\$ 65,655	\$ 39,641	\$ 67
Communications	\$ 8,169	\$ 10,050	\$ 3,445	\$ 17,872	\$ 11,444	\$ 16
Supplies and Expense	\$ 6,021	\$ 10,819	\$ 1,230	\$ 40,465	\$ 12,600	\$ 5,321
Marketing	\$ 715	\$ 665		\$ 49	\$ 14,813	
Indirect Costs	\$ 28,544	\$ 1,546		\$ 236,941	\$ 74,865	\$ 11,811
Credits for other programs	\$ 17,721	\$ 81,206		\$ (101,074)	\$ (13,978)	
Total Expenses	\$ 1,214,363	\$ 1,262,468	\$ 463,126	\$ 2,043,045	\$ 1,288,301	\$ 121,861
Excess Revenue (Loss)	\$ 30,456	\$ 83,863	\$ 31,967	\$ 75,905	\$ (172,804)	\$ (31,312)

DISCUSSION ITEM

WICHE Dues Update

At the May 2008 meeting, the commission set the WICHE dues for the next biennium to \$125,000 for FY10 and \$130,000 for FY11. At the May 2009 meeting, in the midst of state financial distress, the commission reduced the FY11 dues to the prior year level of \$125,000. Last year, at the May 2010 meeting in Portland, OR, the commission set the WICHE dues for the next biennium, maintaining the \$125,000 level for FY12 (the current year) and setting dues for FY13 at \$131,000, contingent upon at least half the member states projecting revenue increases by the November 2011 commission meeting.

Data from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) shows that estimated state tax revenues for fiscal year 2011 grew nationally by an average 6.1 percent, compared to fiscal year 2010. Fourteen WICHE states had increased revenues, with only Wyoming experiencing a reduction (-7.2 percent). WICHE states averaged an increase of 5.25 percent. Despite these revenue increases, most states continue to face substantial fiscal distress. According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, nine WICHE states (Arizona (-39 percent), California (-21 percent), Colorado (-25 percent), Hawaii (-16 percent), Idaho (-4 percent), Nevada (-5 percent), New Mexico (-9 percent), Oregon (-32 percent), and Washington (-15 percent)) had to close major shortfalls in FY11, in the amount of funding that would have been necessary to maintain current levels of service.

For fiscal year 2012, WICHE states again are projected, on average, to have increased revenues of 1.65 percent. NSCL reports, however, that three states are expected to have declining revenues during FY12 (California (-6.7 percent), Nevada (-9.3 percent), and North Dakota (-8.6 percent)). Again, despite average projected revenue increases, NSCL reports that 10 WICHE states have budgeted for shortfalls in fiscal year 2012 (Arizona (-12 percent), California (-28 percent), Colorado (-9 percent), Hawaii (-6 percent), Idaho (-9 percent), Nevada (-31 percent), New Mexico (-4 percent), Oregon (-19 percent), Utah (-9 percent), and Washington (-15 percent)). Four WICHE states are already projecting current services budget shortfalls for FY13 (California (-7 percent), Nevada (-35 percent), and Oregon (-19 percent) and Washington (-15 percent)).

Under the terms of the May 2010 action of the commission, which is based on revenue projections, not projected budget shortfalls, dues for the current year, fiscal year 2012, were maintained at the \$125,000 level; but dues will increase to \$131,000 for fiscal year 2013 because most states anticipate appreciating revenue increases in FY12, unless action is taken by the commission to reconsider its prior action.



