Monday, November 8, 2010

Schedule at a Glance

7:30 am
Breakfast
Residence Inn

8:00 - 9:00 am [Tab 1]
Executive Committee Meeting
(SHEPC Conference Room
Open and Closed Sessions)
Suite 225
Approval of the Executive Committee
teleconference minutes of September 7, 2010 1-3

9:00 - 9:15 am
Break

9:15 - 9:30 am [Tab 2]
Committee of the Whole – Call to Order
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100
Approval of the Committee of the Whole
meeting minutes of May 17-18, 2010 2-5

9:00 - 9:15 am
Break

9:15 - 9:30 am [Tab 2]
Committee of the Whole – Call to Order
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100
Approval of the Committee of the Whole
meeting minutes of May 17-18, 2010 2-5

Report of the chair

Report of the president

Report of the Nominating Committee

Reminder to caucus on the selection of 2011 committee members

Recess until November 9 at 8:00 am
Plenary Session I: What’s Up in the West? Applying Utah’s Tuning Process to a Broader Agenda: An Awesome Presentation

Speakers: Phyllis “Teddi” Safman, assistant commissioner for academic affairs, Utah System of Higher Education; and William Sederburg, commissioner, Utah System of Higher Education

Break

Plenary Session II: What’s Up at WICHE? Common Core Standards and What They Mean for the West

Speaker: Paul Lingenfelter, president, State Higher Education Executive Officers

Lunch and Presentation

Speaker: William Pound, executive director, National Conference of State Legislatures

Plenary Session III: Accountability Systems and Student Learning Outcomes

Speaker: David Longanecker, president, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Break

Programs and Services Committee Meeting

Agenda

Action Item

Approval of the Programs and Services Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2010

Discussion Items:
The Master Property Program: Helping institutions to reduce costs and increase their asset protection

Speakers: Elizabeth Conlin, senior vice president and client executive, Marsh USA; Jon Hansen, WICHE consultant and retired risk manager, Nevada System of Higher Education

New developments in student transfer

Speaker: Stephen Handel, higher education relationship development and community college initiatives, the College Board
Information Items:
Programs and Services regional initiatives: WICHE ICE, Western
Academic Leadership Forum, and the Western
Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders 7-8

Student Exchange Programs update 7-13

Issue Analysis and Research Committee Meeting 8-1

Agenda

Action Item Approval of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2010 8-3

Information Items:
Update on the National Research and Development Center on Postsecondary Education and Employment grant proposal 8-7

Update on the Adult Degree Completion Program Network grant 8-9

Discussion Items:
Update on data resources review (Fact Book/Benchmarks/Tuition & Fees) 8-11

Collaboration with the National Governors Association and Lumina Foundation for Education to develop strategies for outreach to new governors

Progress toward FY 2011 workplan (highlights):
- Facilitating Development of a Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange
- Educational Equity and Postsecondary Student Success: A Center for Urban Education and WICHE Partnership for Policy Research and Analysis
- Non-traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners
- College Access Challenge Grant (CACG) Consortium and Network
- Best Practices in Statewide Articulation and Transfer Systems
- State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIDO) and Policy Publications Clearinghouse
3:30 - 5:00 pm
Self-funded Units Committee Meeting
SHEEO Mingle Conference Room
Suite 103

Agenda

Approval of the Self-funded Units Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2010

Information Items:

WCET:
Progress report on WCET highlights since May

Transparency by Design update

Revenue update

Update on Gates proposal, Continuous Quality Improvement in Online Learning

Technology and Innovation:

U.S. Unified Community Anchor Network (U.S. UCAN)

FCC e-rate changes and resulting impacts on universities and university-led state and regional optical networks

National Internet2 K20 Initiative and the WICHE West

Mental Health Program:
Supporting military and veterans – Department of Defense contract/ Citizen Soldier Support Program

New national technical assistance center on the integration of mental health and primary care – WICHE’s role on behavioral health workforce issues

National Institute of Mental Health study update: Mental health on college campuses

6:00 pm
Dinner on your own (transportation will be provided)
Tuesday, November 9, 2010

7:00 - 8:00 am
Residence Inn

8:00 - 9:15 am [Tab 10]
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100

Committee of the Whole – Business Session 10-1

Agenda

Reconvene Committee of the Whole: Thomas Buchanan, chair

Report and recommended action of the Audit Committee, Jane Nichols, committee chair

**Action Item**

FY 2010 audit report (separate document)

Report and recommended action of the Executive Committee, Thomas Buchanan, WICHE chair

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

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

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

Discussion Items:

Update on WICHE’s budget 10-3

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

**Action Item**

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

Remarks of the outgoing chair

Remarks of the new chair

Selection of 2011 committee members

Meeting evaluation (electronic)
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SCGKH3X

Other business
9:15 - 9:30 am
Break and hotel check-out

9:30 - 10:45 am [Tab 11]
Plenary Session IV: The Collegiate Learning Assessment
Speaker: Roger Benjamin, president, Council for Aid to Education

10:45 - 12:00 noon [Tab 12]
Plenary Session V: Building Next-Generation Accountability Frameworks and State Policies: Lessons from LEAP
Speaker: Debra Humphreys, vice president for communications and public affairs, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Noon
Adjournment
Executive Committee Meeting (Open and Closed Sessions)

Thomas Buchanan (WY), chair
Joseph Garcia (CO), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), immediate past chair
Diane Barrans (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Roy Ashburn (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Michael Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
David Nething (ND)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Camille Preus (OR)
James Hansen (SD)
William Sederburg (UT)
Position vacant (WA)
Klaus Hanson (WY)

Agenda (Open)

Action Item
Approval of the Executive Committee teleconference minutes of September 7, 2010 1-3

Discussion Item: November 2010 meeting schedule

Information Item: Deferred compensation and salary plan

Other business

Agenda (Closed)

Discussion Item: Informal review of the president’s performance and travel during 2010 1-5

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
Tuesday, September 7, 2010

Committee Members Present
Joseph Garcia (CO), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), immediate past chair
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Jessica Piper for Michael Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
David Nething (ND)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Camille Preus (OR)
James Hansen (SD)
David Buhler for William Sederburg (UT)
Klaus Hanson (WY)

Committee Members Absent
Diane Barrans (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Thomas Buchanan (WY), chair

Staff Present
David Longanecker, president
Erin Barber, executive assistant to the president
Demarée Michelau, director of policy analysis
Craig Milburn, chief financial officer
Brian Prescott, director of policy research
Margo Schultz, director, Student Exchange Programs
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE and WALF

Vice Chair Joseph Garcia called the meeting to order and asked Erin Barber to call roll (Chair Thomas Buchanan was travelling and could not participate). A quorum was confirmed.

ACTION ITEM
Approval of the Executive Committee Teleconference Minutes of August 9, 2010

Vice Chair Garcia asked for a motion on the approval of the Executive Committee teleconference minutes of August 9, 2010. Commissioner Nething moved TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 9, 2010, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE. Commissioner Hanson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEM
Budget Update

Vice Chair Garcia asked Craig Milburn for an update on WICHE’s budget. Milburn explained to the committee that FY 2010 ended with $138,188 surplus, and after reserve dedications were made, $11,812 from the surplus was added to the undedicated reserves. Milburn said that there was not much data on the FY 2011 budget, since it was early in the fiscal year. Longanecker added that the organization was still projecting a balanced budget for FY 2011. He also mentioned that the Legislative Advisory Committee (LAC) annual meeting might be funded out of a grant instead of out of the general fund budget. Both Vice Chair Garcia and Commissioner Nichols agreed that it would be good news if the $25,000 for the LAC meeting was funded from a grant instead of the general fund. Commissioner Nething added that considering the present state of the economy in many of the states, WICHE seems to be in an enviable position. Longanecker told the committee that there was growing concern among the staff over the salary freeze and said that so far the organization has only had to lay off one person, in the Mental Health Program. He added that putting together the FY 2012 budget will likely be more challenging and might lead to more layoffs. Milburn told the committee that the auditors from Clifton Gunderson were on site at WICHE for two weeks. So far, the auditors had not had any concerns, and Milburn expected to receive a draft of the audit report around the third week in September.
DISCUSSION ITEM
Update on Projects

Longanecker noted that there was not a lot of new information on projects to give the committee since the August teleconference. There were a number of proposals out for consideration. WICHE did not receive funding from Lumina for an extension of the Non-traditional No More project but was in discussions with Lumina about other possibilities. WICHE had not yet received notification on the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) proposal that was submitted last month for the Interstate Passport project. A proposal will be submitted on September 16 with the University of Pennsylvania on a data systems project that would dovetail with the current Gates grant. WCET also has proposals out to Gates and Lumina for possible funding.

DISCUSSION ITEM
Preliminary Agenda for the November 2010 Meeting

Longanecker told the committee that specific sessions were added to the agenda since the last conference call. Commissioner Sederburg will be presenting on work being done in Utah, and Paul Lingenfelter will be joining a session to talk about the Common Core Standards. Longanecker said he was working on inviting the rest of the speakers, including one for a session on the Collegiate Learning Assessment and others on accountability systems and the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ work on standards and accountability. Staff is still hoping to hold a wrap-around event following the commission meeting that would go into more detail about the Common Core Standards. Staff is planning to meet with the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) to determine if the wrap-around will be possible. Commissioner Nething asked about the schedule of the wrap-around meeting and whether staff wanted to have commissioners present. Longanecker said that they would like to have commissioners attend, especially higher education representatives, SHEEOs, and P-20 representatives. They are hoping to have 45 to 50 people in attendance. Vice Chair Garcia asked how commissioners will be notified. Longanecker said that it would depend on the logistics with SHEEO. He also mentioned that if any of the commissioners were interested in attending the wrap-around event, they should let Longanecker know. Commissioner Nething and Vice Chair Garcia both expressed their interest in attending the meeting. Commissioner Hanson asked for clarification on the lunch session at the November meeting. Longanecker said that it would be based on the Brookings Institute report “Mountain Megas: America’s Newest Metropolitan Places and a Federal Partnership to Help Them Prosper,” which looks at growing areas in the mountain West and whether they are making the investments necessary to sustain economic development (higher education being one of them).

DISCUSSION ITEM
Update on Dues Payments

Longanecker reported that New Mexico is the only state outstanding on its dues payment: this likely wasn’t a problem but maybe an oversight. Commissioner Sullivan said that she would look into it. Commissioner Hanson asked if California had paid its dues. Longanecker said the state was current, except for the community college past due amount, which he is working on.

Other Business

Vice Chair Garcia called for other business. Longanecker told the committee that Erin Barber had been to San Francisco for hotel site visits for the May 2011 meeting. Barber reported that the two Marriott properties, including the Stanford Court Renaissance, were the best possibilities for the meeting. Vice Chair Garcia and Commissioner Nichols agreed that the Stanford Court would be a good location.

The meeting was adjourned.
## DISCUSSION ITEM
### President’s Travel – Calendar Year 2010

### January
- **4-6** Mountain States Association of Community Colleges annual meeting ............................................... Scottsdale, AZ
- **11-12** Louisiana Postsecondary Education Review committee meeting ............................................... Baton Rouge, LA
- **13-14** National Student Clearinghouse Board meeting ........................................................................ Tampa, FL
- **15** University Continuing Education Association Workforce Development Forum ..................................... Scottsdale, AZ
- **21-22** College Board working group meeting ..................................................................................... Chicago, IL
- **28-29** Association for the Study of Higher Education institutes’ directors meeting ................................ Los Angeles, CA

### February
- **4-5** Louisiana Postsecondary Education Review committee meeting ............................................... Baton Rouge, LA
- **17** Joint Committee on the California Master Plan for Higher Education ............................................... Sacramento, CA
- **19** National Student Clearinghouse Data Access Advisory committee meeting ................................ Herndon, VA
- **22** Forum on the Future of Nursing ............................................................................................. Houston, TX
- **24-25** Achieving Wider Access to Higher Education .............................................................................. New York, NY
- **26** College Affordability Legislative Summit ..................................................................................... Chicago, IL

### March
- **2-3** Pacific Northwest Gigapop Board meeting ..................................................................................... Seattle, WA
- **15** Dinner with new commissioners Senator Roy Ashburn and Assemblyman Jim Silva ........................ Sacramento, CA
- **18-19** College Board Rethinking Student Aid capstone event and meetings with Representative Jared Polis and Jack Waldorf (Senator Mark Udall’s policy staff) ................................ Washington, D.C.
- **22-23** National Student Clearinghouse strategy meeting ...................................................................... Herndon, VA
- **24** Brookings Economic Forum ........................................................................................... Washington, D.C.

### April
- **2** Lunch with Jeanne Kohl-Welles and Ann Daley’s retirement celebration ............................................. Olympia, WA
- **14** College Board Advocacy & Policy Center Roundtable ...................................................................... Washington, D.C.
- **21-23** Western Academic Leadership Forum meeting ........................................................................ Rapid City, SD
- **27-28** Policy Forum on Latino College Completion ................................................................................ Washington, D.C.

### May
- **10-11** American Enterprise Institute Higher Education Reform Forum ................................................ Washington, D.C.
- **15-18** WICHE Commission meeting and Oregon Higher Education workgroup meeting ...................... Portland, OR

### June
- **3-4** Complete College America kick-off meeting ................................................................................ Nashville, TN
- **7-8** Gates Foundation Supporting Student Success meeting ...................................................................... Seattle, WA
- **17** Joel Sideman’s retirement celebration ..................................................................................... Phoenix, AZ
- **22-24** South Dakota’s Non-traditional No More WICHE-facilitated meeting ........................................ Brooking, SD

### July
- **7** Oregon Business Association workgroup meeting and Oregon Higher Education workgroup meeting ..............................................................................................................Portland, OR
- **15** State Higher Education Executive Officers annual meeting .......................................................... Minneapolis, MN
- **16** Gates Foundation and Department of Education meeting ............................................................... Washington, D.C.

### August
- **2-3** Center for Urban Education affiliates training .................................................................................. Los Angeles, CA
- **12** Governor’s Forum on Adult Credentialing ...................................................................................... Kalispell, MT
- **25** Oregon Higher Education workgroup meeting ................................................................................ Corvallis, OR
- **26** Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange project meetings ................................................................ Salem, OR
- **27** Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange project meetings ................................................................... Olympia, WA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Meeting with Brian Prescott and Don Hossler regarding possible National Student Clearinghouse partnership on data project, student interactive session at Indiana University, and Lumina .........................................................</td>
<td>Bloomington, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lumina state policy partners meeting ..............................................</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota Roundtable meeting ......................................................</td>
<td>Bismarck, ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science Research Council policy meeting ..................................</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with the Illinois Board of Higher Education ............................</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Student Clearinghouse Board meeting .....................................</td>
<td>Herndon, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference of Southwest Foundations annual meeting ............................</td>
<td>Vail, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Oregon Higher Education Workgroup meeting ........................................</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President’s Forum ..............................................................................</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warren Institute Roundtable ..................................................................</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONAHEC Board meeting ........................................................................</td>
<td>Calgary, Alberta, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-traditional No More North Dakota meeting .....................................</td>
<td>Valley City, ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Northwest Gigapop Board meeting ..........................................</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Community Colleges Chief Instructional Officers fall conference</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multistate Data Exchange kick-off meeting .........................................</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>WCET annual conference .......................................................................</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lumina National Higher Education Productivity Conference ......................</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Congress on Upper-secondary and Higher Education .............</td>
<td>Mexico City, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>College Board State Grant Study Advisory committee meeting ..................</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reform and Innovation in the New Ecology of U.S. Higher Education meeting</td>
<td>Stanford, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miller Center of Public Affairs meeting ............................................</td>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millenium Lecture Series – University of Texas at El Paso ....................</td>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Conference of State Legislatures meeting ................................</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday, November 8, 2010

9.15 - 9.30 am
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100

Committee of the Whole –
Call to Order/Introductions

Call to order: Thomas Buchanan, chair

Welcome

Introduction of new commissioners and guests 2-3

Action Item
Approval of the Committee of the Whole
meeting minutes of May 17-18, 2010 2-5

Report of the chair

Report of the president

Report of the Nominating Committee

Reminder to caucus on selection of committee members

Recess until November 9, 2010, at 8.00 am
New Commissioners – Revised

Thomas Anderes began his appointment as president of the Arizona Board of Regents in July 2010. Prior to this, Anderes served as senior vice president for administration and fiscal affairs at the University of Wisconsin System, taking that post in 2008. He also served as senior vice president for administration and finance at the Oregon University System and at the University and Community College System of Nevada, where he was interim chancellor from 1999 to 2000. Anderes was assistant director of university budgets at Arizona State University from 1978 to 1983. He received a Ph.D. in higher education administration from the University of Connecticut and his B.A. and M.P.A. from the University of Arizona.

