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- November 8, 2004, approved February 9, 2005 1-15
- January 12, 2005, approved February 9, 2005 1-21
- February 9, 2005, approved April 6, 2005 1-28

Report from the Mental Health Program 1-33

Discussion Item: May 2005 meeting schedule

Agenda (closed)

Evaluation of the executive director and adoption of performance objectives for FY 2006 1-37

Committee of the Whole 2-1

Call to Order: Diane Barrans, chair

Introduction of new commissioners and guests 2-3

Report of the chair

Report of the executive director

Report of the Nominating Committee – special elections

Changing Direction in Four WICHE States: State Reports from Arizona, Hawaii, New Mexico, and Washington 3-1

Policy Discussion: The National Commission on Accountability and the National Student Record Database 4-1

Speaker: Paul Lingenfelter, executive director, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), Denver
10.45 - 11.00 am  
Break

11.00 am - 12.00 noon [Tab 5]  
Policy Discussion: Perspective from the “For-Profit Sector”  
Speaker: Larry Gudis, WICHE commissioner and senior vice president of international development, Apollo Group, Axia College, Phoenix

12.00 noon - 12.30 pm [Tab 6]  
What’s Up in Alaskan Higher Education?  
Speaker: Mark Hamilton, president, University of Alaska System, Fairbanks

12.30 - 1.30 pm [no tab]  
Buffet Lunch

1.30 - 2.00 pm  
Break

2.00 - 3.30 pm [Tab 7]  
Policy Discussion: Results of the Study on Student Mobility  
Joint meeting of the Programs and Services and Issue Analysis and Research committees  
Speaker: Christopher Morphew, associate professor, University of Kansas, Lawrence

3.30 - 4.00 pm  
Break

4.00 - 8.45 pm [Tab 8]  
Evening Events: Reception and Dinner  
Dress casually and in layers, preparing for both warm or rainy/cool weather

4.00 - 4.30 pm  
Bus departs from the front of the hotel/transportation to reception

4.30 - 5.30 pm  
Reception at the University of Alaska Southeast, Auke Bay Campus

5.30 - 6.00 pm  
Bus departs university/transportation to dinner

6.00 - 8.00 pm  
Ride Mt. Roberts Tramway to the Timberline Bar & Grill for dinner and entertainment

Predinner Tlinglit (pronounced “klincget”) dance demonstration: welcome by local Alaska Native dance group, followed by a buffet dinner at traditional Alaskan fare

8.00 - 8.45 pm  
Following dinner, and at your leisure, return to sea level via the tram and stroll .5 miles back to the hotel along historic South Franklin Street (last tram of the evening is at 8.45 pm)
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7.00 - 8.30 am [Tab 9]
Treadwell Room, 1st Floor

Breakfast with Cheryl and Dave — What’s Up in the WICHE West? 9-1

Speakers: David Longanecker, executive director, WICHE;
Cheryl Blanco, director, Policy Analysis and Research, WICHE

8.30 - 8.45 am

Break

8.45 - 10.45 am [Tab 10]
Treadwell Room, 1st Floor

Programs and Services Committee Meeting 10-1

Approval of the Programs and Services Committee meeting minutes of November 8-9, 2004 10-3

Approval of FY 2006 workplan (committee’s section) 10-6

Discussion Item: Member states’ use of out-of-region schools for WICHE’s Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) 10-8

Discussion Item: Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE): Preserving access through the 150 percent formula 10-10
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8.45 - 10.45 am [Tab 11]
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Information Item: State Policies and Issues Related to Residency  

Information Item: Unit updates  
1. WCET – Sally Johnstone  
2. Policy Analysis and Research – Cheryl Blanco

10.45 - 11.00 am  
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11.00 am - 12.00 noon [Tab 12]  
Treadwell Room, 1st Floor

Committee of the Whole – Business Session

Consent Agenda

- Approval of the Committee of the Whole meeting minutes of November 8-9, 2004  
- Approval of the Executive Committee meeting minutes of November 2004, January 2005, February 2005, and April 2005 (Tab 1)