Plenary Session III: What's Up at WICHE? WCET's Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework and the Multistate Data Exchange Project

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

9:45 - 10:45 am

Aloha Center Ballroom

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

9:45 - 10:45 am
Aloha Center Ballroom

**Plenary Session III:
What's Up at WICHE? WCET's Predictive Analytics
Reporting Framework and the Multistate Data Exchange
Project**

This session about activities will focus on two major WICHE projects, WCET's Predictive Analytics Reporting (PAR) Framework and the Policy Analysis and Research unit's Multistate Data Exchange project, both of which have been supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Predictive Analytics Reporting Framework. Ellen Wagner, executive director of WCET, will present the major findings and outcomes of recently completed work on the PAR Framework. This is a major study of the ways in which data collected on students enrolled in online and technology-mediated instruction can be used to identify those pinch points that correlate positively or negatively with student success, thus allowing institutions to develop interventions to enhance the success of students and their own efficiency in better serving students.

Multistate Data Exchange. Brian Prescott, director of policy research for WICHE, will present an update on progress toward establishing an exchange of data between four WICHE states – Hawai'i, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. This initiative will allow the four participating states to exchange data, from the entry of students into a state's educational system through to the completion of students in any of the participating states' educational systems and then into the workforce. With the engagement of elementary/secondary data managers, postsecondary data managers, and labor force data managers, this project has worked to develop a governance structure and a common memorandum of agreement; address myriad legal questions, including issues of protecting students' privacy; and integrate data from quite different individual state database systems. The four states were selected because they were willing participants and have substantial migration between them (three are contiguous); in addition, they differed greatly in the extent and sophistication of their respective data systems. While all of the participants have been extremely cordial and supportive of the effort, overcoming barriers of data sharing between states have been substantial in a legal environment that isn't generally fertile for multistate collaboration. Prescott will share the successes to date and schedule for progress into the future.

Speakers: Pearl Iboshi, director, Institutional Research and Analysis Office, University of Hawai'i System; Hae Okimoto, director, academic technologies, University of Hawai'i System; Brian Prescott, director of policy research, WICHE; Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET

Biographical Information on the Speakers

Pearl Imada Iboshi is the director of the Institutional Research and Analysis Office at the University of Hawai'i System. She provides direction to and manages the research staff of the office, which supports, enhances, and fosters the educational mission of the university by providing analyses and management information for use in planning, decision making, assessment, and policy formation. It provides leadership and direction for institutional research at the university. Before taking this position, Imada Iboshi was the interim director of the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations and served on the Governor's Cabinet for the State of Hawai'i in 2010. She also served as the state economist and administrator for the Research and Economic Analysis Division of Hawai'i's Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. Originally from Hilo, Imada Iboshi received her undergraduate degree in economics from Grinnell College, then obtained her master's degree in the same field from Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo and her doctorate in economics from the University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Hae Okimoto has been with the University of Hawai'i System since 1988, when she was hired to lead the 10-campus system's initial distance education endeavor using interactive television. Since then she has led the university's migration from a commercial course management system to a systemwide open source learning and collaboration environment that's integrated with enterprise systems to support classroom instruction, hybrid courses, distance learning, research collaborations, and social networking. Okimoto has systemwide responsibility for distance and e-learning support, including all related technologies, IT customer services, faculty development, and the multicampus student information system. As a board member of the American Association for Higher Education, she promoted the topics of educational technology and distance education in national higher education policy discussions. As a member of the NorthWest Academic Computing Consortium Board, she is a leader in e-learning-related matters. Okimoto helped to establish WCET back in 1989 and has been very active in the cooperative, serving on its conference planning committee and steering committee and, recently, as cochair of its new professional development program, "Forging the Future: The \$10,000 Baccalaureate." She is on the core team that recently received the largest grant from the Labor and Education departments to community colleges for job training and workforce development. She anticipates that lessons learned from the PAR grant can be used in the improvement of programs to support this new grant.

Brian T. Prescott is the director of policy research in the Policy Analysis and Research unit at WICHE. He comanages the unit, with primary responsibility for obtaining and analyzing education and

workforce data with public policy relevance. He is the author of the most recent edition of *Knocking at the College Door*, WICHE's widely used projections of high school graduates by state and race/ethnicity. Additionally, he manages grant- and contract-funded projects and authors occasional policy briefs, chapters, and research reports. Prescott also has experience working directly with states on issues of access, success, affordability, accountability, workforce development, and data systems development. Prior to joining WICHE in 2004, Prescott worked in the Office of State Governmental Relations at the University of Virginia, where he earned a Ph.D. in higher education. He also holds degrees from the University of Iowa and the College of William and Mary.