Susan A. Anderson is the president and CEO of the CIRI Foundation in Anchorage, AK, an organization that provides programs that promote individual economic self-sufficiency and cultural pride through education among Cook Inlet Region original enrollees and their descendants, as well as grants to nonprofit and tribal organizations. Anderson serves as the chair of the Best Beginnings Early Learning Council, formed to implement the recommendations of the Ready to Read, Ready to Learn Task Force. Her work has been recognized with a number of awards, including the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Senate 2010 Award for Distinguished University Service by a Community Member. Prior to joining the foundation, Anderson was manager of the Continuing Education Programs for SPIE—The International Society for Optical Engineering. She also consulted with National Alliance for Photonics Education in Manufacturing partners around the United States. Anderson received a bachelor’s degree in secondary education and a master’s in adult education administration from Western Washington University. She holds a postgraduate certificate in project management and was selected to attend the Stanford University Executive Program for Philanthropy Leaders.

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

Clayton Christian, chair of the Montana Board of Regents, is the owner and CEO of Stewart Title of Missoula and a district manager for Stewart Title Guaranty, overseeing the company’s agency relationships in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. A Montana native, born and raised in the Mission Valley, he worked his way through college on a ranch. He earned a bachelor’s degree from the University of Montana’s School of Business Administration.

Kim Gillan has been a member of the Montana Senate since 2005, serving as minority whip and in other positions (she was a state representative from 1997 to 2004). In addition, she is the workforce development and training coordinator at Montana State University Billings’s College of Professional Studies and Lifelong Learning, responsible for the design and administration of workforce training and certification programs for diverse clients in the greater Billings region. Previously, she served as an independent management consultant, a policy analyst, an energy analyst for the State of Texas, and in other posts. She received a B.A. from the University of California, Los Angeles, and a master’s in regional planning and development from Cornell University.

Jim Johnsen is the senior vice president of administration at Doyon, Ltd., in Fairbanks, AK, with responsibility for shareholder relations, human resources, information technology, strategic planning, and marketing and communications. Johnsen joined Doyon in 2008 after 12 years at the University of Alaska (UA), where he served in several executives roles. He remains on the faculty of the UA Geography Program and is member of the State Committee on Research and several other university committees. Johnsen’s education includes an undergraduate degree from the University of California, Santa Cruz, a master’s from the University of Chicago, and a doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania.
M. Duane Nellis was appointed University of Idaho’s 17th president in 2009. As the university’s chief executive officer, he provides robust and engaging leadership for the University of Idaho by supporting 42 statewide extension offices and university satellite locations in Boise, Coeur d’Alene, Post Falls, Twin Falls, and Idaho Falls; working with the WWAMI (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho) program to ensure that medical education in Idaho is supported; and engaging with university alumni, friends, and donors around the world. Previously, Nellis served as provost and senior vice president of Kansas State University. He also served for seven years at West Virginia University as dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. Nellis is recognized nationally and internationally for his research utilizing satellite data and geographic information systems to analyze various dimensions of the Earth’s land surface. He has been further recognized internationally for his research and teaching through numerous awards. He received his bachelor’s degree in geography at Montana State University and his master’s and doctoral degrees in geography at Oregon State University.

Sheila M. Stearns is Montana’s commissioner of higher education. Early in her career, she taught in American Department of Defense schools before returning to Montana, where she served as the school librarian at Whittier Elementary School in Missoula. Her career with the Montana University System started in 1983, when she was appointed alumni director for the University of Montana. She was promoted to vice president for university relations in 1987, representing the University of Montana to the Montana Legislature for several sessions. In 1993 she was appointed provost and then chancellor of the University of Montana-Western; during her tenure, the university developed a master facilities plan, secured funding for the Swysgood Technology Center, and achieved full accreditation in teacher education by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. In 1999 she assumed the presidency of Wayne State College in Wayne, NE, where she served until returning to Montana as commissioner of higher education in 2003. Stearns attended the University of Montana, earning her B.A. in English, M.A. in history, and an Ed.D.

Steven C. Wheelwright became the 9th president of Brigham Young University Hawaii in 2007. He and Brigham Young University Hawaii have been charged to continue to improve the quality of the education delivered and efficiently utilize the resources of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in order to bless the lives of as many students as possible. The Edsel Bryant Ford Professor of Business Administration (emeritus) at Harvard Business School, Wheelwright is a former senior associate dean of the business school’s MBA program, Baker Foundation professor, and director of school’s publication activities. His research and experience have given him world-recognized expertise in solving complex managerial problems and foreseeing future business trends. He has written several books with colleagues, including Strategic Management of Technology and Innovation, 4th ed.; Operations, Strategy, and Technology – Pursuing the Competitive Edge; and Dynamic Manufacturing: Creating the Learning Organization.
ACTION ITEM
Minutes of the Committee of the Whole

Session I: Call to Order
Monday, May 17, 2010

Commissioners Present
Thomas Buchanan (WY), chair
Joseph Garcia (CO), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), immediate past chair

Diane Barrans (AK)
Patricia Brown Heller (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Josephl Sideman (AZ)
Roy Ashburn (CA)
Jim Silva (CA)
Kaye Howe (CO)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Roberta Richards (HI)
Michael Rush (ID)
Dan Harrington (MT)
Mary Sheehy Moe (MT)
Dede Feldman (NM)
Viola Florez (NM)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Duaine Espegard (ND)
William Goetz (ND)
David Nething (ND)
Robert Burns (SD)
James Hansen (SD)
Jack Warner (SD)
Ryan Deckert (OR)
Tim Nesbitt (OR)
Camille Preus (OR)
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT)
Peter Knudson (UT)
William Sederburg (UT)
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (WA)
Deborah Hammons (WY)
Klaus Hanson (WY)

Guests/Speakers
Michael Dembrow, state representative and WICHE LAC member, Oregon House of Representatives
Richard Hezel, president, Hezel Associates
Karen Humphrey, executive director, California Postsecondary Education Commission
Sandra Luca, research associate, Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California
Louise Lynch, certifying officer, Arizona Board of Regents
Jeanine Sherrick, certifying officer, Nevada System of Higher Education
Lisa Shipley, certifying officer, University of Wyoming
Craig Vaske, advising coordinator, University of Wyoming
Wim Wiewel, president, Portland State University
Becke Wolf, certifying officer, Utah System of Higher Education

Staff Present
Erin Barber, executive assistant to the president and to commission
Louis Fox, vice president, Technology and Innovation
David Longanecker, president
Mimi McFaul, associate director, Mental Health Program
Mollie McGill, associate 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
Brian Prescott, director of policy research, Policy Analysis and Research
Margo Schultz, director, Student Exchange Programs
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE and WALF
Brandi Van Horn, research analyst, Policy Analysis and Research
Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET

Commissioners Absent
Steven Wheelwright (HI)
Robert Kustra (ID)
Arthur Vailas (ID)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Warren Hardy (NV)
Ann Daley (WA)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)
Chair Thomas Buchanan called the meeting to order and welcomed the commissioners. Portland State University President Wim Wiewel provided opening remarks and welcomed commissioners, staff, and guests to Portland State University.

Chair Buchanan introduced three newly appointed commissioners in attendance:

- Roy Ashburn, state senator, California State Senate
- D. Rico Munn, executive director, Colorado Department of Higher Education
- Jim Silva, assemblyman, California State Assembly

Also newly appointed, but not in attendance, was Steven Wheelwright, president of Brigham Young University of Hawaii (he will attend the November meeting).

Chair Buchanan introduced guests attending the meeting and listed commissioners whose terms were expiring after the May 2010 meeting.

**ACTION ITEM**

Approval of the Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes of November 2-3, 2009

Commissioner Lorenz moved TO APPROVE THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 2-3, 2009. Commissioner Rush seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Chair Buchanan announced chair and vice chair appointments for the commission committees:

- Programs and Services Committee:
  - Carl Shaff, chair
  - Diane Barrans, vice chair

- Issue Analysis and Research Committee:
  - Robert Burns, chair
  - Jeanne Kohl-Welles, vice chair

- Self-funded Units Committee:
  - Kaye Howe, chair
  - James Hansen, vice chair

**Report of the President**

David Longanecker introduced staff attending the meeting and announced staff changes.

The first session of the Committee of the Whole was concluded, and the committee went into recess until Tuesday, May 18.
Chair Thomas Buchanan called the meeting to order and reconvened the Committee of the Whole.

Report and Recommended Action of the Audit Committee

Committee Chair Jane Nichols reported that the Audit Committee met on Sunday, May 16, prior to the commission meeting. The Audit Committee elected to retain Clifton Gunderson for the FY 2010 audit and approved the letter of engagement provided by Clifton Gunderson, outlining the terms and fees of the FY 2010 audit. The Audit Committee plans to meet in the fall, before the November meeting, to consider sending out an RFP to select a new auditing firm. The committee reviewed the committee charter and code of ethics. It was decided that the president of WICHE would be asked to sign the President’s Code of Ethics. Nichols reported that there was some discussion on whether or not the commissioners should sign the Commission Code of Ethics; there will be more discussion on this at the November meeting.

Report and Recommended Action of the Executive Committee

Chair Buchanan reported that the Executive Committee continued its discussion of a deferred compensation and salary proposal for the WICHE president. At the November commission meeting in Boulder, the Executive Committee considered a salary proposal presented by the Compensation Committee that would put a plan in place to bring...
the president’s salary more in line with other organizations, in an effort to make WICHE competitive when the time came to seek a successor for Longanecker’s position and to provide him with an incentive to stay with WICHE for the duration of the plan. Several suggestions came out of the conversation: 1) the salaries used for the comparison data should be for organizations like WICHE, instead of national organizations such as the National Governors’ Association or the Association of Governing Boards, or campus/institutional CEOs; 2) the target salary for the WICHE CEO should be higher than average to keep WICHE competitive; 3) the plan should be phased in over time, beginning in 2011; and 4) the plan should be sensitive to current economic circumstances.

The Executive Committee is considering a five-year plan that would phase in incremental increases, beginning in FY 2011. The proposal uses the average of the median salaries of the WICHE-state SHEEOs, the CEOs of the State Higher Education Policy Center (SHEPC), and the CEOs of the Midwestern Higher Education Compact, New England Board of Higher Education, and Southern Regional Education Board. The average of the median salaries of these groups is $193,753 (Longanecker’s current salary is $180,295). The 60th percentile for the three groups is $207,935. The plan would enable WICHE to be competitive when it’s time to hire Longanecker’s successor. The proposal also gradually shifts the financial burden from the WICHE reserves to the general fund budget by the time it’s fully implemented in 2015. In addition, the incremental increases would either be put aside as deferred compensation, to be used as an incentive to keep Longanecker in his current position for the next five years; or they’d function as salary increases over the course of the five years. Commissioner Warner moved TO APPROVE THE YEAR-BY-YEAR INCREMENTAL INCREASE TO GRADUALLY MOVE THE PRESIDENT’S COMPENSATION TO THE 60TH PERCENTILE ($207,935). Commissioner Barrans seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a majority. Commissioner Moe voted nay.

The Executive Committee discussed David Longanecker’s proposal for FY 2012 and FY 2013 WICHE dues (outlined on p. 10-12 of the agenda book). The plan proposes keeping FY 2012 dues at $125,000 and instituting a 5 percent increase to $131,000 for FY 2013 dues, contingent upon improved budgets in at least one-half of the WICHE states. Commissioner Preus seconded the motion. Commissioner Hammons asked for clarification on whether the improvement of state budgets would be measured by an increase in state revenues. Longanecker said that by the time dues need to be considered for FY 2013, states will only know their revenue projections. Commissioner Ogawa said clarity was needed on the motion to determine a time limit, so that there would be no dispute later on. Longanecker said his presumption was that the best proxy in terms of looking at a state’s condition in the fall of 2011 would be revenue estimates for FY 2013 – compared to the budgets approved and being executed for FY 2012 in the fall of 2011. Commissioner Nichols said that Nevada has to submit the dues amount in their budget request very soon and thought it would be wise to put in the higher amount for FY 2013, just in case they are able to make the increase. Longanecker said that projected revenues out of the legislative or governor’s offices seemed to be the best estimate for states because they tend to be more conservative and more reliable. Commissioner Barrans moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2012 AND 2013 PLAN TO INCREASE WICHE DUES AS OUTLINED ON P. 10-12 OF THE AGENDA BOOK. The motion was approved unanimously.

David Longanecker discussed the need to consider staff salaries next year. WICHE staff members are entering their third year of flat salaries (and increased health benefit costs). Longanecker thought that beyond fiscal year 2011, he would have to start considering cutting staffing levels in an effort to increase resources for staff salaries because staff simply can’t afford and shouldn’t have to afford another year with no salary increases.

Chair Buchanan reported that Longanecker had brought before the Executive Committee a request to draw $38,000 from the undedicated reserves to cover the upfront cost of connecting WICHE to Internet2 with UCAR. The connection to Internet2 would significantly increase WICHE’s broadband capacity and would also be a cost-saving measure, providing the access and connectivity for a lower cost than what is currently paid. Commissioner Hansen moved TO APPROVE THE REQUEST TO DRAW UP TO $38,000 FROM THE RESERVES TO COVER THE COST OF CONNECTING TO INTERNET2. Commissioner Bornstein seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Report and Recommended Action of the Programs and Services Committee

Committee Chair Carl Shaff reported that Jere Mock had given a presentation on the 2011 workplan for the Programs and Services unit. Commissioner Shaff moved TO APPROVE THE 2011 WORPLAN SECTIONS PERTAINING TO THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES UNIT. Commissioner Barrans seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Shaff reported that WICHE staff is proposing a 1.5 percent increase for the Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) support fees for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. The increase is in line with the 2008-2009
HECA (higher education cost adjustment) increase developed by SHEEO. Commissioner Shaff moved TO APPROVE THE 1.5 PERCENT INCREASE FOR PSEP SUPPORT FEES IN FY 2011-12 AND FY 2012-13. Commissioner Sideman seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Shaff reported that WICHE submitted a funding proposal to the U.S. Department of Education’s Investing in Innovation (I3) program to create a new initiative in partnership with secondary schools in five states: the Western Scholars Program would be patterned after the State Scholars Program, previously operated by WICHE. Commissioner Sideman asked Longanecker to explain the staffing implications of the Western Scholars Program. Longanecker said that the program would add an additional 52 positions: 6.5 positions would be added to WICHE and the remaining positions would be counselors and advisors in school districts throughout the participating states. Longanecker said the implications of receiving funding for this program would be substantial. The revenues would be more than sufficient to cover staffing costs, and the indirect cost recovery would be more than $5 million per year. The program would be administered in conjunction with the Colorado Department of Higher Education. Commissioner Shaff moved TO APPROVE WICHE TO RECEIVE AND EXPEND FUNDS AS THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WESTERN SCHOLARS PROGRAM. Commissioner Warner seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a majority. Commissioner Munn abstained from the vote due to a potential conflict of interest because this program is being pursued in partnership with the Colorado Department of Higher Education.

Commissioner Shaff reported that the Programs and Services committee heard updates on the Western Academic Leadership Forum and the newly developed two-year forum for community colleges. The committee also heard a presentation on health information technology academic programs given by William Hersh, chairman of the Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology at the Oregon Health & Science University.

Report and Recommended Action of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee
Committee Chair Robert Burns reported that the committee had discussed the 2011 workplan sections pertaining to the Policy Analysis and Research unit. The committee made one change to the workplan: taking off the residency policies project from the “On the Horizon” list. Commissioner Burns moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2011 WORKPLAN SECTIONS PERTAINING TO THE POLICY ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH UNIT’S ACTIVITIES. Commissioner Heller seconded the motion. Commissioner Munn asked whether it would be appropriate to add an item specifying the examination of data, policies, and issues related to undocumented students in light of the removal of the item pertaining to residency policies. Longanecker said that some information on undocumented students might be captured in the State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIDO), but that it would be appropriate to add it in to the workplan. Commissioner Munn moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2011 WORKPLAN SECTIONS PERTAINING TO THE POLICY ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH UNIT’S ACTIVITIES WITH THE ADDITION OF RESEARCH INTO UNDOCUMENTED STUDENTS TO THE WORKPLAN. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Burns reported that the Policy unit is optimistically waiting to hear if their proposal to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation will be funded. The project would involve working with four states to develop a multistate data exchange. Commissioner Burns moved TO APPROVE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MULTISTATE LONGITUDINAL DATA EXCHANGE. Commissioner Warner seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Burns reported on a proposed project that would work to increase access and success in higher education to military students in the West. Commissioner Burns moved TO APPROVE THE SERVING STUDENT SOLDIERS OF THE WEST PROJECT. Commissioner Lorenz seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioner Burns reported that WICHE staff gave a review of their work with the Center for Urban Education, the recent factbook survey, and Web portal research follow-up.