Non-consent Agenda

- Report and recommended action of the Executive Committee, WICHE Vice Chair Dubois (Tab 1)  
- Report and recommended action of the Programs and Services Committee, Committee Chair Dubois (Tab 10)  
- Approval of FY 2006 workplan – committee’s recommendations (Tab 10)  
- Report and recommended action of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee, Committee Chair Nichols (Tab 11)  
- Approval of FY 2006 workplan – committee’s recommendations (Tab 11)  
- Establishing the Center for Transforming Student Services (Tab 11)  
- Founding AdjunctMatch: An e-resource for institutions and online faculty (Tab 11)
Approval of the budget and salary/benefit recommendations for FY 2006 12-15

Approval of the workplan for FY 2006 12-23

Election of new vice chair for CY 2005

Meeting evaluation 12:35

Other business

12.00 noon

Adjournment

Reference [Tab 13]

The WICHE Commission 13-3

Commission Committees 2005 13-4

WICHE Staff 13-5

Higher Education Acronyms 13-6

For further information about this meeting, please contact:
Marla Williams, Assistant to the Executive Director
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)
PO Box 9752, Boulder, CO 80301
303.541.0204 (phone), 303.541.0291 (fax), mwilliams@wiche.edu
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Phil Dubois, vice chair (WY)
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Marshall Lind (AK)
Joel Sideman (AZ)
Robert Moore (CA)
Bill Byers (CO)
Roberta Richards (HI)
Gary Stivers (ID)
Sheila Stearns (MT)
Carl Shaff (NV)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
David Nething (ND)
Cam Preus-Braly (OR)
Tad Perry (SD)
Richard Kendell (UT)
James Sulton (WA)
Committee vice chair (WY)
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Action Item: Evaluation of the executive director and adoption of performance objectives for FY 2006 1-37
*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 executive director 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 Executive Director.
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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 executive director 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 Executive Director.
Committee of the Whole

Agenda

Call to Order: Diane Barrans, chair

Welcome

Introduction of new commissioners and guests

Report of the chair

Report of the executive director

Report of the Nominating Committee – special elections
New Commissioners

James O. Hansen, a returning WICHE commissioner from South Dakota, is currently the chair of the Committee on Budget and Finance for the Board of Regents. He is also on the board of directors of the South Dakota Retirement System. A former state superintendent of schools and secretary of the Department of Education and Cultural Affairs, Hansen is active in numerous community organizations, including the Governor’s Citizens’ Education Review Panel. He holds a B.S. from Black Hills State University, an M.A. from the University of Northern Colorado, and an Ed.D. from the University of South Dakota. He also studied at Teachers College of Columbia University in New York.

William J. Hybl is chairman and CEO of El Pomar Foundation, one of the largest and oldest private philanthropic foundations in the Rocky Mountain West and a national leader in innovative grantmaking, operating many of its own programs focusing on excellence in individual and organizational leadership. Hybl is president emeritus of the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and has served twice as its president; he is also chairman and CEO of the U.S. Olympic Foundation; vice chairman of the board of The Broadmoor Hotel; and president of the Air Force Academy Foundation. He served in the Colorado Legislature in 1972-73; was special counsel to President Ronald Reagan in 1981; was appointed as the civilian aide to the Secretary of the Army in 1986 (and still holds in that position); and served as vice chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, having received three consecutive presidential appointments from 1990-1997. In 2001, President George W. Bush appointed him as U.S. representative to the 56th General Assembly of the United Nations. In 2003, Hybl was elected chairman of the board of IFES (formerly International Foundation for Election Systems), and in 2004, he was elected chairman of the board for IFES Limited, an affiliated organization registered in the United Kingdom. Hybl is a graduate of The Colorado College and earned his J.D. at the University of Colorado School of Law in Boulder.

Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, a representative in the Washington State Legislature since 1997, represents the 46th District, which includes Northeast Seattle. She is chair of the Higher Education Committee in the House of Representatives and also serves on the Appropriations and Commerce and Labor committees, as well as on the House and Senate Joint Committee on Economic Development and International Relations. Gutierrez Kenney, the child of migrant farmworkers, cofounded the Washington State Migrant Child Care Centers; she also founded the Educational Institute for Rural Families and helped to establish the Farmworkers Clinics, as well as statewide child care and early childhood education teacher training programs. Currently, Gutierrez Kenney is a member of the National Council of La Raza Board of Directors; president of El Centro Mexicano del Estado de Washington; president of the Washington and Jalisco Sister State Association; cochair of the Eleanor Roosevelt Global Leadership Institute; and a member of numerous other organizations and boards. She is a nationally recognized speaker, addressing issues concerning health, education, affordable housing, and economic development, and has received numerous awards, including the OTHLI Award (Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs), National Award for Leadership (Center for Policy Alternatives), and the National Pacesetter Award (Women Legislators Lobby).
Changing Direction in Four WICHE States: State Reports from Arizona, Hawaii, New Mexico, and Washington

Over the past three years WICHE, through the generous support of Lumina Foundation and through partnership with the American Council on Education, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the State Higher Education Executive Officers, has worked with 14 states to help them figure out how they should be “changing direction” to assure that they can adequately finance broader access and greater student success within their respective systems of higher education. In this session, four of the WICHE states that have participated in the Changing Direction project will share the changes that have occurred or are being contemplated within their states.

Arizona was one of five states in the first cohort of the Changing Direction project and has perhaps moved its change agenda more dramatically than any other state in that group. Commissioner Sideman will discuss both the first and second stages of Arizona’s Changing Direction initiative.

Hawaii was one of five states in the second Changing Direction cohort. Commissioner Doris Ching will discuss the recent developments in tuition and financial aid policy and other ways that the state has drawn on the Changing Direction project.

New Mexico and Washington have recently been accepted into the third Changing Direction cohort, yet both will be using the project to complement substantial efforts already underway to address finance issues in new ways to assure expanded access, quality, and relevance to state objectives. Commissioner Chambers from New Mexico will discuss recent successes and lack thereof as only a recently retired SHEEO can. And Commissioner Sulton will share the essence of Washington State’s recently updated master plan and how they hope the Changing Direction project will help the state maintain focus and energy on the issues of higher education access and relevance.
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9.45 - 10.45 am
Treadwell Room, 1st Floor

Policy Discussion: The National Commission on Accountability and the National Student Record Database

In March 2005, the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, which had been convened by the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) organization, released a major national report, “Accountability for Better Results: A National Imperative for Higher Education.” This report calls for a concerted collaborative effort – by the federal government, state governments, institutions (CEOs and trustees), accreditors, faculty, and students – to more aggressively demand and provide greater accountability in American higher education.

The national commission was cochaired by the Honorable Frank Keating, former governor of Oklahoma, and the Honorable Richard W. Riley, former governor of South Carolina and former U.S. Secretary of Education. The remaining 11 members included exceptional individuals from various stakeholder groups, including WICHE Commissioner Senator Dave Nething from North Dakota and WICHE Legislative Advisory Committee member Carol Liu, assemblywoman from California.

The report argues compellingly that our systems of accountability need to be improved and lays out possible ways in which different stakeholders could contribute to improved accountability, making the case that the roles of various stakeholders in assuring accountability should align with their specific areas of responsibility. One of the most provocative recommendations in the report is the call for “a national student unit record system.” Absent such a system in the higher education arena – in which the majority of students swirl from one institution to another – we will never know whether students are achieving their goals or whether our institutions are doing their job. Many states have successfully developed such systems, assuring security of individual students’ records while substantially enhancing the state’s knowledge of its systems efficacy. A national system would allow for this kind of analysis for our overall system of higher education. While many in higher education have received this recommendation with enthusiasm, others are concerned. Lingenfelter will describe the major findings of the report and discuss perspectives from different points of view.