Ellen Wagner is executive director of WCET, a cooperative association of institutions, vendors, and educational stakeholders looking to advance excellence and accelerate adoption of innovative technology-enhanced teaching and learning practices and policies in higher education. She is also a partner and senior analyst for Sage Road Solutions, where she is responsible for industry intelligence and enablement services. Wagner is the former senior director of worldwide e-learning at Adobe Systems and was senior director of worldwide education solutions for Macromedia. She also served as chief learning officer and director of education for Viviance new education, a Swiss-based e-learning company with offices in 10 North American and European countries; and chief learning officer and VP of consulting services for Informania. Wagner was formerly a tenured professor and chair of the Educational Technology Program at the University of Northern Colorado and held a number of administrative posts, including director of the Western Institute for Distance Education and coordinator of campus instructional and research technologies, Academic Affairs Division. Her Ph.D. in learning psychology comes from the University of Colorado, Boulder. Her M.S. and B.A. degrees were earned at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.



WICHE



Plenary Session IV: Finance in the New World

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

11:00 am - 12:30 pm

Aloha Center Ballroom

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

12 Tuesday 11:00 am-12:30 pm

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

11:00 - 11:30 am

Aloha Center Ballroom

Plenary Session IV: Finance in the New World

Higher education, particular public higher education, is in the process of responding to what is being called "the new normal" way of doing business. And in great part, this new normal is being driven by the way in which higher education is being financed. States and institutions are receiving less public funding and are searching for ways to generate revenue from other sources, in order to replace state dollars and to use existing resources in new ways that promote and incentivize changes that enhance productivity within the enterprise.

Brian Prescott, director of policy research for WICHE, will begin this session by providing information on exactly (or as exactly as is possible with limited data) what has been happening recently in the financing of higher education in the WICHE states. Following his presentation Dennis Jones, president of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, will present some of the more innovative approaches to performance funding that states are using to respond to the new normal facing higher education.

Some institutions, and even some states, continue to believe that the reductions in funding that higher education has faced in the economic downturn simply reflect a necessary but temporary circumstance and that funding will be restored when resources return to state coffers, as they always have before. Other institutions, and some states, are attempting to "hold their institutions harmless" by searching for new sources of revenue – most often through generalized increases in tuition or by trying to attract more high-paying out-of-state students. Most institutions and most states, however, are looking for ways to blend some additional revenue from other sources with substantial redirection in the way higher education is delivered. Time will tell which strategies significantly serve the public good. This set of presentations will provide evidence of what is actually happening in both resources and resource allocations in the WICHE states and will discuss the rationale behind these changes.

Speakers: Dennis Jones, president, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems; Brian Prescott, WICHE director of policy research.

11:00 am - 12:30 pm

Facilitated Discussion on Finance in the New World

Facilitator: David Longanecker, president, WICHE

Biographical Information about the Speakers and Facilitator

David A. Longanecker has served as the president of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education in Boulder, CO, since 1999. WICHE is a regional compact between 15 Western states created to assure access and excellence in higher education through collaboration and resource sharing among the higher education systems of the West. Previously, Longanecker served for six years as the assistant secretary for postsecondary education at the U.S. Department of Education. Prior to that he was the state higher education executive officer (SHEEO) in Colorado and Minnesota. He was also the principal analyst for higher education for the Congressional Budget Office. Longanecker has served on numerous boards and commissions. He has written extensively on a range of higher education issues. His primary interests in higher education are: expanding access to successful completion for students within all sectors of higher education, promoting student and institutional performance, assuring efficient and effective finance and financial aid strategies, and fostering effective use of educational technologies, all for the purpose of sustaining the nation's strength in the world and increasing quality of life for all Americans, particularly those who have traditionally been left out in the past. He holds an Ed.D. from Stanford University, an M.A. in student personnel work from George Washington University, and a B.A. in sociology from Washington State University.