Report and Recommended Action of the Self-funded Units Committee
Committee Chair Kaye Howe reported that the committee reviewed the 2011 workplan sections pertaining to the self-funded units. Louis Fox reported on work being done in WICHE Technology and Innovation. It was an integral part of becoming connected to Internet2. The goal is to be self-sustaining in the next year. Dennis Mohatt reported that the Mental Health Program budget is balanced. The program is currently working on 18 projects in various states. The committee received a draft of the new Mental Health brochure. The mental health first aid program is in its second year, with 10 out of 15 WICHE states involved. Ellen Wagner reported on work she’s doing in WCET, specifically trying to become more integrated with WICHE. She reported that staffers are working on a new branding for WCET and expect to officially launch it sometime in July. Other projects within WCET include a focus group series for corporate
members, possible new funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, CatalystCamp and the annual fall meeting. Wagner hopes to have the WCET budget balanced by May 2011. Commissioner Howe moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2011 WORKPLAN SECTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SELF-FUNDED UNITS’ ACTIVITIES. Commissioner Hansen seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

**ACTION ITEM**
Approval of the FY 2011 Annual Operating Budget 
General Fund and Non-General Fund Budgets

Craig Milburn reported that the Legislative Advisory Committee has been added to the general fund budget, as previously approved by the commission. The balance of the reserves is $1.1 million. Only one-third of WICHE’s budget is shown in the general fund budget; the remaining two-thirds of the budget is in project areas. Commissioner Espegard asked how WICHE handles the delinquent dues within the budget. Milburn said that WICHE projected to not receive the dues this year but that the dues are budgeted as revenue. The auditors have to be convinced that it is conceivable that we’ll receive them as revenue. Longanecker shared with the committee the history behind the delinquent dues from the California Community College System. Commissioner Shaff moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2011 ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET AND GENERAL AND NON-GENERAL BUDGETS. Commissioner Ogawa seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

**ACTION ITEM**
Approval of Salary and Benefit Recommendations for FY 2011

Commissioner Nething moved TO APPROVE THE SALARY AND BENEFIT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 2011. Commissioner Moe seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

**ACTION ITEM**
Approval of the FY 2011 Workplan

Commissioner Espegard moved TO APPROVE THE FY 2011 WORKPLAN. Commissioner Shaff seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Chair Buchanan told the committee that the meeting evaluation would be sent via email. Longanecker reminded the committee that the next commission meeting will be November 8-9, 2010, in Boulder, CO, at the SHEPC offices. Longanecker also thanked the Oregon commissioners for their hospitality and Chancellor Pernsteiner for his help in hosting the WICHE Commission at Portland State University.

The Committee of the Whole was adjourned.
Monday, November 8, 2010

9:30 - 10:45 am
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100

Plenary Session I:
What’s Up in the West? Applying Utah’s Tuning Process to a Broader Agenda: An Awesome Presentation

As we focus this commission meeting’s general sessions on student-learning outcomes, one exciting development warrants special attention. Utah is one of three states, and the only Western state, working on “tuning” specific fields of study to assure that all Utah institutions at least meet a set of uniform student-learning outcomes for graduates with majors in those fields. Tuning is a concept that has been developed in the European Union to assure that standards in student-learning outcomes are met by students from different institutions in different countries.

Speakers: Phyllis “Teddi” Safman, assistant commissioner for academic affairs, Utah System of Higher Education; and William Sederburg, commissioner, Utah System of Higher Education

Biographical Information on the Speakers

Phyllis “Teddi” Safman is the assistant commissioner for academic affairs with the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE). Her responsibilities include: transfer, articulation, and assessment of general education; No Child Left Behind; teacher education and K-16 articulation; and the Tuning Project, an outgrowth of the Bologna Process and the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U’s) Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative. She works with faculty from 32 academic disciplines on issues ranging from student persistence and completion to competencies, essential learning outcomes (AAC&U), and teaching practices. Safman works with faculty-led state efforts to create transfer and articulation policy to assure students in the USHE of a seamless transfer from two- to four-year studies. Although a musician by former training, Safman received a Ph.D. in continuing and adult education from the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Formerly an associate dean of continuing education at the University of Utah, she held leadership positions in adult and continuing education nationally, regionally, and statewide. She joined the commissioner’s staff in 1993, with a short break to work in accreditation and strategic planning in Washington, D.C., and Chicago. She serves on the Western Academic Leadership Forum and teaches a graduate course on organization and governance in higher education at the University of Utah.

William A. Sederburg began serving as Utah’s commissioner of higher education in 2008. Prior to this he was president of Utah Valley University (UVSC, formerly Utah Valley State College), beginning in 2003. At UVSC he received approval for the institution’s mission and name change; reorganized the college’s administration; and instituted a planning, budget, and accountability process, among
other accomplishments. He also taught and lectured at several colleges in Michigan before becoming the 16th president of Ferris State University in Big Rapids in 1994. In addition, he served in the Michigan State Senate, where he tackled education issues with various state initiatives. He involved academic administrators in statewide economic, employment, and technological issues. He also served as chair of the Midwestern Higher Education Commission, where he worked to increase educational opportunities in the Midwestern states. Sederburg earned a bachelor’s degree from Mankato State University and a master’s degree and a doctorate (both in political science) from Michigan State University.
Monday, November 8, 2010

11.00 am - 12.00 noon
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100

Plenary Session II:
What’s Up at WICHE? Common Core Standards and What They Mean for the West

This past June the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) launched a new national initiative to adopt Common Core Standards for all American students, grades K-12, in English-language arts and mathematics. To date, the governors of all but two states (Alaska and Texas) have endorsed this effort, which has the potential of substantially improving the preparation of students for future success in college and the world of work.

Despite being designed to assure that students come to college prepared to succeed, higher education has been only modestly engaged in the development of these standards, and few leaders in higher education understand well their implications for their states or institutions. Yet for a variety of reasons, higher education’s engagement in this effort is essential to its ultimate success. First, implementing these standards will certainly affect higher education in many ways, impacting the future demand for and configuration of remedial/developmental education, the demands on the preparation of students training to become teachers, and the development and alignment of standards that will almost certainly follow within higher education. Second and equally important, success in implementing these K-12 standards will require an uncommon level of interaction and, indeed, accommodation between the K-12 sector and higher education. Higher education, therefore, must be proactive in helping to define a path for students that is mutually understood and appreciated in all sectors of the education system.

One higher education leader who has not been absent from the development of these standards is Paul Lingenfelter, president of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). Lingenfelter, along with other higher education leaders, including representatives from the American Council on Education, while invited late to the game, have been active in helping to assure that legitimate concerns and needs from higher education have been attended to in the development of these standards. Lingenfelter will join us to discuss the development of these Common Core Standards and what they mean for higher education in the West.

Speaker: Paul Lingenfelter, president, State Higher Education Executive Officers
Biographical Information on the Speaker

Paul E. Lingenfelter’s work as president of SHEEO has focused on successful participation in higher education, accountability, and finance. Under his leadership SHEEO organized and staffed the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, which in 2005 issued its report *Accountability for Better Results: A National Imperative for Higher Education*. He previously served as vice president of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, where he established and led the MacArthur Foundation Program on Human and Community Development. Earlier, Lingenfelter served as deputy director for fiscal affairs for the Illinois Board of Higher Education. He received an A.B. from Wheaton College in literature, an M.A. from Michigan State University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in higher education. He currently serves on the boards of the National Student Clearinghouse and the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability.
Lunch and Presentation

The commission meeting falls one week after the 2010 elections. William Pound, executive director of the National Conference of State Legislatures, will join us at lunch to discuss the results of the election and the likely consequences thereof.

Speaker: William Pound, executive director, National Conference of State Legislatures

Biographical Information on the Speaker

William Pound has served as the executive director of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) since 1987. He has been with the conference since its founding in 1975 and has been instrumental in the development of many of its innovative programs and services designed for legislators, legislative leaders, and legislative staff. Pound has researched and written extensively on legislatures and the legislative process and fiscal and public finance issues. He speaks to both national and international audiences on topics of state government fiscal conditions, public policy issues, and the activities of state legislatures and federalism.

NCSL was created by the 50 state legislatures to represent their interest on the federal level and to develop greater interstate communication and cooperation. NCSL maintains a Washington, D.C., office, which represents state legislatures on state-federal issues, and a Denver office that works on state issues and priorities. NCSL provides a wide range of services to legislatures, including direct project assistance, research information, and publications.
Monday, November 8, 2010

1.30 - 3.00 pm
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100

Plenary Session III:
Accountability Systems and Student Learning Outcomes

Most folks would agree that student learning should be assessed. The disagreements occur over who is responsible for making such assessments, what they should be, when they should be performed, and where they should be done. David Longanecker will lead a discussion of these four different questions, providing the lay of the land in the current environment of American higher education (with a tad of discussion about what is happening elsewhere in the world).

Speaker: Peter Ewell, vice president, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

Biographical Information on the Speaker

Peter T. Ewell is Vice President of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). Dr. Ewell’s work focuses on assessing institutional effectiveness and the outcomes of college. He has directed many projects on this topic, including initiatives funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the National Institute for Education, the Ford Foundation, the Lumina Foundation, and the Pew Charitable Trusts. In addition, he has consulted with over 375 colleges and universities and twenty-four state systems of higher education on topics related to performance indicators and the assessment of student learning. Dr. Ewell has authored seven books and numerous articles on these topics. In addition, he has prepared commissioned papers for many state agencies and national organizations. A graduate of Haverford College, he received his Ph.D. in Political Science from Yale University in 1976 and was on the faculty of the University of Chicago.
Programs and Services Committee Meeting

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

Committee vice chair (AK)
Thomas Anderes (AZ)
Roy Ashburn (CA)
Joseph Garcia (CO)
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Agenda

Presiding: Carl Shaff, chair
Staff: Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Margo Schultz, director, Student Exchange Program
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE and Western Academic Leadership Forum

Action Item

Approval of the Programs and Services Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2010

Discussion Items:

The Master Property Program: Helping institutions to reduce costs and increase their asset protection – Jere Mock

Speakers: Elizabeth Conlin, senior vice president and client executive, Marsh USA; Jon Hansen, WICHE consultant and retired risk manager, Nevada System of Higher Education

New developments in student transfer – Pat Shea

Speaker: Stephen J. Handel, senior director of higher education relationship development and community college initiatives at the College Board
Information Items:
Programs and Services regional initiatives: WICHE ICE, Western Academic Leadership Forum, and the Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders – Pat Shea 7-8

Student Exchange Programs update – Margo Schultz 7-13

Other business

Adjournment
ACTION ITEM
Programs and Services Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday, May 17, 2010

Committee Members Present
Carl Shaff (NV), chair
Diane Barrans (AK)
Joel Sideman (AZ)
Roy Ashburn (CA)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Michael Rush (ID)
Dede Feldman (NM)
Duaine Espegard (ND)
Jack Warner (SD)
Bonnie Jean Beesley (UT)
Klaus Hanson (WY)

Committee Members Absent
Joseph Garcia (CO), vice chair
Vacancy (MT)
Tim Nesbitt (OR)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)

Guests: WICHE Certifying Officers
Louise Lynch (AZ)
Jeannine Sherrick (NV)
Becke Wolf (UT)
Lisa Shipley (WY)
Craig Vaske (WY)

Guest Speaker
William Hersh, M.D., professor and chairman, Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology, Oregon Health & Science University

Staff Present
Jere Mock, vice president, Programs and Services
Margo Schultz, director, Student Exchange Programs
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE and Western Academic Leadership Forum

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

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

ACTION ITEM
Approval of Programs and Services Workplan for FY 2011

Jere Mock presented highlights of the Programs and Services unit’s workplan for FY 2011. WICHE’s Student Exchange Programs broaden educational access for nearly 26,000 students annually. These include the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE), the Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP), and the Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP). The WICHE Internet Course Exchange (ICE), the newest exchange, enables institutions to broaden access to online courses and programs through a regional network of institutions. New institutions and programs are being recruited to participate in each of the programs; a new support fee model is being explored for PSEP; and new strategies to address emerging state workforce needs through multistate collaborations are under consideration. WICHE’s Western Academic Leadership Forum (formerly the Northwest Academic Forum) provides academic leaders in the WICHE region a venue to share information, resources, and expertise as they address issues of common concern and work together on innovative solutions. Forty-seven institutions, systems, and coordinating/governing boards participate. The forum’s new counterpart for academic leaders of two-year institutions, systems, and state boards was launched in April 2010. An executive committee, with one representative from each state, will identify initial areas of focus, define member services, help recruit members, and explore potential funding sources during FY 2011 for this consortium.

WICHE also engages institutions and state agencies in several cost-savings initiatives. Staff members are working to expand the Western institutions’ participation in the Midwestern Higher Education Compact’s (MHEC’s) Master Property Program, a property insurance and risk management consortium. WICHE also partners with MHEC to enable institutions, K-12 entities, and government agencies to buy hardware and software from the MHECtech purchasing collaborative through an array of competitively bid contracts for hardware, software, and technology services from several industry-leading companies. Staff is exploring the potential for a regional program that would promote interstate collaborations around energy-saving initiatives and the development of new academic programs to support alternative/sustainable energy workforce development. Strategies to achieve greater economies of scale
around targeted administrative functions at the institutional and state agency level are other cost-saving efforts under consideration.

Mock also reported on communications’ activities incorporated in the FY 2011 workplan. Further development of the redesigned WICHE Website is planned, along greater use of social media and a continuation of the electronic dissemination of publications spanning a range of topics, as well as WICHE’s annual report, state factsheets, and other materials.

A motion was made by Commissioner Barrans TO APPROVE THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES’ 2011 WORKPLAN. Commissioner Sideman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**ACTION ITEM**

**Approval of Support Fees for PSEP for 2011-12 and 2012-13**

Margo Schultz, director of WICHE’s three Student Exchange Programs, reviewed the fee-setting process for WICHE’s Professional Student Exchange Program. She explained that the proposed increase is based on the HECA inflation index, which climbed by 1.5 percent between 2008 and 2009. Support fee setting is a balancing act. The goal is to keep students’ financial burden as low as possible; meet public institutions’ tuition differentials so that they have sufficient incentive to save seats for WICHE students; and keep support fee rates affordable for states so that they can support as many PSEP students as possible.

In fields where the resident/nonresident tuition differential is not met at several public institutions, staff typically proposes base fee adjustments. However, staff decided not to propose any base fee increases for 2011 or 2012 because of the economic difficulties experienced by most WICHE states, and for other reasons, outlined below. Feedback on the proposed fees was solicited from the deans of the participating schools and the state higher education agencies. Staff then analyzed the feedback, made adjustments, and notified all affected parties of the proposed fees and the timeline for WICHE Commission review.

Schultz explained that the evaluation of support fee levels for this round of fee-setting was problematic in several fields: dentistry, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and physician assistant.

As in May 2008, WICHE staff has concern about not increasing support fees beyond the 1.5 percent for dentistry, given that nonresident differentials are no longer being covered by the support fee at some of the institutions: University of Colorado Denver (32 WICHE students), University of Nevada, Las Vegas (0), and the University of Washington (5). However, the resident/nonresident tuition differentials at these schools are significantly greater than at other public institutions. In most cases the resident tuition is substantially lower than the overall WICHE dentistry school average, contributing to a greater differential.

For the past few years, the University of Colorado Denver’s School of Dentistry has operated under a state policy whereby students who enroll as nonresidents can no longer obtain Colorado residency for their second and subsequent years in school; once a student enrolls at the nonresident rate in their first year, they must remain a nonresident for the duration of their studies. Staff decided not to propose an adjustment increase that would compensate for these large differentials after speaking with some supporting states that send high numbers of dentistry students through the program. Forgoing an adjustment is a calculated risk, as WICHE students could eventually lose access to UC Denver because the institution can obtain the differential from non-WICHE students who are willing to pay the difference.

The majority of WICHE occupational therapy students are enrolled at private institutions (31:3); therefore, staff does not recommend an increase at this time. The same is true of physical therapy (PT): the majority of WICHE students are enrolled at private institutions or at publics where the differential is being met (22:18), so staff is not proposing a base increase in PT. The vast majority of physician assistant students are enrolled at private institutions (18:6), so staff does not recommend an increase in this field either. Tuition differentials are not being met at several of the public institutions enrolling PSEP students in these fields.