Biographical Information about the Speaker

Paul E. Lingenfelter became executive director of SHEEO, the national organization of State Higher Education Executive Officers, in June 2000. His work at SHEEO has focused on increasing successful student participation in higher education, including: strengthening student preparation by building stronger relationships with K-12 educators; improving the quality of teaching; developing accountability systems that contribute to improved performance; improving mechanisms for developing state higher education policy; and developing the data systems and financial policies needed to achieve educational improvement. From 1985 to 2000 Lingenfelter served on the staff
of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. In 1996, he was appointed vice president to establish and lead the MacArthur Foundation’s Program on Human and Community Development, which supports research, policy analysis, and practical interventions that address economic opportunity, community capacity, child and youth development, and mental health. Before this appointment, he was involved in the full range of the foundation’s international and domestic programs as associate vice president for planning and evaluation and director of program-related investments. Lingenfelter served as deputy director for fiscal affairs for the Illinois Board of Higher Education from 1980 to 1985. From 1968 to 1980, he held other administrative positions with the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the University of Michigan, where he staffed a faculty research grants competition and a university committee on the role of the dissertation in graduate education. He has been retained as a consultant by the United States Corporation for National Service, the Laidlaw Foundation in Canada, the Education Commission of the States, the New York Board of Regents, and the U.S. Office of Education. Lingenfelter 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. His graduate work in higher education administration emphasized political science and policy analysis. He has written numerous policy studies and articles related to his work in higher education and philanthropy.

10.45 - 11.00 am  Break
Policy Discussion: Perspective from the “For-Profit Sector”

As Congress considers reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, one of the most controversial proposals being considered would eliminate the distinction that exists in current federal law between for-profit and nonprofit postsecondary institutions and consider all institutions as essentially equivalent, from the federal perspective. This change would have little impact on students’ eligibility for most federal financial aid because students attending most for-profit institutions are already eligible for all of the largest federal student aid programs.

The change would, however, make for-profit institutions eligible for a number of federal “institutional” aid programs imbedded within the Higher Education Act, as well as for those from programs in other federal agencies that use the Higher Education Act’s definition of an “institution of higher education.” The change would also modestly increase eligibility for the three smaller federal “campus-based” financial aid programs – supplemental educational opportunity grants (SEOG), college work-study (CWS), and the Perkins loan program – which heretofore have been available only to students attending public or nonprofit private institutions.

Proponents of the plan contend that for-profit institutions serve the public good by providing educational programs equivalent in quality to nonprofit institutions, as attested to by their accreditation, and that their students and institutions should therefore be eligible for the same benefits as students attending other institutions. Opponents of the plan contend that for-profit and nonprofit institutions differ fundamentally in their reasons for being and thus differ greatly in their roles and missions. They also express fear that opening up the programs to a new group of institutions, given the stagnant federal budget for higher education, will further diminish the resources colleges have today to sustain quality and access.

Similar discussions abound in the Western states, as the presence of for-profit providers of higher education services increases. Some states, for example, provide state financial aid to students in for-profit institutions; others do not. Some states welcome new providers, even incorporating them into public policy discussions; others do not. And all states will be impacted by the federal discussion, because if the federal definition changes, state programs that receive federal funds will not be able to discriminate against federally eligible institutions.

Commissioner Gudis, a recognized national leader in the for-profit sector of higher education, who is actively engaged in both state and federal discussions of the roles and responsibilities of for-profit institutions, will share with the commission perspectives from the for-profit sector on its contributions to the public good, its position within the higher education community, and where public policy should be headed regarding this rapidly growing and increasingly valuable component of American higher education.
Biographical Information about the Speaker

Lawrence M. Gudis has been employed for over 19 years by the Apollo Group. Currently, he is responsible for Apollo Group’s expansion beyond the United States as its senior vice president/international development. He was responsible for the development of the newest venture in higher education for Apollo Group – Axia College, which serves an increasing population of recent high school graduates who must work full or part-time. Prior to his appointment as president of Axia College, Gudis worked more than 16 years at the University of Phoenix, serving in several capacities: first as campus director, then vice president of the Phoenix Campus, and finally as a senior vice president for the University of Phoenix. In 1998 Gudis led the UOP Phoenix Campus when it was awarded the Governor’s Pioneer Award for Quality, the only baccalaureate-granting institution in Arizona to earn this award. Additionally, he served as an examiner for the State of Arizona Governor’s Quality Award in 2001. In 2002 he was named by the United States Department of Commerce to the Board of Examiners for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. A community advocate, he has served on the boards of Gompers Center for the Handicapped and the Foundation for Senior Living. In 2002, he was the primary organizer and sponsor for a Habitat for Humanity home and is a board member for the Valley of the Sun Habitat for Humanity.
What’s Up in Alaskan Higher Education?