Dennis P. Jones, president of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), has more than 40 years of experience in research, development, technical assistance, and administration in the field of higher education management and policymaking. A member of the NCHEMS staff since 1969, he assumed increasing levels of responsibility within that organization, becoming president in 1986. Under his leadership, and in collaboration with an extraordinarily talented staff, NCHEMS has achieved a position of preeminence as a leader in the development and promulgation of information-based approaches to policymaking in higher education. Jones is widely recognized for his work in such areas as: developing "public agendas" to guide state higher education policymaking; financing, budgeting, and resource allocation methodologies for use at both state and institutional levels; linking higher education with states' workforce and economic development needs; and developing and using information to inform policymaking. He has written many monographs and articles on these topics; has presented his work at many regional, national, and international conferences; and has consulted with hundreds of institutions and state higher education agencies on management issues of all kinds. Jones is a graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and served as an administrator (in business and institutional planning) there for eight years prior to his joining the NCHEMS staff. He has served as

an advisor to the U.S. Secretary of Education, Lumina Foundation, the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and numerous other associations, policy organizations, and state agencies.

Brian T. Prescott is the director of policy research in the Policy Analysis and Research unit at WICHE. He comanages the unit, with primary responsibility for obtaining and analyzing education and workforce data with public policy relevance. He is the author of the most recent edition of *Knocking at the College Door*, WICHE's widely used projections of high school graduates by state and race/ethnicity. Additionally, he manages grant- and contract-funded projects and authors occasional policy briefs, chapters, and research reports. Prescott also has experience working directly with states on issues of access, success, affordability, accountability, workforce development, and data systems development. Prior to joining WICHE in 2004, Prescott worked in the Office of State Governmental Relations at the University of Virginia, where he earned a Ph.D. in higher education. He also holds degrees from the University of Iowa and the College of William and Mary.





Reference

WICHE Commission

Commission committees 2011

WICHE staff

Future commission meeting dates

Higher education acronyms

Western Interstate
Commission
for Higher Education

www.wiche.edu

Reference

- WICHE Commission 13-3
- 2011 WICHE Commission committees 13-4
- WICHE staff 13-5
- Future commission meeting dates 13-5
- Higher education acronyms 13-6



WICHE COMMISSION

WICHE's 45 commissioners are appointed by their governors from among state higher education executive officers, college and university presidents, legislators, and business leaders from the 15 Western states. This regional commission provides governance and guidance to WICHE's staff in Boulder, CO. Joseph Garcia, Colorado lieutenant governor and executive director of the Colorado Department of Higher Education, is the 2011 chair of the WICHE Commission; Bonnie Jean Beesley, vice chair of the Utah Board of Regents, is vice chair.

ALASKA

Susan Anderson, president/CEO, The Ciri Foundation
*Diane Barrans (WICHE chair, 2005), executive director, Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education
James Johnsen, senior vice president of administration, Doyon, Ltd.

ARIZONA

Thomas Anderes, president, Arizona Board of Regents
*Leah Bornstein, president, Coconino Community College
David Lorenz, retired vice president of administration and finance, Northern Arizona University

CALIFORNIA

Christopher Cabaldon, principal, Capitol Impact, LLC; Mayor, West Sacramento City
*Dianne Harrison, president, California State University – Monterey Bay
Michael Kirst, president, State Board of Education; professor emeritus, Stanford University

COLORADO

*Joseph Garcia (WICHE chair), Colorado lieutenant governor; executive director, Colorado Department of Higher Education
*D. Rico Munn, partner, Baker and Hostetler
Dene Kay Thomas, president, Fort Lewis College