Commissioner Barrans asked if WICHE might consider a different model to calculate support fees, given that it is becoming increasingly difficult to meet differentials in public programs in so many of the fields. Schultz responded affirmatively and noted that at the certifying officers’ meeting held the previous day, the group discussed forming
a committee to look at new ways of calculating the fees that would not involved meeting resident/nonresident differentials. Shaff said that the certifying officers’ meeting, they made a unanimous recommendation to support the proposed fee increases and encouraged commissioners to support them as well. All concurred that the proposed increases are necessary in light of the 5 to 15 percent tuition increases that most healthcare professions programs are anticipating for the coming year.

Commissioner Sideman moved TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED INCREASE OF 1.5 PERCENT FOR SUPPORT FEES FOR THE 2011 AND 2012 ACADEMIC YEARS. Commission Hanson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**ACTION ITEM**

**Approval for WICHE to Seek Funding for a Western Scholars Program**

Mock reviewed an action item requesting authorization for staff to seek and receive funding for a new initiative called Western Scholars, as a continuation and expansion of certain aspects of the federally funded State Scholars Initiative. Staff submitted a grant proposal on May 8 to the U.S. Department of Education’s Investing in Innovation competition. The grant requests $29.8 million over five years to serve 2,800 high-need students in 20 high schools in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Utah from 9th grade through their first year of college with intensive academic and student support services. If the grant is received, the students will be required to take a rigorous high school curriculum, will receive frequent tutoring and academic counseling, will be able to enroll in up to six remedial courses, will have opportunities for dual enrollment in college courses, and will participate in credit-based testing options. Several organizations partnered with WICHE to develop this proposal: a consortium of high schools; the Colorado GEAR UP program; the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching at Columbia University’s Teachers College; and the Center for Governmental Studies at Northern Illinois University. The corporate partner for this initiative is Gallup, which will provide an innovative student portal and database along with several assessments that will help students to understand how their talents align with potential majors and careers. The Department of Education plans to announce the awards for the Investing in Innovation competition in September.

Commissioner Sideman moved TO APPROVE THE WESTERN SCHOLARS ACTION ITEM. Commissioner Feldman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Updates and Presentation on the Health IT Workforce**

Schultz said that WICHE staff will solicit additional graduate programs to join the Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP) next fall. Programs must be distinctive or healthcare-related (and not covered in PSEP) for consideration. WICHE staff is especially interested in recruiting programs in graduate nursing, nurse practitioner, health information technology, sustainable energy programs, and professional sciences masters programs. Finally, Schultz encouraged commissioners to take a look at the new PSEP brochure, which was simplified and published in January 2010.

Pat Shea, director of WICHE Internet Course Exchange (ICE) and Western Academic Leadership Forum (WALF), provided updates on the WALF’s recent annual meeting at the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. She also described the new regional forum that WICHE is creating for academic leaders of community colleges and two-year systems and state boards in the West. She and Mock met with the group’s newly appointed executive committee members during the American Association of Community Colleges meeting in April. The committee, composed of one representative per state, will convene again in July at WICHE to further develop the forum’s focus, define member services, and explore potential funding sources. Like the Western Academic Leadership Forum, the new community and technical college forum will be funded from membership dues and grants.

The final highlight of the meeting was a presentation by William Hersh, professor and chair of the Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology in the School of Medicine at Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU). He gave an overview of health information technology (HIT) workforce needs and higher education’s efforts to respond to these needs. He said $84 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds have been awarded recently to 16 universities and community colleges to support the training of more than 50,000 new HIT professionals. The ARRA funding is in support of national goals to adopt electronic health records. Hersh described OHSU’s plans to use a recent federal grant of $5.8 million to create a national dissemination resource for HIT curricula at OHSU and to expand the university’s health informatics programs.
DISCUSSION ITEM

MHEC Master Property Program
Helping Institutions to Reduce Costs and Increase their Asset Protection

In 2004 the WICHE Commission approved expanding the Midwestern Higher Education Compact’s (MHEC’s) property insurance and risk management program to the WICHE region. The MHEC Master Property Program (MPP) was established in 1994 to help colleges and universities to reduce their property insurance costs and broaden their coverage while improving their asset protection strategies. Last year the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE) opted to make the program available to institutions in New England.

The MPP now includes 48 members (with 100 campuses) with total insured values of over $73.1 billion. It has generated more than $59.1 million in savings for the participating institutions. Lexington/Chartis is the program underwriter; Marsh and Captive Resources LLC administer the program under the direction of an oversight committee that is representative of the insured institutions. GAB Robins handles all property claims for the member institutions. Institutions in the WICHE region that are MPP members include:

- Arizona: Pima Community College District
- Colorado: Colorado College
- Nevada: Nevada System of Higher Education, 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 College
- Oregon: Lewis Clark College, Reed College, Willamette University
- Utah: Westminster College
- Washington: Seattle Pacific University
- Wyoming: University of Wyoming

The risk managers at Seattle Pacific University and the University of Wyoming represent the WICHE member institutions on the MPP Oversight Committee. Additional details about the program and its benefits are in the MPP brochure that’s provided in the meeting package.

Staff encourages other systems and institutions in the WICHE region to learn more about the program and seek a quote to determine if the MPP can reduce their insurance and risk management costs. Elizabeth “Beth” Conlin, MPP program administrator and Marsh senior vice president and client executive, will provide an overview of the program during the Programs and Services Committee meeting and will describe its governance, program components and coverages, and cost allocation and dividend elements, as well as the process for seeking program quotes. Jon Hansen, recently retired risk manager of the Nevada System of Higher Education who is assisting WICHE in marketing the program to additional institutions, will be on hand to describe how institutions in Nevada and other members have benefitted from their participation.
DISCUSSION ITEM

New Developments in Student Transfer

There is universal concern among policymakers in the United States about the low college degree completion rates, especially for students who begin their education in two-year institutions. There is also widespread debate about the reasons for these low rates and the extent to which changing the conversation about transfer and articulation could improve the situation.

Although many states have developed or are working on articulation and transfer systems for institutions within their state, there is a lack of multistate partnerships for this purpose. Building on the WICHE and Hezel Associates’ recently completed research on policies and practices in transfer and articulation, funded by Lumina Foundation for Education, WICHE recently applied for a Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant of $749,949 to implement three new transfer and articulation strategies among institutions volunteering to participate across the region. These strategies include:

1. Creating a transfer and articulation process based on mapping general education core curriculum to Liberal Education and America’s Promise’s (LEAP’s) “essential learning outcomes,” authored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

2. Establishing agreements that provide a seamless path into participating four-year schools for students who have earned an A.A. or A.S. degree at a community college in the WICHE region.

3. Developing pathways for students in two pilot disciplines – biology and elementary education – to complete their first 60 hours at community colleges and then transfer to four-year schools for completion.

To provide the larger context on promising new policies and best practices in transfer from a national perspective, and to provide an opportunity for commissioner input on these issues, Stephen J. Handel, senior director of Higher Education Relationship Development and Community College Initiatives at the College Board, will give a presentation during the committee meeting. Handel leads the College Board’s efforts to establish partnerships with higher education institutions and organizations that advance educational access and equity for all students and develops policies and programs that serve community college students and educators. Prior to joining College Board, Handel served as the University of California system’s first director of community college transfer enrollment planning and undergraduate outreach.
INFORMATION ITEM
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 11 institutional members and four consortia members for an overall impact on more than 30 institutions.

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) as well as a common retail price (the price institutions charge a student for a seat) for enrolling in courses in the program.

ICE 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. By aggregating enrollment across two or more institutions, the enrollment can be high enough to make these courses or programs sustainable. Areas of interest include social work, STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) education, Native American studies, business, and foreign languages. A proposal to the National Science Foundation to pilot cross-campus development of, and sharing enrollment in, two online lab courses in science is pending. Both the Nursing Education Xchange (NEXus) and the Colorado Department of Labor/ U.S. Department of Labor demo project continue to use ICE to make more online courses responding to workforce needs available to students at their home institutions. The latter will conclude its work in December.

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.

ICE members include:

- Adams State College (CO)
- Arizona Universities Network
- Bismarck State College (ND)
- Boise State University (ID)
- Lewis-Clark State College (ID)
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 via membership dues and a grant from TIAA-CREF.

The Forum Executive Committee met in the WICHE Learning Center September 30 to October 1 to develop the program for annual meeting, to be held April 13-15, 2011, at Colorado State University in Ft. Collins. The agenda for that meeting, “The Politics of Student Success: Meeting the Challenges from Readiness to Completion,” will be available on the Website later this month.

During September and October, WICHE staff built the Academic Leaders Toolkit (www.wiche.edu/alt) from the prototype designed by the Forum Toolkit Committee. This Web-based repository will contain profiles of successful decision-making tools and processes used by academic leaders and will be an important strategic-planning resource for them. Tools in a broad range of categories – such as program evaluation, creation and elimination; faculty recruitment and retention; and student outcomes assessment – will help academic leaders better address their increasing range of responsibilities. During the fall the members of the executive committees for both the Forum and the Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders (see below) will invite submissions for the toolkit. A public launch is tentatively planned for January.

More about the Forum’s upcoming annual meeting and general information about the organization can be found at www.wiche.edu/walf.

Current members include:

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

Arizona
- Arizona State University
- Arizona Board of Regents

California
- California State University system

The ICE annual meeting will be held March 10-11, 2011, in Boulder.
Colorado
- Metropolitan State College of Denver
- Colorado State University, Ft. Collins
- Colorado State University, Pueblo

Hawaii
- University of Hawaii system

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

Montana
- Montana State University, Billings
- 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
- South Dakota State University
- The University of South Dakota

Utah
- Utah State Board of Regents
Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders

The Western Alliance of Community College Academic Leaders (the Alliance) held its first official meeting July 7-8, 2010, in the WICHE Learning Center. Its members include academic leaders of two-year schools and their related systems and state coordinating and governing boards. Modeled after the Western Academic Leadership Forum, which donated $10,000 in seed money to launch the Alliance, it provides 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 the July meeting, the members developed a mission statement and set the goals and objectives for the organization. In addition, they defined the pressing need for a project addressing transfer and articulation across the West. As a result WICHE submitted a proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), requesting $749,976 for a three-year project to create a WICHE Interstate Passport that would reframe the conversation about the transfer and articulation process to one based on student outcomes. Institutions will participate on a voluntary basis. If successful, the project will serve as a national model.

During this initial year, a leadership team of three serves as chair. A listserv facilitates communication among the members. Like the Forum, the Alliance is soliciting submissions for the Academic Leaders Toolkit (www.wiche.edu/alt), tentatively planned for public launch in January.

More information about the organization can be found at www.wiche.edu/waccal.

Charter members with representatives on the Alliance Executive Committee are:

- Alaska: University of Alaska, Fairbanks
- Arizona: Coconino Community College
- California: California Community Colleges
- Colorado: Colorado Community College system
- Hawaii: University of Hawaii Manoa
- 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
INFORMATION ITEM
Student Exchange Programs Update

Western Undergraduate Exchange

The Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) is a regional tuition-reciprocity agreement that enables students from WICHE states to enroll in participating two- and four-year public institutions at 150 percent of the enrolling institution’s resident tuition. WUE has been operating for 23 years and is the largest program of its kind in the nation. The program continues to thrive: in 2009-10, 24,670 WUE students and their families saved some $173.4 million in tuition costs. Students can choose from some 145 participating WUE institutions.

WUE institutions report their WUE enrollments through October. WICHE staff will have estimates of the 2010-11 academic year enrollments for the November 2010 commission meeting. We anticipate that enrollments will continue to increase. Given the pressures on the California higher education system, California residents are very interested in enrolling through WUE.

Western Regional Graduate Program

The Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP) is an outstanding educational resource for the West, allowing master’s, Ph.D., and graduate certificate students who are residents of the 15 participating states to enroll in some 220 high-quality programs at some 45 participating institutions on a resident tuition basis. In fall 2009 502 students enrolled through WRGP. Staff is still finalizing fall 2010 enrollment numbers for WRGP programs but anticipates an increase, largely due to the fact that California residents became eligible to enroll through WRGP in fall 2009, thanks to California State University East Bay’s offering of two WRGP programs.

WRGP is a tuition-reciprocity arrangement similar to WUE, in that students can enroll directly in the program through WRGP and are not dependent upon the approval of their home state funding to participate. This represents 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. Fifty-two WRGP programs are healthcare-related, in 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).

WICHE staff invited public institutions in the WICHE region to nominate their graduate programs for participation in the WRGP network in September 2010. Notification was sent to graduate deans, provosts, academic vice presidents, WICHE state higher education executive offices, and interested department chairs. The nomination deadline is November 1, 2010; staff will report on the nominations at the November meeting.

Professional Student Exchange Program

The Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) provides students in 12 Western states (all WICHE states except California, Oregon, and South Dakota) with access to a wide range of professional programs that otherwise might not be available to them because the fields of study are not offered at public institutions in their home states. PSEP students pay reduced levels of tuition – usually resident tuition in public institutions or reduced tuition at private schools. The home state pays a support fee to the admitting schools to help cover the cost of the students’ education. Each state determines the fields and the number of students it will support. Through 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. During the 2010-11 academic year, some 700 students are enrolled through PSEP, with support fees totaling over $14.3 million (staff will present final numbers at the November commission meeting). The economic recession continues to adversely affect the number of students supported through PSEP, despite the unprecedented need for healthcare professionals. Compared to the previous academic year, numbers appear to have remained constant, with no growth in the number of students supported.
**Student Exchange Programs Marketing**

WICHE staff is developing fresh marketing approaches for WICHE’s Student Exchange Programs. In addition to increasing outreach to prospective students and their parents, WICHE staff also wants to increase awareness with legislators and other stakeholders as to the benefits of tuition reciprocity and student access programs. One strategy involves gathering testimonials on the benefits of the programs from current students, graduates, institutional leaders, and policymakers and posting them on WICHE’s Website. Other strategies involve increasing the programs’ presence in social media and on our WICHE states’ college-mentoring Websites. Finally, staff is increasing its outreach with regional high school counseling associations and is also seeking funding for additional projects, such as a “WUE Ambassadors” program, in which a small number of counselors from WICHE states would be selected to attend a one-day workshop on WICHE’s offerings and become “experts” in their states, tasked with spreading the word about WICHE’s student access programs.

**New Support Fees–Setting Model**

Support fees for WICHE’s Professional Student Exchange Program are currently set to meet the resident/nonresident differentials of our public cooperating programs. It is becoming increasingly difficult to meet these differentials, particularly in a time of reduced state support for higher education. This has become especially problematic with public institutions located in Colorado, Utah, and Washington. 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.

This has prompted WICHE staff to explore a different model for setting support fees. The most straightforward possibility would be to have the institution 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. The effects of such a policy at the current rates would vary, depending on the field. Occupational therapy and physician assistant students would pay slightly more. Students studying dentistry, allopathic medicine, physical therapy, and veterinary medicine would pay slightly less, on average, than under the current model. Students studying osteopathic medicine, optometry, and podiatry would not be affected because WICHE is only working with private institutions in those fields. Pharmacy students enrolling at public institutions that have generously written off the unmet differential with the support fee could be worse off. It will also be important to examine the number of students adversely affected, not just the averages.

To best inform our discussions, staff is working with certifying officers who are also coordinating with their state higher education offices. Staff will also work with representatives from the enrolling programs at our cooperating institutions. And finally, staff discussed their support fees–setting methods with staff of the Southern Regional Education Board, which operates a similar program.

Ultimately, the new proposed model must be simple, with standard fee rates by field (no variation between institutions in the same field), and easy for states to budget on a biennial basis. Commissioners may also want to consider some fee adjustments (either lowering the fee or slightly increasing the fee) to come to a more standardized coverage rate for students across the professions. Staff will keep commissioners apprised of their discussions and will present a discussion item at the May 2011 meeting.
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ACTION ITEM  
**Issue Analysis and Research Committee Minutes**  
**Monday, May 17, 2010**

**Committee Members Present**  
Robert Burns (SD), chair  
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (WA), vice chair  
Viola Florez (NM)  
Dan Harrington (MT)  
David Lorenz (AZ)  
William Sederburg (UT)  
Ryan Deckert (OR)  
Patricia Brown Heller (AK)  
D. Rico Munn (CO)  
William Goetz (ND)  
Deborah Hammons (WY)

**Committee Members Absent**  
Steven Wheelwright (HI)  
Arthur Vailas (ID)  
Jane Nichols (NV)

**Staff Present**  
Brian Prescott, director of policy research, Policy Analysis and Research  
Demarée Michelau, director of policy analysis, Policy Analysis and Research  
Brandi Van Horn, research analyst, Policy Analysis and Research

Chair Burns convened the Issue Analysis and Research Committee on May 17, 2010, and a quorum was established.