Mark Hamilton, president of the University of Alaska and former WICHE commissioner (1999 to 2003), will describe the University of Alaska system of higher education and discuss the unique challenges and opportunities that the state faces. Alaska has the third smallest population of the WICHE states, with slightly over 625,000 residents, and it is by far the largest geographically. It has the largest share of native people (14 percent) of any state in the U.S. It is a state of extremes – extremely few people, extremely large spaces, extremely tall mountains, extremely cold winters, extremely dark summers, extremely low taxes, and more. All of which makes it an extremely interesting place to live and do business.

Alaska higher education reflects this extreme culture. Alaska was one of the first states to invest heavily in distance learning through technology. Its distributed system of education provides a broad array of services in many exceptionally remote areas. And the university’s resident campuses in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau provide unique learning environments.

Biographical Information about the Speaker

Mark Hamilton, the twelfth president of the University of Alaska, oversees the operations of the University of Alaska system. Under Hamilton’s dynamic leadership over the past six years, the university has been rejuvenated. After a decade of budget cuts and program, faculty, and staff reductions, the University of Alaska has experienced budget growth, program expansions, and increases in facilities, faculty, staff, and students unprecedented in previous administrations. The university enrolls 33,900 students, employs 7,850 faculty, staff and students, and has an operating budget of over $530 million. As one of his first official actions as president, Hamilton established the UA Scholars Program to persuade the state’s brightest high school graduates to stay in Alaska for college. The program has been a major success, currently enticing 1,385 scholars to stay in-state for their higher education. In addition, the number of Alaska high school seniors who have come directly to the university has increased by more than 42 percent since 1999.

President Hamilton has convinced the governor, the legislature, and the public that the University of Alaska is a first-rate student university, as well as a first-rate research university. Therefore, the state’s financial difficulties are one reason to spend more, not less, on higher education. Both of the last two governors have made the university a priority, as has the legislature. The public has also responded. As soon as students and their parents recognized the state was investing in higher education, students were willing and even eager to go to college at their state university. In addition, once Alaska businesses were sure that the university was moving forward, partnerships began to flourish.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.30 - 1.30 pm</td>
<td>Buffet Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Room Restaurant, 1st Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 - 2.00 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.00 - 3.30 pm  
Treadwell Room, 1st Floor  

Policy Discussion: Results of the Study on Student Mobility

A joint meeting of the Programs and Services and Issue Analysis and Research Committees

Christopher Morphew has been collaborating with WICHE on a study to examine the utility and promise of interstate student exchange agreements, using the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) program as a proxy. With funding support from Lumina Foundation for Education, the study is examining how out-of-state migration patterns are likely to affect student access and success, and how these patterns may be affected by regional policies designed to make interstate migration easier. The study addresses such questions as: Who benefits from student interstate migration patterns? What evidence is there that student interstate migration patterns serve states’ diverse higher education and economic needs? What political/policy factors contribute to student interstate migration patterns? At the May 2004 commission meeting, Morphew outlined his project to members of the Programs and Services Committee and the Issue Analysis and Research Committee. During fall 2004 Morphew collected information via an online survey of WUE students, and he will report on major findings during a joint meeting of the two committees. Results of the study will be directed toward how state and regional policies might be constructed to allow states to share their finite higher education resources and maintain, or perhaps increase, student access to public higher education resources.

Biographical Information about the Speaker

Christopher C. Morphew is associate professor of higher education administration at the University of Kansas. On July 1, he will join the faculty of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. Prior to joining KU in 1997, he was a visiting assistant professor at Iowa State University. His research agenda focuses on issues of higher education governance and policy, including work at the institutional, state, and federal levels. He has received funding for his research from the Ford Foundation, Lumina Foundation for Education, and the National Center for Education Statistics. He has published widely in journals, including The Journal of Higher Education, Review of Higher Education, and Higher Education Policy. He received his Ph.D. in social sciences and educational practices from Stanford University in 1996. He also holds degrees from the University of Notre Dame and Harvard University.