HAWAI'I

*Roy Ogawa (WICHE chair, 2008), attorney, Ogawa, Lau, Nakamura & Jew
Roberta Richards, principal, Pauoa Elementary School
Steven Wheelwright, president, Brigham Young University-Hawai'i

IDAHO

M. Duane Nellis, president, University of Idaho
*Michael Rush, executive director, Idaho State Board of Education
Mack Shirley, state representative

MONTANA

Clayton Christian, chair, Montana Board of Regents; president, Stewart Title of Missoula
Kim Gillan, state senator
*Sheila Stearns, commissioner of higher education, Montana University System

NEVADA

Joseph Hardy, state senator
*Jane Nichols (WICHE chair, 2009), vice chancellor for academic and student affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education
*Carl Shaff, educational consultant

NEW MEXICO

José Garcia, cabinet secretary, New Mexico Higher Education Department
Susanna Murphy, lecturer, Department of Educational Leadership and Organizational Learning, University of New Mexico, College of Education
*Patricia Sullivan, assistant dean, College of Engineering, New Mexico State University

NORTH DAKOTA

Duaine Espegard, member, State Board of Higher Education
William Goetz, chancellor, North Dakota University System
*David Nething (WICHE chair, 2006), state senator

OREGON

Ryan Deckert, president, Oregon Business Association
Tim Nesbitt, former deputy chief of staff, Office of the Governor
*Camille Preus, commissioner, Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development

SOUTH DAKOTA

Robert Burns, distinguished professor emeritus, Political Science Department, South Dakota State University, and dean emeritus, SDSU Honors College
*James Hansen, regent, South Dakota Board of Regents
Jack Warner, executive director, South Dakota Board of Regents

UTAH

*Bonnie Jean Beesley (WICHE vice chair), vice chair, Utah Board of Regents
Peter Knudson, state senator
*William Sederburg, commissioner, Utah System of Higher Education

WASHINGTON

*Don Bennett, executive director, Higher Education Coordinating Board
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, state representative
Jeanne Kohl-Welles, state senator

WYOMING

*Thomas Buchanan (immediate past WICHE chair), president, University of Wyoming
Samuel Krone, state representative
Karla Leach, president, Rock Springs Community College

*Executive Committee member

2011 COMMISSION COMMITTEES

Executive Committee

Joseph Garcia (CO), chair
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT), vice chair
Thomas Buchanan (WY), immediate past chair

Diane Barrans (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Michael Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
David Nething (ND)
Camille Preus (OR)
James Hansen (SD)
William Sederburg (UT)
Don Bennett (WA)
Position vacant (WY)

Issue Analysis and Research Committee

Robert Burns (SD), chair
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (WA), vice chair
Thomas Buchanan (WY), ex officio

Susan Anderson (AK)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Christopher Cabaldon (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Steven Wheelwright (HI)
M. Duane Nellis (ID)
Kim Gillan (MT)
Jane Nichols (NV)
José Garcia (NM)
William Goetz (ND)
Ryan Deckert (OR)
Committee chair (SD)
William Sederburg (UT)
Committee vice chair (WA)
Position vacant (WY)

Disaster Recovery Planning Committee

Diane Barrans (AK), chair
Camille Preus (OR)
William Kuepper (CO), consultant and former WICHE
commissioner
Roy Ogawa (HI)

Programs and Services Committee

Carl Shaff (NV), chair
Diane Barrans (AK), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), ex officio

Committee vice chair (AK)
Thomas Anderes (AZ)
Dianne Harrison (CA)
Joseph Garcia (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Robert Kustra (ID)
Clayton Christian (MT)
Committee chair (NV)
Susanna Murphy (NM)
Duaine Espégard (ND)
Tim Nesbitt (OR)
Jack Warner (SD)
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)
Position vacant (WY)

Self-funded Units Committee

Position vacant, chair
James Hansen (SD), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), ex officio

James Johnsen (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Michael Kirst (CA)
Position vacant (CO)
Roberta Richards (HI)
Michael Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
Joseph Hardy (NV)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
David Nething (ND)
Camille Preus (OR)
Committee vice chair (SD)
Peter Knudson (UT)
Thomas Buchanan (WY)