**ACTION ITEM**  
**Approval of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee Meeting Minutes of November 2, 2009**

Chair Burns asked members to review and approve the minutes of the previous meeting. Commissioner Heller motioned TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2009, ISSUE ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE MEETING. Commissioner Lorenz seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously by the committee.

**ACTION ITEM**  
**Approval of a New Project:**  
**Facilitating Development of a Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange**

Prescott provided an overview of a new project, *Facilitating Development of a Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange*. The project is a multistate data exchange that will connect K-12, postsecondary, education, and workforce data systems in the following four states: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Hawaii. The project will be funded at approximately $1.5 million over three years by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Commissioner Heller asked if the grant was competitive, and Prescott’s response was that there was no RFP issued for the project. Chair Burns asked if Hawaii’s data was unique in comparison to the rest of the Western states. Prescott stated the Hawaii is like the other states already involved with connecting their K-12 and higher education data systems. Prescott also mentioned that the unit’s goal is to provide a road map for the nation on how to do this sort of data exchange. Prescott and other project members will be looking for additional states to involve as the project moves forward.

Commissioner Goetz moved TO APPROVE THE NEW PROJECT. Commissioner Deckert seconded the motion. The project was approved unanimously.

**ACTION ITEM**  
**Approval of a New Project:**  
**Serving Student Soldiers of the West – Policy and Practice Solutions**

Michelau introduced a new project titled *Serving Student Soldiers of the West – Policy and Practice Solutions*. She explained that the unit would like to engage in a project to increase access to higher education for military personnel and their families, with a focus on the West. The project would be funded at about $1 million over three years, and she is currently considering Lumina Foundation and the Wal-Mart Foundation as potential funders. Michelau stated that the unit plans to collaborate with other organizations that have expertise in this area, such as the Service...
Members Opportunity Colleges and the American Council on Education (ACE). A critical aspect of those partnerships would be the formation of an advisory board. Michelau mentioned that there is a lot of room for more discussion regarding the project and sought permission from the committee to seek funding for the project.

Vice Chair Kohl-Welles asked if seeking funding from Wal-Mart would be controversial and politically sensitive and asked if the unit considered any other funding options. Michelau explained that Wal-Mart has funded other educational organizations in the past, which is why it was considered. She also asked if obtaining funding from Wal-Mart would be problematic for the commission. No one stated that receiving funding from this foundation would present a problem for the commission.

Commissioner Sederburg mentioned that it would behoove the unit to incorporate the academic pathway movement and military training into this project; also, there is some overlap between the military’s standardized tests and the ACT/SAT tests. Michelau indicated that collaborating with organizations such as ACE would assist the unit in addressing some of the issues surrounding standardized testing and transfer credit. ACE has considerable expertise and experience in transcript evaluation for military personnel. A unified approach is important when looking at state-level policy because of the variation in coursework policies by institution and military branch.

Commissioner Florez said she and her colleagues have been working in New Mexico for quite some time to determine how to align military credentials. The legislature has extended eligibility for the state’s financial aid program to military personnel returning from duty. New Mexico has sites on all its campuses that work with military personnel. She expressed support for the project.

Commissioner Lorenz asked if the study will only examine military personnel or if it will include the family members too. Michelau responded that she would like to include family members in the study; however, this will be contingent upon funding.

Commissioner Hammons asked if the unit could support staff salary increases with funding from grants. Prescott responded that they typically try to build an increase of 3 to 4 percent into any grant proposal. Michelau reported that even when the unit has soft money from grants, Longanecker has resisted offering salary increases to individuals who are funded by grants.

Chair Burns asked if there is any potential for funding from the U.S. Department of Defense or similar organizations for this project. Michelau stated that the unit will look to those agencies for funding.

Commissioner Sederburg questioned whether the committee should approve the $1 million amount, given that the project’s budget and activities are not fully developed, rather than simply giving the Policy unit authority to seek funding for a project. Prescott said they believed the committee would want to have some sense of the fiscal scope of the activity and what kind of impact it would have on organizational and staff resources. Vice Chair Kohl-Welles agreed, and suggested that the action item be amended to make it clear that the $1 million is just approximate at this point.

Commissioner Kohl-Welles moved TO APPROVE THE NEW PROJECT, GRANTING AUTHORITY TO SEEK APPROXIMATELY $1 MILLION IN FUNDING OVER THREE YEARS. Commissioner Sederburg seconded the motion. The project was approved unanimously.

ACTION ITEM
Approval of Issue Analysis and Research Activities in the 2011 Workplan

Prescott stated that most of the items in the workplan should be familiar to the commissioners. Michelau mentioned that the unit has been working on the Non-traditional No More project for about three years. Additionally, the unit has submitted a preproposal to Lumina Foundation for a program to increase adult degree completion. The unit has yet to be invited to submit a full proposal. Michelau stated that the unit will build upon the work done in the Non-traditional No More project and will seek additional funding beyond Lumina Foundation if needed.

Prescott mentioned that the Colorado Opportunity Fund (COF) evaluation is basically complete. He chose to leave the project on the workplan until all events associated with it have concluded, including a forthcoming publication in Change magazine, which is a condensed version of the COF report, and a COF presentation at a financial aid research meeting.
Michelau stated that the upcoming Legislative Advisory Committee (LAC) meeting will be held on October 5-6, and that Policy expects good participation. There are states with LAC vacancies, and she will be contacting the commissioners to get those positions filled.

Commissioner Sederburg asked if Michelau and Prescott had a sense of how much WICHE is impacting the states. He asked how many other states are using WICHE data and information. Prescott stated that it depends on the extent to which a state views WICHE as a resource to do things that are outside their routine. For example, the unit worked with Colorado and its COF program. And Hawaii has approached the Policy unit to do some work with data systems. Michelau mentioned that if commissioners know that WICHE staff is working in certain areas, staff can often work commissioners’ projects or ideas into the unit’s grant proposals as well. Commissioner Sederburg asked what instigates the unit’s projects. Prescott said that the unit’s work is typically guided by the commissioners via the workplan and from individual states with specific needs. The Policy unit would be open to exploring ways to respond to the interest of a commissioner if they felt the unit would be well-positioned to provide valuable assistance to the commissioner’s state.

In discussing items that are “on the horizon,” Michelau mentioned that residency policies have been on the workplan for the last five years. The unit tried to get funding to do a study in all 50 states (including with Lumina) but hasn’t been able to get a grant. She asked the commissioners how to handle this issue. Commissioner Sederburg stated that the project would be a really low priority. Commissioner Lorenz added that it sounds like the unit’s plate is pretty full already and he was not sure there would be added value from such a project. Michelau stated that the commissioners could remove the item or leave it on. Commissioner Sederburg asked how many people are in the unit and wondered whether the unit should focus on only a few important items. Prescott mentioned that the “on the horizon” items are brainstorming ideas for potential projects. Michelau stated that some of the work regarding residency policies might be captured in other projects and that it might not make sense for it to remain a standalone project. Commissioner Munn asked what was meant by “residency policies”; if they were policies impacting undocumented students, he was reluctant to remove the item, as it would relevant to the Western states.

Commissioner Deckert moved TO APPROVE THE WORKPLAN UNDER THEIR JURISDICTION FOR EXISTING ITEMS, NEW DIRECTION ITEMS, AND ITEMS ON THE HORIZON, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE “RESIDENCY POLICIES” ITEM. Commissioner Lorenz seconded the motion. The project was approved with 10 in favor and one opposed.

Information and Discussion Items

Prescott described the High School Graduate Projections methods review project, which had already been approved. The unit is considering whether the existing methodology is appropriate and exploring ways to more effectively make the data available to constituents. The unit was under the impression from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation that it was interested in providing funding, but ultimately Gates’ interest was only in funding the data systems project. The unit would move forward with the project using funding already committed by ACT and College Board. The next edition is being planned for the year 2013.

Prescott also described another initiative: A Statement of Common Purpose, in which the Council of Chief State School Officers and State Higher Education Executive Officers would collaborate with other organizations to develop model data standards for K-12 and postsecondary education. Chair Burns asked if the project would address issues such as how to define high school graduation rates. Prescott stated that the project is more about standardizing data elements (i.e., what is a remedial course?).

Next, Prescott reminded the committee that at the previous commission meeting, there was a discussion about the unit’s data resources (the Fact Book, Benchmarks, and Tuition & Fees publications) and the extent to which they remained useful. The unit plans to streamline the Fact Book, ensure the Benchmark’s figures are useful, and streamline the Tuition & Fees report by dramatically reducing the number of tables and weighting the tuition figures by enrollment. Prescott invited the committee to comment on the unit’s plans and review a survey associated with the review. Prescott also mentioned that he has been involved in discussions with Patrick Kelly at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) about their respective data resources. He proposed that WICHE and NCHEMS consider creating a data resource that might be cobranded.

With regard to the Center for Urban Education (CUE) Equity Project, Prescott mentioned that the unit has a subcontract with CUE, which has a grant from the Ford Foundation to support the project. The project examines how
state-level policies impact underrepresented students, using tools created by CUE. Prescott mentioned that there is an affiliates’ program associated with the project and invited the commissioners to provide him with names of early-career policy professionals who might be interested in participating in the project.

Prescott mentioned that as a member of the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative, an advisory board for the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collection within the National Center for Education Statistics, he is aware that there’s interest in looking at whether the IPEDS Human Resource Survey is providing useful information. He invited the committee members to inform him if this resource is beneficial to them.

Finally, Michelau briefed the committee on the Statewide Articulation and Transfer project. She mentioned that Lumina Foundation would like to have a meeting regarding the project next year and that it is interested in determining the effectiveness of Web portals. She solicited feedback on the types of next steps that would be appropriate in this area.

Chair Burns adjourned the meeting.
INFORMATION ITEM

Proposed Project:
Partner in National Research and Development Center on Postsecondary Education and Employment

During the August 2010 Executive Committee conference call, the Policy unit presented an action item that would allow WICHE to partner with the University of Pennsylvania to develop the National Research and Development Center on Postsecondary Education and Employment, in response to a request for proposals from the U.S. Department of Education. The Executive Committee voted approval to seek, receive, and expend funds to support WICHE as the administrator and fiscal agent for the National Data Exchange, an activity to be conducted in partnership with the University of Pennsylvania’s Learning Alliance, NCHEMS, and SHEEO. The proposal was submitted in September 2010 and awards are expected to be announced in January. The following is a description of the proposed project, its relationship to WICHE’s mission, staff impact, and other relevant details.

Project Description

WICHE proposes to build upon its work in developing statewide database networks – particularly its continuing work in developing a four-state pilot multistate data networks for sharing elementary/secondary, postsecondary, and workforce data across state lines – by competing for the U.S. Department of Education’s proposed National Research and Development Center on Postsecondary Education and Employment. WICHE would partner in this effort with the Learning Alliance at the University of Pennsylvania, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) organization. Collectively, these four partners would create, maintain, and nurture a national postsecondary education and employment exchange. This entity, much like the four-state pilot currently underway, would allow all states to share data amongst themselves; but equally important it would allow the research community to examine issues from a state, regional, and national perspective.

Relationship to WICHE Mission

The program directly supports WICHE’s mission to expand educational access and excellence in the West by growing the research capability of WICHE and of other Western researchers into those factors that contribute to expanding access and excellence in the West. This project would expand WICHE’s leadership in the database management arena beyond the work we have accomplished to date under prior and current grants from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Background

In 2007 the Western SHEEOs, at the regional breakfast meeting held that summer in conjunction with the annual SHEEO meeting, suggested that it would be of value to them if WICHE were able to help coordinate and inform the rapidly emerging interest in the development of state student unit databases. Up to that point, most of the attention at the federal level had been focused on the development of stronger state databases for elementary and secondary education. But a number of Western states had begun collaborations between elementary/secondary education and postsecondary education. Indeed, a number of the SHEEOs indicated strong interest within their states in also including data that would follow students into the workforce. At that time there was very little national or federal discussion of databases that were this inclusive; but the Western SHEEOs were unanimous in their support of including workforce data in any efforts that WICHE pursued.

In late 2008 WICHE received a grant from the Gates Foundation to support a collaborative regional effort consistent with the SHEEOs’ interest. In December 2008 WICHE convened a meeting, inviting the individuals from the 15 WICHE states who were responsible for all three levels of data aggregation: elementary/secondary, postsecondary, and employment. Fourteen states participated, and though not all states were fully represented for all three areas, most were. The meeting provided useful information to the states on such issues as privacy requirements, data element alignment, and database governance. One recommendation coming out of the meetings was that WICHE seek funding to explore the possibility of interstate data sharing because the significant interstate mobility of the U.S. population, particularly between contiguous states, limited the utility of discrete state-by-state databases in informing
public policy. All 15 states expressed some level of interest in participating in such an project, but WICHE felt it would be better to begin with a pilot effort, and selected four states (Hawaii, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington), three of them contiguous, to partner in an initial proposed pilot interstate data exchange. WICHE also explored including the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (NSCRC) as a partner in this project because of NSCRC’s exceptional experience and capacity in database management and data storage. Working with the four states and NSCRC, WICHE developed a proposal for the Gates Foundation, for which WICHE received approval and funding in June 2010. These Gates-funded efforts provide the base for WICHE’s partnership with the University of Pennsylvania, NCHEMS, and SHEEO on this proposal to establish a National Data Exchange.

Staff and Fiscal Impact

The proposed National Data Exchange would be one of four components within the National Research and Development Center on Postsecondary Education and Employment. We sought funding of approximately $500,000 per year for a five-year grant period, which would represent approximately 25 percent of the overall funding requested from the federal government for the center. The remaining 75 percent would support the other components of the center, which would include replicating the National Employer Survey, a national network for early identification of employment trends and employer needs, and a technical assistance component to infuse evidence-based practice into the alignment of higher education practice and employment needs. WICHE, as the fiscal agent and operational manager for the National Data Exchange, would garner support for a portion of the salaries and benefits of three current employees and one new employee (totaling 1.2 FTE per year). This presumes that the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center becomes the data repository and provides the matching and de-identification of data for the various state databases. If this does not occur and some or all of these functions are picked up by WICHE, the staff and fiscal resources to WICHE would be substantially larger. WICHE would be fully remunerated for all services provided to this project; thus, no in-kind contribution from WICHE would be required.
INFORMATION ITEM
Update on the Adult Degree Completion Program Network grant

media release

WICHE Awarded a Lumina Foundation Grant to Develop a Learning Network Designed to Help Adults Complete College Degrees

Commitment Focuses on Creating a Learning Network to Share Successful Strategies

Boulder, Colorado — As part of a new nationwide effort, Lumina Foundation for Education has awarded the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) a four-year grant to develop a learning network to support Lumina's Adult Degree Completion strategy. The network will be made up of regional organizations, state agencies, city programs, nonprofit organizations and others working to help those adults who have earned a significant number of college credits but left postsecondary education before finishing return to complete their degrees.

Thirty-seven million Americans between the ages of 25 and 64 have earned some college credits in their effort toward a degree or credential but, for a variety of reasons, have not successfully completed their higher education. While the U.S. job market once eagerly found places for these workers, the "Great Recession" has destroyed that security, yet future workforce needs will require even more degreed employees.

“There is growing evidence that adults who have gone to college but not received a degree are looking for a second chance but need the right kind of information and motivation to help them succeed,” says Lumina President/CEO Jamie Merisotis. “This vital work aligns directly with our goal to increase the proportion of Americans with high-quality degrees or credentials to 60 percent by 2025. Given demographic trends and attainment rates among young adults, it is highly unlikely that the nation can meet its growing need for college-educated workers only by focusing on recent high school graduates.”

Specifically, the network will serve as a mechanism for effective networking, communication, and dissemination of information about successful adult degree completion strategies. It will include an interactive Website; meetings/conferences; Webinars to highlight effective strategies for serving adults; policy briefs and reports on lessons learned; a repository of higher education policies related to adult learners; a listserv to expedite network communications; presentations at regional and national meetings; the use of social and communications media to engage grantees and other stakeholders in relevant discussions; and other activities to be determined once the network is operational.
“With many exciting programs now serving this population, there is a great need to disseminate innovative new strategies and ideas, particularly ideas for which there is evidence of success,” says WICHE President David Longanecker. “As we begin to look toward a recovery from the recession, the need to serve this population is greater than ever before. WICHE is looking forward to providing the forum in which these ideas are shared nationwide.”

WICHE’s grant is one of 19 announced today by Lumina. The new network will include these grantees, plus other states and organizations actively involved in this area, including five states (Arkansas, Colorado, Nevada, North Dakota, and South Dakota) that previously worked closely with WICHE in its related effort, Non-Traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners. Abstracts of all 19 grants are available at www.luminafoundation.org.