3.30 - 4.00 pm

Break
Monday, May 16, 2005

4.00 - 8.45 pm
Off hotel property

Reception and Dinner in Juneau

Note: Dress is casual. Guests should wear layers and be prepared for any kind of weather (sunny and 68 or rainy and cold). For those who wish to hike back down after dinner, appropriate hiking gear is a must.

4.00 – 4.30 pm
Transportation to the reception: The bus will depart from the front of the hotel (please board the bus immediately).

4.30 – 5.30 pm
Reception at the University of Alaska Southeast, Auke Bay Campus.

5.30 – 6.00 pm
Bus departs university/transportation to dinner.

6.00 – 8.00 pm
Ride Mt. Roberts Tramway to the Timberline Bar & Grill for dinner and entertainment.

Predinner Tlinglít (pronounced “klincget”) dance demonstration: welcome by local Alaska Native dance group, followed by a buffet dinner of traditional Alaskan fare (no speaker planned).

8.00 – 8.45 pm
Following dinner, and at your leisure, return to sea-level via the tram and stroll .5 miles back to the hotel along historic South Franklin Street (last tram of the evening is at 8.45 pm).
Tuesday, November 13, 2006

8.00 - 9.30 pm  
Carriage House

Policy Discussion: State Strategies to Enhance Student Success

Improving the chances of student success, as measured by year-to-year retention and degree completion, is generally considered a problem for colleges and universities to solve. But state-level policy can support or hinder the effectiveness of institutional decisions to address student success problems and how those efforts are directed. Many states now require institutional reporting on retention and graduation rates; only a few have budgetary inducements in the form of incentive or performance funding for institutions that increase retention or degree completion. In this session, consultant Art Hauptman will look at current state strategies for improving student success and explore with participants other approaches states might consider to help postsecondary institutions increase their persistence and graduation rates.

Biographical Information on the Speaker

Arthur Hauptman has been a public policy consultant specializing in higher education finance issues since 1981. He has written or edited a number of volumes and dozens of chapters and articles on issues relating to the provision of student financial aid, fee setting, and the public funding of institutions. In the U.S., he has consulted with a number of federal and state agencies, and higher education associations and institutions. Internationally, over the past decade he has consulted with government ministries or funding bodies in more than a dozen industrialized and developing countries. He holds a B.A. in economics from Swarthmore College and a M.B.A. from Stanford University.
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8.45 - 10.45 am
Treadwell Room, 1st Floor

Programs and Services Committee

Phil Dubois (WY), chair
Carl Shaff (NV), vice chair
Diane Barrans (AK), ex officio

Marshall Lind (AK)
John Haeger (AZ)
Herbert Medina (CA)
Bill Hybl (CO)
Doris Ching (HI)
Bob Kustra (ID)
Ed Jasmin (MT)
Committee vice chair (NV)
Dede Feldman (NM)
Robert Potts (ND)
James Sager (OR)
Jim Hansen (SD)
George Mantes (UT)
Don Carlson (WA)
Committee chair (WY)

Agenda

Presiding: Phil Dubois (WY), chair
Primary Staff: Jere Mock, director, Programs and Services
Margo Schultz, coordinator, Student Exchange Programs

Approval of the Programs and Services Committee meeting minutes of November 8-9, 2004 10-3

FY 2006 workplan: The committee will take action on its portion of the FY 2006 workplan 10-6

Discussion Item: Member states’ use of out-of-region schools for WICHE’s Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) 10-8

Discussion Item: Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) – Preserving access through the 150 percent formula 10-10

Information Item: NEON, The Northwest Educational Outreach Network 10-13

Other business

Adjournment

10.45 - 11.00 am

Break
ACTION ITEM
Programs and Services Committee Meeting Minutes
November 8-9, 2004