Audit Committee

Thomas Buchanan (WY), chair and immediate past
WICHE chair
Diane Barrans (AK)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT), WICHE vice chair

WICHE STAFF

President's Office

David Longanecker, president
Erin Barber, executive assistant to the president and to the commission

Accounting and Administrative Services

Craig Milburn, chief financial officer
Robin Berlin, senior accounting specialist
Peggy Stevens, accounting specialist

Human Resources

Tara Hickey, human resources coordinator

IT Services

Jerry Worley, chief technology officer
Renaë Dahiya, web/database developer
Patrick Mitchell, software developer
Penne Siedenburg, help desk technician

Mental Health Program

Dennis Mohatt, vice president
Mimi McFaul, associate director
Joanne Brothers, budget coordinator
Mariah Coe, research and technical assistance associate
Tamara DeHay, research and technical assistance associate
Neil Gowensmith, research and technical assistance associate
Tara Hickey, administrative coordinator
Debra Kupfer, mental health consultant
Chuck McGee, project director
Sabrina Tang, administrative assistant
Jessica Tomasko, research and technical assistance associate
Jeremy Vogt, research assistant

Policy Analysis and Research

Demarée Michelau, director of policy analysis
Brian Prescott, director of policy research
Peace Bransberger, research analyst
Cheryl Graves, administrative assistant
Carl Krueger, project coordinator
Patrick Lane, project coordinator

Programs and Services and Communications and Public Affairs

Jere Mock, vice president
Candy Allen, graphic designer
Margo Colalancia, director, Student Exchange Program
Laura Ewing, administrative assistant
Annie Finnigan, communications manager
Kay Hulstrom, administrative assistant
Deborah Jang, web design manager
Ken Pepion, director, Bridges to the Professoriate
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE, the Forum, and the Alliance
Catherine Weldon, project coordinator, NANSLO

Technology & Innovation

Louis Fox, senior associate

WCET

Ellen Wagner, executive director
Mollie McGill, deputy director, programs and membership
Russell Poulin, deputy director, research and analysis
Beth Davis, consultant
Sherri Artz Gilbert, manager, operations
Cali Morrison, manager, major grants
Megan Raymond, manager, events and programs
Peggy Stevens, coordinator, web services

Names in **bold** type indicate new employees or new positions within WICHE. The WICHE website, **www.wiche.edu**, includes a staff directory with phone numbers and e-mail contact forms.

Future Commission Meeting Dates

2012

May 21-22 – Fort Collins, CO
November 12-13 – Salt Lake City, UT

2013

May 20-21 – Spokane or Seattle, WA
November 4-5 – Boulder, CO

2014

May 19-20 – New Mexico
November 10-11 – Boulder, CO

HIGHER EDUCATION ACRONYMS

Higher ed is addicted to acronyms, so much so that the actual names of organizations are sometimes almost lost to memory. Below, a list of acronyms and the organizations they refer to (plus a few others).