About WICHE and Lumina Foundation for Education

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (www.wiche.edu) and its 15 member states work collaboratively to expand educational access and excellence for all citizens of the West. By promoting innovation, cooperation, resource sharing, and sound public policy among states and institutions, WICHE strengthens higher education’s contributions to the region’s social, economic, and civic life. Our programs – Student Exchange, the WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies, Policy Analysis and Research, and Mental Health – are working to find answers to some of the most critical questions facing higher education today. WICHE’s 15 member states include Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Lumina Foundation for Education (www.luminafoundation.org) is committed to enrolling and graduating more students from college—especially low-income students, students of color, first-generation students and adult learners. Our goal is to increase the percentage of Americans who hold high-quality degrees and credentials to 60 percent by 2025. Lumina pursues this goal in three ways: by identifying and supporting effective practice, through public policy advocacy, and by using our communications and convening power to build public will for change.

September 29, 2010

Contact
Demarée Michelau, Director of Policy Analysis
dmichelau@wiche.edu
303.541.0223
DISCUSSION ITEM
Summary of FY 2011 Workplan Activities
Issue Analysis and Research Committee

Existing Activities

Adult degree completion strategy. WICHE will develop and manage a learning network to support Lumina’s Adult Degree Completion Program, composed of 11 “core” and five “affiliated” grants. The network will implement mechanisms for effective networking, communication, and dissemination of the Adult Degree Completion Program. Key components will include: 1) an interactive Website to serve as a resource for grantees and others working to increase adult degree completion; 2) meetings and conferences for grantees and others invited to participate in network activities; 3) Webinars to highlight effective strategies for serving adults; 4) policy 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 once the network is operational, in consultation with Lumina (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 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. Currently, we are examining how we might contemporize the report to allow for the calculation of enrollment-weighted averages and also to make it available online.

Non-traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners. With funding from Lumina Foundation for Education, Non-traditional No More is working with Arkansas, Colorado, Nevada, 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: identifying ready adults and 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).

Legislative Advisory Committee. WICHE created the Legislative Advisory Committee (LAC) in 1995 to inform the WICHE Executive Committee and staff about significant legislative issues related to higher education; provide input on WICHE initiatives; and advise staff on program and participant considerations related to WICHE’s policy workshops. 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. State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIIDO), 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.

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, governor’s 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 has made numerous presentations on its findings (and related demographic information) and continues to respond to media and other inquiries. The unit has also received commitments from its traditional partners, ACT and the College Board, to review the methodology to ensure that the projections continue to be based on the most appropriate data and estimation methods and to 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. Earlier this year 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 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 differs, both options allow CACG states the opportunity to learn from each other, share best practices and lessons learned, and receive current, evidence-based research. The CACG Consortium is composed of Alaska and Wyoming, and the CACG Network is made up of Alaska, Nevada, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. States are still welcome to join either the consortium or network.


Association for the Study of Higher Education Institutes on Equity and Critical Policy Analysis. WICHE has partnered with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) at the University of Southern California and the Association for the Study of Higher Education to assist in the development of an Institute on Equity Research Methods and Critical Policy Analysis. The institute expects to engage scholars and researchers on higher education in order to more appropriately and effectively frame the issues of educational inequities for public policy debates.

Education Equity and Postsecondary Student Success: A CUE and WICHE Partnership for Policy Research and Analysis. As subcontractor to CUE, WICHE will assist on this Ford Foundation–funded project aimed at helping states to employ CUE’s innovative approaches for making policies more intentionally equity-minded. WICHE’s responsibilities include: consulting with CUE on the overall direction of the project; gathering state-level data for populating CUE’s data tools; and organizing and leading an affiliates’ program of promising scholars and policy analysts. WICHE is currently analyzing data from the Nevada System of Higher Education to track student progress by race/ethnicity through a set of momentum points (i.e., successful remediation, 30 credits, 60 credits, transfer, etc.) and will use the findings to inform a conversation in Nevada about improving equitable outcomes.

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 Alerts 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.

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 experts 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.

**Knocking at the College Door: Projections of High School Graduates by State and Race/Ethnicity**

*methodology review and expansion.* The Policy Analysis and Research unit is seeking funding to conduct a review
of the cohort survival ratio (CSR) methodology that the Knocking series has used to make projections throughout
its 30-year history. Given changes in data and technology, it is prudent to examine whether there is a better, more
accurate approach to making these projections. In addition, the current proposal includes an effort to expand
the analyses to disaggregate by income and other useful characteristics and to contemporize the delivery of the
projections through a dynamic, Web-based interface.

**Facilitating Development of a Multi-State Longitudinal Data Exchange.** With funding from the Gates
Foundation, this project is working with states (initially, four are proposed – Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Hawaii)
to collaborate on a data exchange that would enable states to track the production, stock, and flow of human capital
at a regional level. Rather than losing track of individuals who move across state lines, this exchange would pioneer
an interoperable data system capable of assessing education and workforce outcomes overall and for targeted
groups – such as underrepresented student populations. WICHE will facilitate the creation of a workable design and a
governance structure that provides the needed analytical capacity while assuring the protection of privacy.

**On the Horizon**

**Exploration of issues related to undocumented students.** WICHE staff will explore data, policies, and issues
related to undocumented students, as this is an issue that is of interest and concern to policymakers and higher
education leaders in the West.

**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. A few 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.

**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 bring them to scale.

**Developing more effective Web portals.** WICHE and WCET are currently examining state Web portals designed to
help students navigate the transfer process. Future work will build on this effort.

**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 times. 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 the 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.
Policy and Mental Health collaboration on recidivism reduction in the prison population. State corrections policy has endured significant changes in the past 25 years. Historically, it was based on a belief that those who are incarcerated should be rehabilitated if possible. But 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 has 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 taking 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 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) and in conducting research on the efficacy of such efforts.

Forging collaborations between Western higher education agencies and institutions and state departments of labor and workforce development. The Policy Analysis and Research unit recently wrapped up the Ford Foundation–funded project called Escalating Engagement, which in part focused on highlighting higher education’s workforce development mission. It 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 proposing a new project that more explicitly focuses 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 those 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 related to workforce development and higher education but also how state-level and federal policies related to the two areas can be made complementary. The Policy Analysis and Research unit is interested in pursuing the capacity to build upon its expertise in these areas as part of a 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 the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Likewise, the public is demanding to know what they are getting out of higher education 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 what they must be able to do. The next wave of policy will almost certainly focus on issues of measuring and improving student learning.
Discussion Items:
Update on data resources review (Fact Book/Benchmarks/Tuition & Fees)

Collaboration with the National Governors Association and Lumina Foundation for Education to develop strategies for outreach to new governors

Progress toward FY2011 workplan (highlights): 8-11
• *Facilitating Development of a Multistate Longitudinal Data Exchange*
• *Educational Equity and Postsecondary Student Success: A Center for Urban Education and WICHE Partnership for Policy Research and Analysis*
• *Non-traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners*
• College Access Challenge Grant (CACG) Consortium and Network
• *Best Practices in Statewide Articulation and Transfer Systems*
• State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIDO) and Policy Publications Clearinghouse

Other business

Adjournment
Self-Funded Units Committee Meeting

Kaye Howe (CO), chair
James Hansen (SD), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), ex officio

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

Agenda

Presiding: James Hansen, vice chair

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

Action Item

Approval of the Self-funded Units Committee meeting minutes of May 17, 2010

Information Items:
WCET:
• Progress report on WCET highlights since May, including new
  Website, Webcast series, and advocacy on federal policy issues
• Transparency by Design update
• Revenue update
• Update on Gates proposal: Continuous Quality Improvement in Online Learning
Technology & Innovation:
- U.S. Unified Community Anchor Network (U.S. UCAN)
- FCC e-rate changes and resulting impacts on universities and university-led state and regional optical networks
- National Internet2 K20 initiative and the WICHE West Mental Health Program:
  - Supporting military and veterans – Department of Defense contract/Citizen Soldier Support Program
  - New national technical assistance center on the integration of mental health and primary care – WICHE’s role on behavioral health workforce issues
  - National Institute of Mental Health study update – mental health on college campuses

Other business

Adjournment
**ACTION ITEM**

**Self-Funded Units Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, May 17, 2010**

**Committee Members Present**

Kaye Howe (CO), chair  
James Hansen (SD), vice chair  
Leah Bornstein (AZ)  
James Silva (CA)  
Roberta Richards (HI)  
Michael Rush (ID)  
Mary Sheehy Moe (MT)  
David Nething (ND)  
Jane Nichols (NV)  
Camille Preus (OR)  
Peter Knudson (UT)  
Thomas Buchanan (WY)

**Committee Members Absent**

Warren Hardy (NV)  
Patricia Sullivan (NM)

**Staff Present**

David Longanecker, WICHE president  
Louis Fox, vice president, Technology and Innovation  
Mimi McFaul, associate director, Mental Health Program  
Mollie McGill, associate director, WCET  
Dennis Mohatt, director, Mental Health Program, and vice president for behavioral health  
Ellen Wagner, executive director, WCET

Committee chair Kaye Howe convened the meeting.

The committee approved the minutes of the November 2, 2009, Self-Funded Units Committee meeting.

Ellen Wagner reported on WCET’s recent SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis and WCET’s workplan for FY 2011. Highlights of her presentation included the following.

- WCET recently completed an audit of its membership base and services most valued by members, as well as a review of other e-learning organizations, and realigned its services and priorities around a new action agenda.
- WCET has updated and sharpened its mission statement and soon will announce a rebranding of the WCET name (as the WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies) and a realignment with WICHE.
- WCET’s priorities for FY 2011 and key themes for programmatic events include: authentication, accountability, adult learners, student retention, student completion, and mobility.
- WCET will continue to serve as a leading national organization promoting effective policies and practices to advance the use of technology in higher education.
- WCET is submitting a proposal to the Gates Foundation on quality measures. WCET will partner with several institutions to develop a proposal on predictive analytics to inform student success strategies.

Louis Fox gave updates on the following WICHE Technology and Innovation initiatives and interests.

- Work with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Federal Communications Commission, and National Science Foundation.
- eScience Institute and Open Content initiative.

Dennis Mohatt reported on the Mental Health Program.

- Budget review: The Mental Health Program will finish the fiscal year with almost $100,000 in its fund balance.
- Mental Health currently has 18 active projects (seven of those are in Alaska, four are in South Dakota, one is in Colorado, and they have many federal contracts).
- The draft Mental Health Program brochure and financial information includes information about how the program money is procured and a history of the Mental Health affiliation dues for the past five years.
- The National Institute of Mental Health grant (on mental health first aid on college campuses) has recruited schools from 10 of the 15 WICHE states for year two of the study.

The committee adjourned.
INFORMATION ITEM

Update on Gates proposal: 
*Continuous Quality Improvement in Online Learning* 

This project proposes using large-scale data analysis to promote continuous quality improvement in U.S. postsecondary online learning programs. By aggregating data sets from multiple institutions and using advanced statistical modeling to identify patterns that predict performance, we can help practitioners spot barriers to student success before they become problems and focus attention on enablers that predictably and reliably improve student achievement, particularly in traditionally underserved populations.
Tuesday, November 9, 2010

8.00 - 9.15 am
SHEPC Learning Center
Suite 100

Committee of the Whole – Business Session

Agenda

Reconvene Committee of the Whole: Thomas Buchanan, chair

Report and recommended action of the Audit Committee:
Jane Nichols, committee chair

Action Item
FY 2010 audit report (separate document)

Report and recommended action of the Executive Committee:
Thomas Buchanan, WICHE chair

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

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

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

Discussion Items:
Update on the Legislative Advisory Committee (LAC) annual
meeting: Senator David Nething, LAC member

Update on WICHE’s budget

Action Item
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 2011 committee members

Meeting evaluation (electronic)
(http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SCGKH3X)

Other business

Adjourn Committee of the Whole business session
DISCUSSION ITEM
Update on WICHE’s Budget

WICHE did not budget for any deficits for FY 2010 and did not realize any in the general fund, as you can see in the report titled “General Fund Budget Comparing FY 2010 with FY 2011.” However, as can be seen on the report’s program area revenue and expense summary, one of our program areas did realize a loss; but even that did not cause WICHE to realize a deficit in FY 2010.

All WICHE programs combined resulted in a gain in net assets of $80,442. When WICHE is combined with the State Higher Education Policy Center (SHEPC), then the combined financial statement shows a loss of $106,044. This is entirely to be expected because SHEPC always shows a loss, due to fact that the partners make equity contributions to SHEPC rather than revenue contributions.

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

The Mental Health Program experienced a gain of $132,278. Since it began the year in a deficit position of ($89,843), it has now moved to a positive fund balance of $42,434.

WCET experienced a loss of $182,386. Since it began the year with a fund balance of $282,535 and it has received a contribution of $100,000 from the WICHE reserves, as directed by the commission, it is now at a fund balance of $200,149.

Our new initiative, Technology and Innovation, began the year with a zero balance and added a $50,000 contribution from WICHE reserves, as directed by the commission. Technology and Innovation operated partly inside the general fund and partly separately in FY 2010 and spent $2,574 less than its $57,009 general fund contribution. It ended the year with a fund balance of $50,000.

The general fund began the year with a reserve of $1,337,633 and ended the year with a reserve of $1,325,821, as seen on the general fund budget report.

Looking Ahead to Fiscal Year 2011

Again, WICHE has not budgeted for a deficit for FY 2011. However, due to the tight economy, we have not budgeted for any small gains either. It will be a challenge in all our program areas to manage the budgets carefully.

As a further note, two rooms which have been common areas for SHEPC until this fiscal year have been moved by agreement of the partners into the private spaces of WICHE and SHEEO. WICHE has taken possession of a 193-square-foot room on the second floor, and SHEEO has taken possession of a 294-square-foot room on the first floor. The net result of this is a small adjustment of ownership percentage of each of the partners in SHEPC. WICHE has moved from an ownership percentage of approximately 58 percent of SHEPC prior to FY 2011 to an ownership percentage of approximately 57 percent beginning in FY 2011.
# Program Area Revenue and Expense Summary for FY 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs &amp; Services</th>
<th>Policy Analysis</th>
<th>PSEP &amp; Bridges</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>WCET</th>
<th>Innovation &amp; Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues and Fees</td>
<td>$ 125,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 331,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Registration Fees</td>
<td>$ 2,290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 208,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>$ 263,910</td>
<td>$ 864,629</td>
<td>$ 144,240</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 288,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>$ (1,054)</td>
<td>$ (269)</td>
<td>$ (14,756)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 80,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 70,439</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 11,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>$ (106)</td>
<td>$ 6,500</td>
<td>$ 142</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 28,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Allocation</td>
<td>$ 400,339</td>
<td>$ 308,075</td>
<td>$ 300,907</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 57,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$ 790,658</td>
<td>$ 1,179,568</td>
<td>$ 445,147</td>
<td>$ 1,744,097</td>
<td>$ 870,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenses**        |                 |                |               |      |                         |
| Salaries            | $ 368,588       | $ 389,346      | $ 193,235     | $ 521,816 | $ 349,720               |
| Benefits            | $ 120,858       | $ 127,142      | $ 66,635      | $ 167,654 | $ 118,583               |
| Audit, Legal & Consulting | $ 46,804     | $ 128,700      | $ 130,662     | $ 15,417  | $ 84,638                |
| Subcontracts        | $ 42,553        | $ 215,605      | $ 40,030      | $ 327,297 | $ 231,001               |
| Travel              | $ 38,013        | $ 133,129      | $ 78,829      | $ 191,857 | $ 194,111               |
| Printing and Copying | $ 7,652         | $ 7,604        | $ 4,968       | $ 20,961  | $ 1,862                 |
| Rent                | $ 38,788        | $ 53,798       | $ 20,151      | $ 61,494  | $ 38,158                |
| Computer/Network    | $ 33,444        | $ 42,855       | $ 15,519      | $ 52,209  | $ 37,131                |
| Communications      | $ 8,198         | $ 7,722        | $ 4,646       | $ 18,709  | $ 14,132                |
| Supplies and Expense | $ 10,222       | $ 13,244       | $ 2,110       | $ 11,050  | $ 12,140                |
| Marketing           |                |                |               |      | $ 7,692                 |
| Indirect Costs      | $ 34,925        | $ 52,796       |               | $ 163,793 | $ 40,140                |
| Credits for other programs | $ 4,590       |               | $ 10,684      | $ 55,683  | $ 10,491                |
| **Total Expenses**  | $ 754,635       | $ 1,171,941    | $ 436,807     | $ 1,611,819 | $ 1,052,771             |

| **Excess Revenue (Loss)** | $ 36,023       | $ 7,627        | $ 8,340       | $ 132,278 | $ (182,386)            |

|                         | $ 2,574        |               |               |      |                         |

---
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### Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