AACC	American Association of Community Colleges	aacc.nche.edu
AACTE	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	aacte.org
AAC&U	Association of American Colleges and Universities	aacu.org
AASCU	American Association of State Colleges and Universities	aascu.org
AASHE	Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education	aashe.org
AAU	Association of American Universities	aau.edu
ACC NETWORK	Adult College Completion Network	adultcollegecompletion.org
ACE	American Council on Education	acenet.edu
ACT	(college admission testing program)	act.org
ACUTA	Association of College & University Telecommunications Administrators	acuta.org
AED	Academy for Educational Development	aed.org
AEI	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research	aei.org
AERA	American Educational Research Association	era.net
AGB	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges Ingram Center for Public Trusteeship and Governance	agb.org agb.org/ingram-center-public-trusteeship-and-governance
AIHEC	American Indian Higher Education Consortium	aihec.org
AIHEPS	Alliance for International Higher Education Policy Studies	nyu.edu/steinhardt/iesp/aiheps/
AIR	Association for Institutional Research	airweb.org
APLU	Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (formerly NASULGC)	www.aplu.org
ASPIRA	(an association to empower Latino youth)	aspira.org
ASHE	Association for the Study of Higher Education	ashe.ws
CAE	Council for Aid to Education	cae.org
CAEL	Council for Adult and Experiential Learning	cael.org
CASE	Council for Advancement and Support of Education	case.org
CBO	Congressional Budget Office	cbo.gov
CCA	Complete College America	completecollege.org
CGS	Council of Graduate Schools	cgsnet.org
CHEA	Council for Higher Education Accreditation	chea.org
CHEPS	Center for Higher Education Policy Studies	utwente.nl/mb/cheps
CIC	Council of Independent Colleges	cic.org
CLA	Collegiate Learning Assessment	cae.org/content/pro_collegiate.htm
COE	Council for Opportunity in Education	coenet.us
CONAHEC	Consortium for Higher Education Collaboration	conahec.org
CONASEP	CONAHEC's Student Exchange Program	conahecstudentexchange.org
CSG-WEST	Council of State Governments - West	csgwest.org
CSHE	Center for the Study of Higher Education	ed.psu.edu/cshe
CSPN	College Savings Plan Network	collegesavings.org
CUE	Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California	cue.usc.edu
DQC	Data Quality Campaign	dataqualitycampaign.org
ECS	Education Commission of the States	ecs.org

ED- U.S. Dept. of Education links:

ED-FSA	Federal Student Aid	ed.gov/about/offices/list/fsa
ED-IES	Institute of Education Sciences	ed.gov/about/offices/list/ies
ED-NCES	National Center for Education Statistics	nces.ed.gov
ED-OESE	Office of Elementary & Secondary Education	ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese
ED-OPE	Office of Postsecondary Education	ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope
ED-OSERS	Office of Special Education & Rehabilitative Services	ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers
ED-OVAE	Office of Vocational and Adult Education	ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae

FIPSE	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/fipse
EdREF	EdRef College Search Reference	EdRef.com
EC	Electronic Campus Initiatives	ecinitiatives.org
EDUCAUSE	(An association fostering higher ed change via technology and information resources)	educause.edu
EPI	Educational Policy Institute	educationalpolicy.org
ETS	Educational Testing Service	ets.org
Excelencia	Excelencia in Education	edexcelencia.org
GHEE	Global Higher Education Exchange	ghee.org
HACU	Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities	hacu.net
HBLI	Hispanic Border Leadership Institute	asu.edu/educ/hbli
ICE	Internet Course Exchange (WICHE)	wiche.edu/ice
IHELP	Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, California State University Sacramento	csus.edu/ihelp
IHEP	Institute for Higher Education Policy	ihep.org
IIE	Institute of International Education	iie.org
IPEDS	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System	nces.ed.gov/ipeds
JBC	Joint Budget Committee	
JFF	Jobs for the Future	jff.org
McREL	Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning	mcrel.org
MHEC	Midwestern Higher Education Compact	mhec.org
MOA	Making Opportunity Affordable	makingopportunityaffordable.org
MSA/CHE	Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education	middlestates.org
NAAL	National Assessment of Adult Literacy	nces.ed.gov/naal
NACOL	North American Council for Online Learning	nacol.org
NACUBO	National Association of College and University Business Officers	nacubo.org
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress	nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard
NAFEO	National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education	nafeo.org
NAFSA	(an association of international educators)	nafsa.org
NAICU	National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities	naicu.edu
NANSLO	North American Network of Science Labs Online	http://wiche.edu/nanslo
NASFAA	National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators	nasfaa.org
NASH	National Association of System Heads	nashonline.org
NASPA	National Association of Student Personnel Administrators	naspa.org
NASSGAP	National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs	nassgap.org
NCA-CASI	North Central Association Commission on Accreditation and School Improvement	ncacihe.org
NCAT	The National Center for Academic Transformation	thencat.org
NCCC	National Consortium for College Completion	n/a
NCHEMS	National Center for Higher Education Management Systems	nchems.org
NCLB	No Child Left Behind	ed.gov/nclb
NCPPE	National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education	www.highereducation.org
NCPR	National Center for Postsecondary Research	postsecondaryresearch.org
NCSL	National Conference of State Legislatures	nctl.org
NEASC-CIHE	New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education	neasc.org
NEBHE	New England Board of Higher Education	nebhe.org
NGA	National Governors' Association	nga.org
NILOA	National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment	learningoutcomeassessment.org
NLA/SLA	New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability	newleadershipalliance.org
NPEC	National Postsecondary Education Cooperative	nces.ed.gov/npec
NRHA	National Rural Health Association	nrharural.org
NSC	National Student Clearinghouse	studentclearinghouse.org
	Pathways to College Network	pathwaystocollege.net
NWCCU	Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	www.nwccu.org
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development	www.oecd.org
PISA	Program for International Student Assessment	www.pisa.oecd.org

PESC	Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council	pescc.org
PPIC	Public Policy Institute of California	ppic.org
RMAIR	Rocky Mountain Association for Institutional Research	rmair.org
SACS-CoC	Southern Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Colleges	sacscoc.org
SFARN	Student Financial Aid Research Network	pellinstitute.org/conference_SFARN.html
SHEEO	State Higher Education Executive Officers	sheeo.org
SHEPC	State Higher Education Policy Center	n/a
SONA	Student Organization of North America	conahec.org/conahec/sona
SPIDO	State Policy Inventory Database Online	wiche.edu/spido
SREB	Southern Regional Education Board	sreb.org
SREC	Southern Regional Electronic Campus	electroniccampus.org
SURA	Southeastern Universities Research Association	sura.org
TBD	Transparency by Design	wcet.wiche.edu/advance/transparency-by-design
UCEA	University Professional & Continuing Education Association (formerly NUCEA)	ucea.org
UNCF	United Negro College Fund	uncf.org
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization	unesco.org
UPCEA	University Professional Continuing Education Association	upcea.edu
VSA	Voluntary System of Accountability	voluntarysystem.org
WACCAL	Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders	wiche.edu/waccal
WAGS	Western Association of Graduate Schools	wagsonline.org
WALF	Western Academic Leadership Forum	wiche.edu/walf
WASC-ACCJC	Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges	accjc.org
WASC-Sr	Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities Washington College Directory Network	wascsenior.org/wasc washington.collegedirectorynetwork.com
WCET	WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies	wcet.wiche.edu
WGA	Western Governors' Association	westgov.org
WICHE	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education	wiche.edu
WIN	Western Institute of Nursing	ohsu.edu.son.win

SHEEO Offices in the West:

ACPE	Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education	state.ak.us/acpe/acpe.html
UAS	University of Alaska System	alaska.edu
ABOR	Arizona Board of Regents	abor.asu.edu
CCHE	Colorado Commission on Higher Education	highered.colorado.gov/cche.html
CDHE	Colorado Department of Higher Education	highered.colorado.gov
UH	University of Hawai'i	hawaii.edu
ISBE	Idaho State Board of Education	www.boardofed.idaho.gov
MUS	Montana University System	mus.edu
NMHED	New Mexico Higher Education Department	hed.state.nm.us
NSHE	Nevada System of Higher Education	nevada.edu
NDUS	North Dakota University System	ndus.nodak.edu
OUS	Oregon University System	ous.edu
SDBOR	South Dakota Board of Regents	ris.sdbor.edu
USBR	Utah State Board of Regents	utahsbr.edu
HECB	Higher Education Coordinating Board	hecb.wa.gov
WCCC	Wyoming Community College Commission	commission.wcc.edu
UW	University of Wyoming	uwyo.edu