**General Fund Budget**

**Comparing FY 2010 with FY 2011**

#### Revenue and Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2010 Actual</th>
<th>Actual Higher or (Lower) than Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011 Higher or (Lower) than FY 2010 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011 Higher or (Lower) than FY 2010 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4102 Indirect Cost Reimbursements</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$327,370</td>
<td>$97,370 42.3%</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$30,000 13.0%</td>
<td>($67,370) -20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4104 Indirect Cost Sharing-WICHE</td>
<td>($30,000)</td>
<td>($82,038)</td>
<td>($52,038) 173.5%</td>
<td>($60,000)</td>
<td>($30,000) 100.0%</td>
<td>$22,038 -26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4201 Members/Fees States/Institutions a</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>$0 0.0%</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>$0 0.0%</td>
<td>$0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($87,000) 100.0%</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$0 0.0%</td>
<td>$0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300 Interest</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$14,031</td>
<td>($45,969) -76.6%</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>($40,000) -66.7%</td>
<td>$5,969 42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400 Publication Sales &amp; Refunds</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>($88) -88.0%</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>($50) -50.0%</td>
<td>$50 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600 Other Income</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$7,161</td>
<td>($4,839) -40.3%</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>($2,000) -16.7%</td>
<td>$1,000 39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4850 Credit Card Transaction Rev. / Units</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($3,500) -100.0%</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>($2,500) -71.4%</td>
<td>$1,000 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$2,237,600</td>
<td>$2,141,536</td>
<td>($96,064) -4.3%</td>
<td>$2,193,050</td>
<td>($4,459) -2.0%</td>
<td>$51,514 2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2010 Actual</th>
<th>Actual Higher or (Lower) than Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011 Higher or (Lower) than FY 2010 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011 Higher or (Lower) than FY 2010 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102 Student Exchange Program</td>
<td>$300,907</td>
<td>$292,567</td>
<td>($8,341) -2.8%</td>
<td>$300,092</td>
<td>($816) -0.3%</td>
<td>$7,525 2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104 Policy Analysis &amp; Research</td>
<td>$308,075</td>
<td>$295,920</td>
<td>($12,154) -3.9%</td>
<td>$308,146</td>
<td>($72) 0.0%</td>
<td>$12,226 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105 Communications &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>$435,644</td>
<td>$387,153</td>
<td>($48,491) -11.1%</td>
<td>$435,605</td>
<td>($39) 0.0%</td>
<td>$48,451 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107 Technology &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>$57,009</td>
<td>$54,934</td>
<td>($2,074) -3.6%</td>
<td>$55,126</td>
<td>($11,534) -3.1%</td>
<td>$12,295 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0110 President's Office</td>
<td>$366,654</td>
<td>$342,326</td>
<td>($24,328) -6.6%</td>
<td>$355,120</td>
<td>($11,534) -3.1%</td>
<td>$12,795 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111 Commission Meeting Expense</td>
<td>$139,414</td>
<td>$99,808</td>
<td>($39,606) -28.4%</td>
<td>$129,975</td>
<td>($9,439) -6.8%</td>
<td>$30,167 30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0112 Administrative Services</td>
<td>$136,375</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>($36,375) -26.4%</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>($9,439) -6.8%</td>
<td>$30,167 30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0115 Miscellaneous Gen. Fund</td>
<td>$167,597</td>
<td>$117,563</td>
<td>($50,034) -29.9%</td>
<td>$160,001</td>
<td>($7,596) -4.5%</td>
<td>$42,437 36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0116 Program Development</td>
<td>$25,750</td>
<td>$14,419</td>
<td>($11,331) -44.0%</td>
<td>$13,502</td>
<td>($12,248) -47.6%</td>
<td>$30,167 30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0131 LAC Meeting</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$14 $25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000 $0</td>
<td>$25,000 $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,236,509</td>
<td>$2,003,348</td>
<td>($233,161) -10.4%</td>
<td>$2,193,050</td>
<td>($43,459) -2.0%</td>
<td>$51,514 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) for the Fiscal Year</strong></td>
<td>$1,091</td>
<td>$138,188</td>
<td>$137,097 -12566.8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,091) 100.0%</td>
<td>($138,188) 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves at Beginning of Year</strong></td>
<td>$1,188,724</td>
<td>$1,325,821</td>
<td>$137,097 -12566.8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,091) 100.0%</td>
<td>($138,188) 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves Dedicated during Year</strong></td>
<td>$1,188,724</td>
<td>$1,325,821</td>
<td>$137,097 -12566.8%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,091) 100.0%</td>
<td>($138,188) 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) In May 2008, Commission set dues for FY 2010 at $125,000 and for FY 2011 at $130,000. In May 2009, Commission reduced FY 2011 dues to $125,000.
(b) California unpaid Dues.
(c) Minimum reserve set by the commission is 12% of Budgeted Expenses. Set May 2000.
(d) Facility Payments reserve set by commission at 6 months of cost. Set May 2007.
(e) Unexpected Shortfall reserve set by commission at 10% of Budgeted Expenses. To be used only if anticipated funding does not materialize. Set May 2007.
(f) CECFA Bond reserve. Legal requirement of bond financing.
(g) Allocation from Reserves for Louis Fox only if necessary. Set by Executive Committee at Nov 2009 meeting.
(h) Allocation from Reserves for WCET only if necessary. Set by Executive Committee at Nov 2009 meeting.
Plenary Session IV:
The Collegiate Learning Assessment

The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), though still relatively young, having been applied for the first time in 2007, has become the hottest commodity in the array of student learning assessments. An increasing number of colleges and universities are subscribing to the CLA. The Voluntary System of Accountability, developed by the Association of Public Land-Grant Universities and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, has adopted the CLA as one of the three recommended measures for demonstrating student learning. The State of Texas has adopted the CLA as the measure of student learning for all its universities. And the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development has chosen the CLA as the principle assessment tool in its AHELO project, for comparing student learning internationally. Part of the attractiveness of the CLA as a measure of student learning is its focus on what are generally described as higher-order learning skills: those broad-based communication, computational, and discerning thinking skills that extend beyond the specific knowledge of content that’s expected of graduates within a specific major.

Yet the CLA is not without its critics, and the criticism seems to relate primarily to three concerns. First, some criticize the CLA for not measuring more specifically the learning in a student’s chosen major, given that this is what the student has traditionally been expected to master to be considered a college graduate. Second, some criticize the CLA for trying to measure something that is clearly important but perhaps immeasurable, in accord with Einstein’s oft-quoted statement that “not everything that counts can be measured” (or as Pirsig says of quality in *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*, “You know what it is, yet you don’t know what it is”). Third, some criticize the methodology used by the CLA to assess student learning, raising concerns about both the validity and reliability of its findings.

Many of those who support the CLA argue that such criticism is a case of “the perfect being the enemy of the good,” whereas those concerned with the CLA believe that we have to strive for the perfect because seeking only the good raises the risk of error too high, given the high stakes involved for both institutions and individuals.

In response to both the increased popularity of the CLA and the concerns that have been raised, the Council for the Advancement of Education (CAE), which produces the CLA, has been examining the CLA and exploring possibilities for enhancements that will strengthen the instrument. One such possible improvement would be to provide a tool that is useful not only to the institution in assessing its overall success
September 19, 2010

A Measure of Education Is Put to the Test

Results of national exam will go public in 2012

By David Glenn

You have 90 minutes to complete this test.

Here is your scenario: You are the assistant to a provost who wants to measure the quality of your university's general-education program. Your boss is considering adopting the Collegiate Learning Assessment, or CLA, a national test that asks students to demonstrate their ability to synthesize evidence and write persuasively.

The CLA is used at more than 400 colleges. Since its debut a decade ago, it has been widely praised as a sophisticated alternative to multiple-choice tests. At some colleges, its use has helped spark sweeping changes in instruction and curriculum. And soon, many more of the scores will be made public.

But skeptics say the test is too detached from the substantive knowledge that students are actually expected to acquire. Others say those who take the test have little motivation to do well, which makes it tough to draw conclusions from their performance.

You may review the following documents:

- Graphs of Collegiate Learning Assessment scores on the University of Texas system's campuses over a four-year period.
- An essay in which an assistant provost at a flagship campus describes her "grave concern" about using CLA scores to compare different colleges.
- A report in which the CLA's creators reply to their critics. Your task: Write a two-page memorandum to your boss that describes and analyzes the major arguments for and against adopting the CLA. When you have finished, please hand your materials to the proctor and leave the room quietly.

It is easy to see why the test format that you just tasted has been so appealing to many people in higher education. The CLA is a direct measure of skills, in contrast to surveys about how much time students spend studying or how much they believe they have learned. And unlike multiple-choice-based measures of learning, the CLA aspires to capture a student's ability to make an argument and to interpret multiple types of evidence. Those skills are close to the heart of a liberal-arts education.
"Everything that No Child Left Behind signified during the Bush administration—we operate 180 degrees away from that," says Roger Benjamin, president of the Council for Aid to Education, which developed and promotes the CLA. "We don't want this to be a high-stakes test. We're putting a stake in the ground on classic liberal-arts issues. I'm willing to rest my oar there. These core abilities, these higher-order skills, are very important, and they're even more important in a knowledge economy where everyone needs to deal with a surplus of information." Only an essay test, like the CLA, he says, can really get at those skills.

Richard J. Shavelson, an educational psychologist at Stanford University and one of the CLA's creators, makes a similar point in his recent book, Measuring College Learning Responsibly: Accountability in a New Era (Stanford University Press). "If you want to find out not only whether a person knows the laws governing driving but also whether she can actually drive a car," he writes, "don't judge her performance solely with a multiple-choice test. Rather, also administer a behind-the-wheel driving test."

"The CLA is really an authentic assessment process," says Pedro Reyes, associate vice chancellor for academic planning and assessment at the University of Texas system. "The Board of Regents here saw that it would be an important test because it measures analytical ability, problem-solving ability, critical thinking, and communication. Those are the skills that you want every undergraduate to walk away with." (Other large systems that have embraced the CLA include California State University and the West Virginia system.)

One feature that appealed to Mr. Reyes and his colleagues is that the CLA typically reports scores on a "value added" basis, controlling for the scores that students earned on the SAT or ACT while in high school. In raw terms, the highest scores in the Texas system are at Austin and Dallas, the most-selective campuses. But in value-added terms, it appears that students at San Antonio and El Paso make stronger gains between their freshman and senior years.

The CLA's overseers, however, say they do not want colleges to become overly concerned with bean-counting and comparing public scores. Instead, they emphasize the ways in which colleges can use their own CLA scores to experiment with improved models of instruction. Since 2007, Mr. Benjamin's organization has invested heavily in "performance-task academies," which encourage colleges to add CLA-style assignments to their liberal-arts courses.
One campus that has gone down that road is the University of Evansville, where first-year-experience courses have begun to ask students to do performance tasks.

"We began by administering a retired CLA question, a task that had to do with analyzing crime-reduction strategies," says Brian R. Ernsting, an associate professor of biology at Evansville. "We talked with the students about the modes of thinking that were involved there, how to distinguish correlation from causation and anecdotes from data."

Similar things are happening at Pacific Lutheran University. "Our psychology department is working on a performance task that mirrors the CLA, but that also incorporates disciplinary content in psychology," says Karen E. McConnell, director of assessment. "They're planning to make that part of their senior capstone course."

How to Interpret the Scores?

Mr. Ernsting and Ms. McConnell are perfectly sincere about using CLA-style tasks to improve instruction on their campuses. But at the same time, colleges have a less high-minded motive for familiarizing students with the CLA style: It just might improve their scores when it comes time to take the actual test.

And that matters, in turn, because by 2012, the CLA scores of more than 100 colleges will be posted, for all the world to see, on the "College Portrait" Web site of the Voluntary System of Accountability, an effort by more than 300 public colleges and universities to provide information about life and learning on their campuses. (Not all of the colleges have adopted the CLA. Some use the Educational Testing Service's "Proficiency Profile," and others use the ACT's Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency.)

A few dozen colleges in the voluntary project, including those in the Texas system, have already made their test scores public. But for most, the 2012 unveiling will be a first.

"If a college pays attention to learning and helps students develop their skills—whether they do that by participating in our programs or by doing things on their own—they probably should do better on the CLA," says Marc Chun, a research scientist at the Council for Aid to Education. Such improvements, he says, are the main point of the project.

But that still raises a question: If familiarizing students with CLA-style tasks does raise their scores, then the CLA might not be a pure, unmediated reflection of the full range of liberal-arts skills. How
exactly should the public interpret the scores of colleges that do not use such training exercises?

Trudy W. Banta, a professor of higher education and senior adviser to the chancellor for academic planning and evaluation at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, believes it is a serious mistake to publicly release and compare scores on the test. There is too much risk, she says, that policy makers and the public will misinterpret the numbers.

"Standardized tests of generic skills—I’m not talking about testing in the major—are so much a measure of what students bring to college with them that there is very little variance left out of which we might tease the effects of college," says Ms. Banta, who is a longtime critic of the CLA. "There's just not enough variance there to make comparative judgments about the comparative quality of institutions."

Compounding that problem, she says, is the fact that most colleges do not use a true longitudinal model: That is, the students who take the CLA in their first year do not take it again in their senior year. The test's value-added model is therefore based on a potentially apples-and-oranges comparison.

The test's creators reply that they have solved that problem by doing separate controls for the baseline skills of freshman test-takers and senior test-takers. That is, the freshman test-takers' scores are assessed relative to their SAT and ACT scores, and so are senior test-takers' scores. For that reason, colleges cannot game the test by recruiting an academically weak pool of freshmen and a strong pool of seniors.

Another concern is that students do not always have much motivation to take the test seriously. That problem is especially challenging with seniors, who are typically recruited to take the CLA toward the end of their final semester, when they can already taste the graduation champagne. Who at that stage of college wants to carefully write a 90-minute essay that isn't required for any course?

For that reason, many colleges have had to come up with elaborate incentives to get students to take the test at all. (See the graphic below.) A recent study at Central Connecticut State University found that students' scores were highly correlated with how long they had spent writing their essays.

Take My Test — Please

The Collegiate Learning Assessment has been widely praised. But it involves an arduous 90 minutes of essay writing. As a result,
many colleges have resorted to incentives and requirements to get students to take the test, and to take it seriously.

As of last week, there were some significant bugs in the presentation of CLA scores on the College Portrait Web site. Of the few dozen universities that had already chosen to publish CLA data on that site, roughly a quarter of the reports appeared to include erroneous descriptions of the year-to-year value-added scores. In some cases, the errors made the universities’ gains appear better than they actually were. In other cases, they made them seem worse.

Seniors at California State University at Bakersfield, for example, had CLA scores that were 155 points higher than freshmen’s, while the two cohorts’ SAT scores were similar. The College Portrait site said that the university’s score gains were “below what would be expected.” The University of Missouri at St. Louis, meanwhile, had senior scores that were only 64 points higher than those of freshmen, and those two cohorts had identical ACT scores. But those score gains were reported as “well above what would be expected.”

"It doesn’t make sense, what’s presented here," said Stephen Klein, the CLA’s director of research and development, when The Chronicle pointed out such discrepancies. "This doesn’t look like something we would produce." Another official at the Council for Aid to Education confirmed that at least three of the College Portrait reports were incorrect, and said there appeared to be systematic problems with the site’s presentation of the data.

As The Chronicle went to press, the Voluntary System of Accountability’s executive director, Christine M. Keller, said her
office would identify and fix any errors. The forms that institutions fill out for the College Portrait, she said, might be confusing for administrators because they do not always mirror the way the CLA itself (and the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency and ETS's Proficiency Profile) present their official data. In any case, Ms. Keller said, a revised version of the College Portrait site is scheduled to go online in December.

It is clear that CLA scores do reflect some broad properties of a college education. In a study for their forthcoming book, *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* (University of Chicago Press), the sociologists Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa asked students at 24 colleges to take the CLA during their first semester and then again during their fourth. Their study was conducted before any significant number of colleges began to consciously use CLA-style exercises in the classroom.

The two authors found one clear pattern: Students' CLA scores improved if they took courses that required a substantial amount of reading and writing. Many students didn't take such courses, and their CLA scores tended to stay flat.

The pattern was consistent across the ability spectrum: Regardless of whether a student's CLA scores were generally low or high, their scores were more likely to improve if they had taken demanding college courses.

So there is at least one positive message in Mr. Arum and Ms. Roksa's generally gloomy book. Colleges that make demands on students can actually develop their skills on the kinds of things measured by the CLA.

"We found that students in traditional liberal-arts fields performed and improved more over time on the CLA," says Mr. Arum, a professor at New York University. "In other fields, in education, business, and social work, they didn't do so well. Some of that gap we can trace back to time spent studying. That doesn't mean that students in education and business aren't acquiring some very valuable skills. But at the same time, the communication and reasoning skills measured by the CLA really are important to everyone."

**Dueling Purposes**

For more than a century, scholars have had grand visions of building national tests for measuring college-level learning. Mr. Shavelson, of Stanford, sketches several of those efforts in his book, including a 1930s experiment that tested thousands of students at colleges throughout Pennsylvania. (Sample question: "Of Corneille's

Mr. Shavelson believes the CLA's essays and "performance tasks" offer an unusually sophisticated way of measuring what colleges do, without relying too heavily on factual knowledge from any one academic field. But in his book he also notes the tension between the two basic uses of nationally normed tests: Sometimes they're used for internal improvements, and sometimes they're used as benchmarks for external comparisons. Those two uses don't always sit easily together. Politicians and consumers want easily interpretable scores, while colleges need subtler and more detailed data to make internal improvements.

Can the CLA fill both of those roles? That is the experiment that will play out as more colleges unveil their scores.
in enhancing student learning but also to individual students as a way to validate how much they’ve learned.

Roger Benjamin will be presenting to the commission, to respond to some of the criticisms of the assessment, to discuss some of the benefits that are being reaped from participation in the CLA, to describe recent developments with the CLA, and to discuss possible ways in which WICHE could be involved in the increasing public policy dialogue and action regarding the measurement of student learning.

Speaker: Roger Benjamin, president, Council for Aid to Education

Biographical Information on the Speaker

Roger Benjamin is president of the New York-based Council for Aid to Education, the home of the Collegiate Learning Assessment. He was a senior research scientist at RAND from 1990 to 2005 (director of RAND education from 1994 to 1999). Previous to his appointment to RAND, he was a member of the Political Science Department of the University of Minnesota and associate dean and executive officer of the College of Liberal Arts of the University of Minnesota. He also served as senior vice chancellor for academic affairs and provost at the University of Pittsburgh and vice president for academic affairs and provost of the University of Minnesota, as well as professor of political science. Benjamin is the author or co-author of numerous monographs and articles on institutional design questions in public policy. In education policy his work includes a number of articles and monographs on governance, assessment, and strategic planning. He directs a program designed to introduce performance assessment into education throughout the K-16 system in U.S., the 31 member countries of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, and beyond.
If “the time has come” for measuring student-learning outcomes and holding institutions accountable for ensuring that their graduates have learned what they need to know and to be able to do, how do we know when that has been achieved? What is a learned person?

Much of the criticism around focusing on student-learning outcomes falls into three arguments.

- **Argument 1:** Real learning is beyond the realm of assessment. This is the Pirsig argument, presented earlier: with respect to quality, “you know what it is, but you don’t know what it is.” For all practical purposes, the real quality of learning is beyond measurement.

- **Argument 2:** Measuring quality almost of necessity leads to focusing on the wrong stuff. This argument brings together the cautions of two American icons, Albert Einstein, who said that “not everything that counts can be measured, and not everything that can be measured counts,” and Peter Drucker who stated that “what gets measured gets managed.”

- **Argument 3:** The proof of the quality of American higher education is in the pudding (or perhaps more accurately, in the market). More students come to the U.S. from elsewhere to pursue an education than go anywhere else. The market tells us that we are good, and we don’t need other more artificial measures.

Fortunately, the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has focused substantial attention on the issues around establishing standards for student-learning outcomes and around the assessment thereof. Its seminal work, reflected in *Greater Expectations: Project on Accreditation and Assessment*, has helped many institutions throughout the country, including many in the West, to develop their internal efforts to assess the level of student learning. This has assisted those institutions not only in their external accreditation reviews but also in their internal struggles to better understand their students and the complexity of student learning.

We have invited Debra Humphreys, AAC&U’s vice president for communications and public affairs, to share with you some of what AAC&U has learned about what constitutes a college-educated person and how institutions, and perhaps even states, can better understand how well they contribute to making sure that their graduates have the learning required to fit this bill.
Speaker: Debra Humphreys, vice president, Office of Communications and Public Affairs, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Biographical Information on the Speaker

Debra Humphreys is the vice president for communications and public affairs at the Association of American Colleges and Universities, a position she assumed in 2001. Prior to that she served as director of programs in the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Global Initiatives at AAC&U, where she directed programs on women’s issues and diversity in higher education. She also served as executive editor of AAC&U’s quarterly publication On Campus with Women and as editor of the quarterly Diversity Digest. She is currently leading national advocacy efforts as part of AAC&U’s campaign “Liberal Education and America’s Promise: Excellence for Everyone as a Nation Goes to College.” Through this effort she is helping to build communications capacity on the part of college and university leaders and faculty members and educate the public about the value of an engaged liberal education to prepare for the changing global economy. In addition, Humphreys worked extensively with the staff members coordinating AAC&U’s national initiative “Greater Expectations: The Commitment to Quality as a Nation Goes to College” and helped to edit and publicize its publication Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College.

Before assuming her current position at AAC&U, she served as project director of two of AAC&U’s national diversity initiatives, “Racial Legacies and Learning: An American Dialogue” and “Diversity Works.” Humphreys also served as associate director of AAC&U’s other national initiative, “American Commitment: Diversity, Democracy and Liberal Learning,” which involved more than 100 institutions working to transform their general education curricula to address issues of American diversity and democracy. She is the author of the project’s report General Education and American Commitments: A National Report on Diversity Courses and Requirements.

Before coming to AAC&U in 1992, she had experience teaching women’s studies and English at Rutgers University, Towson State University, and at the University of Maryland at Baltimore County. She also served as program associate at the National Women’s Studies Association. Humphreys speaks widely to educators, business leaders, and policymakers about the importance of liberal and higher education to the future of America’s economic health and democratic vitality. She also serves often as a communications and educational consultant to colleges and universities and serves on the editorial advisory board of University Business, Change magazine, and About Campus. She received her B.A. from Williams College and her Ph.D. in English from Rutgers University.
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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. Thomas Buchanan, president of the University of Wyoming, is the 2010 chair of the WICHE Commission; Joseph Garcia, president of Colorado State University–Pueblo, 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
Roy Ashburn, state senator

COLORADO
*Joseph Garcia (WICHE vice chair), president, Colorado State University–Pueblo
Kaye Howe, executive director, National Science Digital Library
*D. Rico Munn, executive director, Colorado Department of Higher Education

HAWAI'I
*Roy Ogawa (WICHE chair, 2008), attorney, Ogawa, Lau, Nakamura & Jew
Roberta Richards, principal, Pauoa Elementary School
Steven Wheelwright, president, Brigham Young University–Hawaii

IDAHO
Robert Kustra, president, Boise State University
M. Duane Nellis, president, University of Idaho
*Michael Rush, executive director, Idaho State Board of Education

MONTANA
Clayton Christian, chair, Montana Board of Regents, and chief executive officer, Stewart Title of Missoula
Kim Gillan, state senator
*Sheila Stearns, commissioner of higher education, Montana University System

NEVADA
Warren Hardy, president, Associated Builders and Contractors
*Jane Nichols (WICHE chair, 2009), vice chancellor for academic and student affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education
*Carl Shaff, educational consultant

NEW MEXICO
Viola Florez, cabinet secretary, New Mexico Department of Higher Education
Susanna Murphy, secretary of education, New Mexico Public Education Department
*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, 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, vice chair, Utah Board of Regents
Peter Knudson, state senator
*William Sederburg, commissioner, Utah System of Higher Education

WASHINGTON
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, state representative
Jeanne Kohl-Welles, state senator

WYOMING
*Thomas Buchanan (WICHE chair), president, University of Wyoming
Deborah Hammons, state representative
*Klaus Hanson, emeritus professor of German, University of Wyoming

*Executive Committee member
2010 COMMISSION COMMITTEES

Executive Committee
Thomas Buchanan (WY), chair
Joseph Garcia (CO), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), immediate past chair

Diane Barrans (AK)
Leah Bornstein (AZ)
Roy Ashburn (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Michael Rush (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
David Nething (ND)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Camille Preus (OR)
James Hansen (SD)
William Sederburg (UT)
Appointment pending (WA)
Klaus Hanson (WY)

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)
Roy Ashburn (CA)
Joseph 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)
Klaus Hanson (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)
Appointment pending (CA)
D. Rico Munn (CO)
Steven Wheelwright (HI)
M. Duane Nellis (ID)
Kim Gillan (MT)
Jane Nichols (NV)
Viola Florez (NM)
William Goetz (ND)
Ryan Deckert (OR)
Committee chair (SD)
William Sederburg (UT)
Committee vice chair (WA)
Deborah Hammons (WY)

Self-funded Units Committee
Kaye Howe (CO), chair
James Hansen (SD), vice chair
Jane Nichols (NV), ex officio

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

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

Audit Committee
Jane Nichols (NV), chair and immediate past WICHE chair
Diane Barrans (AK)
David Lorenz (AZ)
Joseph Garcia (CO), WICHE vice chair
Roy Ogawa (HI)
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 Green, accounting specialist

Human Resources
Tara Hickey, human resources coordinator

IT Services
Jerry Worley, chief technology officer
Renae Dahiya, Web/database developer
Penne Siedenburg, help desk technician

Mental Health
Dennis Mohatt, vice president, behavioral health, and director, WICHE Mental Health Program
Mimi McFaul, associate director
Tamara DeHay, research and technical assistance associate
Maureen Flory, research and technical assistance associate
Elisabeth Hahn, consultant
Tara Hickey, administrative coordinator
Debra Kupfer, mental health consultant
Chuck McGee, project director
Nicole Speer, research and technical assistance associate
Jessica Tomasko, research and technical assistance associate

Policy Analysis and Research
Demarée Michelau, director of policy analysis
Brian Prescott, director of policy research
Cheryl Graves, administrative assistant
Carl Krueger, project coordinator
Patrick Lane, project coordinator
Brandi Van Horn, research analyst

Programs and Services and Communications and Public Affairs
Jere Mock, vice president
Candy Allen, graphic designer
Laura Ewing, administrative assistant
Annie Finnigan, communications manager
Kay Hulstrom, administrative assistant
Deborah Jang, Web design manager
Ken Pepion, director, Bridges to the Professoriate
Margo Schultz, director, Student Exchange Programs
Pat Shea, director, WICHE ICE and Western Academic Leadership Forum

Technology and Innovation
Louis Fox, senior associate
James Werle, director, Internet2, K20 Initiative

WCET (WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies)
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
Peggy Green, coordinator, Web services
Cali Morrison, manager, events and programs

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 addresses.

Future Commission Meeting Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 16-17 – San Francisco</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 31-Nov. 1 – Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boulder, Colorado
# 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AACC</td>
<td>American Association of Community Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aacc.nche.edu">www.aacc.nche.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACTE</td>
<td>American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aacte.org">www.aacte.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACU</td>
<td>Association of American Colleges and Universities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aacu.edu.org">www.aacu.edu.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCU</td>
<td>American Association of State Colleges and Universities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aascu.org">www.aascu.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>Association of American Universities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aau.edu">www.aau.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>American Council on Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acenet.edu">www.acenet.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>College admission testing program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.act.org">www.act.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACUTA</td>
<td>Association of College &amp; University Telecommunications Administrators</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acuta.org">www.acuta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td>Academy for Educational Development</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aed.org">www.aed.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aei.org">www.aei.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB</td>
<td>Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acuta.org">www.acuta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHEC</td>
<td>American Indian Higher Education Consortium</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aihec.org">www.aihec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>Association for Institutional Research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acuta.org">www.acuta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APLU</td>
<td>Association for International Higher Education Policy Studies</td>
<td><a href="http://www.highereducation.org/reports/aiheps/">www.highereducation.org/reports/aiheps/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPIRA</td>
<td>(an association to empower Latino youth)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aspira.org">www.aspira.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHE</td>
<td>Association for the Study of Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ashe.missouri.edu">www.ashe.missouri.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATA</td>
<td>American Telecommunications Alliance</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atalliance.org">www.atalliance.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAE</td>
<td>Council for Aid to Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.caec.org">www.caec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEL</td>
<td>Council for Adult and Experiential Learning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.caec.org">www.caec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Council for Advancement and Support of Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.caec.org">www.caec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Congressional Budget Office</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cbo.gov">www.cbo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Complete College America</td>
<td><a href="http://www.completecollege.org">www.completecollege.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>Council of Graduate Schools</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cgsnet.org">www.cgsnet.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEA</td>
<td>Council for Higher Education Accreditation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cha.org">www.cha.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEPS</td>
<td>Center for Higher Education Policy Studies</td>
<td><a href="http://www.utwente.nl/cheps">www.utwente.nl/cheps</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Council of Independent Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cic.org">www.cic.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment</td>
<td><a href="http://www.caec.org/content/pro_collegiate.htm">www.caec.org/content/pro_collegiate.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>Council for Opportunity in Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.triprogram.org">www.triprogram.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAHEC</td>
<td>Consortium for Higher Education Collaboration</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conahec.org">www.conahec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONASEP</td>
<td>CONAHEC's Student Exchange Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conahec.org">www.conahec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG-WEST</td>
<td>Council of State Governments – West</td>
<td><a href="http://www.westtrends.org">www.westtrends.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSHE</td>
<td>Center for the Study of Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.psu.edu/cshe">www.ed.psu.edu/cshe</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPN</td>
<td>College Savings Plan Network</td>
<td><a href="http://www.collegesavings.org">www.collegesavings.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California</td>
<td>cue.usc.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQC</td>
<td>Data Quality Campaign</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/">www.dataqualitycampaign.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Education Commission of the States</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecs.org">www.ecs.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>U.S. Dept. of Education links:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-FSA</td>
<td>Federal Student Aid</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/fsa/index.html">www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/fsa/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-IES</td>
<td>Institute of Education Sciences</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ies/index.html?src=mr">www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ies/index.html?src=mr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-OESE</td>
<td>Office of Elementary &amp; Secondary Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/index.html?src=mr">www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/index.html?src=mr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-OPE</td>
<td>Office of Postsecondary Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/index.html?src=mr">www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/index.html?src=mr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oecd.org">www.oecd.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pisa.oecd.org">www.pisa.oecd.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pesc.org">www.pesc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPIC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ppic.org">www.ppic.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAIR</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unlv.edu/PAIR/rmair">www.unlv.edu/PAIR/rmair</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS-CoC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sascoc.org">www.sascoc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFARN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pellinstitute.org/SFARN">www.pellinstitute.org/SFARN</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEEO</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sheeo.org">www.sheeo.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEPC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conahec.org/sona">www.conahec.org/sona</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIDO</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/spido">www.wiche.edu/spido</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREB</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sreb.org">www.sreb.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.electroniccampus.org">www.electroniccampus.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SII</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/statescholars">www.wiche.edu/statescholars</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sura.org/home/index.html">www.sura.org/home/index.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wcet.info/2.0/index.php?q=TransparencybyDesign">www.wcet.info/2.0/index.php?q=TransparencybyDesign</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCF</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ucnf.org">www.ucnf.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unesco.org">www.unesco.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPCEA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.upcea.edu">www.upcea.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.voluntarysystem.org">www.voluntarysystem.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACCAL</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/wacccal">www.wiche.edu/wacccal</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/wags/index.htm">www.wiche.edu/wags/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALF</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/walf">www.wiche.edu/walf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC-ACCJC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.accjc.org">www.accjc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC-Sr</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wascweb.org/senior/wascr.html">www.wascweb.org/senior/wascr.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCET</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wcet.wiche.edu">www.wcet.wiche.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.westgov.org">www.westgov.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu">www.wiche.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohsu.edu.son.win">www.ohsu.edu.son.win</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHEEO Offices in the West, by State:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>ACPE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.alaskaadvantage.state.ak.us">www.alaskaadvantage.state.ak.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UAS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.alaska.edu">www.alaska.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>ABOR</td>
<td><a href="http://www.abor.asu.edu">www.abor.asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>CPEC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cpec.ca.gov">www.cpec.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>CDHE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.highered.colorado.gov">www.highered.colorado.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>UH</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hawaii.edu">www.hawaii.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>ISBE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov">www.boardofed.idaho.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mus.edu">www.mus.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>NMHEDED</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hed.state.nm.us">www.hed.state.nm.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>NSHE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nevada.edu">www.nevada.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>NDUS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ndus.nodak.edu">www.ndus.nodak.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OUS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ous.edu">www.ous.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>SDBOR</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rs.sdbor.edu">www.rs.sdbor.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>USBR</td>
<td><a href="http://www.utahsbr.edu">www.utahsbr.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>HECB</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hecb.wa.gov">www.hecb.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>WCCCC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.commission.wcc.edu">www.commission.wcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uwyo.edu">www.uwyo.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>