Members Present
Phil Dubois (WY), chair
Carl Shaff (NV), vice chair
Dianne Barrans (AK), ex officio
Don Carlson (WA), ex officio
Marshall Lind (AK)
John Haeger (AZ)
Joel Sideman (AZ)
Bill Kuepper (CO)
Roberta Richards (HI)
Bob Kustra (ID)
Ed Jasmin (MT)
Robert Potts (ND)
Robert (Tad) Perry (SD)
Richard Kendell (UT)
Klaus Hanson (WY)

Committee Members Absent
Herbert Medina (CA)
Bill Byers (CO)
Jack Riggs (ID)
Dede Feldman (NM)
Cam Preus-Braly (OR)

Staff Present
Candy Allen
Suzanne Benally, consultant
Anne Finnigan
David Longanecker
Michelle Mééal
Jere Mock
Margo Stephenson (Schultz)

Chair Phil Dubois opened the meeting and welcomed new committee members.

Action Item
Approval of the Minutes of the May 17, 2004 Committee Meeting

Klaus Hanson moved and John Haeger seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2004, Programs and Services committee meeting.

Information Item
The Equity Scorecard

Jere Mock, director of Programs and Services, introduced Suzanne Benally, former WICHE staff member and lead consultant for the Equity Scorecard project. Mock said WICHE is serving as a subcontractor to the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education (USC-CUE) to expand the implementation of the Equity Scorecard. The initiative is supported with funding from the Ford Foundation and helps colleges and universities to provide equitable educational outcomes for historically underrepresented students. WICHE hopes to expand the project to other institutions in the WICHE region in the future and will seek additional funding from the Ford and Bill & Melinda Gates Foundations.

Benally described the pilot project being conducted with the USC Center for Urban Education; the center’s mission is to provide research on socially and economically underrepresented groups as part of its efforts to transform institutions to better serve these students. Estela Mara Bensimon, professor of higher education and director of the Center for Urban Education, and the center’s staff implemented the Equity Scorecard project at 14 colleges in California over the past three years, with support from the James Irvine Foundation. Earlier this year, Bensimon approached WICHE with an opportunity to expand the approach to other Western institutions. The core premise of the Equity Scorecard is that evidence about the state of equity in educational outcomes for underrepresented students, presented in the form of graphically displayed quantitative data, can have a powerful effect in mobilizing institutional attention and action.
Two Colorado institutions are participating in the pilot project: Fort Lewis College in Durango and Metropolitan State College of Denver. Fort Lewis College was selected because it has a large number of Native American students and has shown a commitment to serving this group by providing tuition-free education. Metropolitan State College of Denver is an urban, nonresidential university, which has the largest group of undergraduate minorities in Colorado and historically low tuition rates. Teams of administrators and faculty from the two institutions will work over a 12-month period to collect and analyze available data related to access, retention, institutional receptivity, and excellence and determine which outcomes to highlight for particular groups of students. The teams are called “evidence teams” because their basic role in the project is to hold a mirror up to an institution that reflects the status of underrepresented students with respect to basic educational outcomes. The teams are asked to view equity as a measure of institutional performance and to disaggregate students’ outcomes data by race, ethnicity and gender.

The teams are given a template to follow, beginning with institutional “vital signs.” They are then asked to develop objectives, to establish their baseline data, and identify the point at which their institutions might reach equity. The teams create institutional scorecards by selecting goals and measures for several priority areas and then present the completed scorecard to the institution’s president and top administrators. The hope is that the data and institutional reports generated through the scorecard project will also enable the campuses to establish a regular institutional assessment and accountability process to monitor outcomes for all students.

Benally gave examples of the types of questions that the teams will ask: What programs and majors do underrepresented students enroll in? Do the programs and majors in which underrepresented students enroll lead to high-demand or high-paying career opportunities? What are the comparative retention rates for underrepresented students by program? Does the composition of the faculty correspond to the racial and ethnic composition of the student body? Do particular majors or courses function as “gatekeepers” for some students and “gateways” for others? How large is the institutions’ pool of high-achieving, underrepresented students in each academic discipline that is eligible for graduate study?

Mock said the roles of WICHE and CUE will be to facilitate several of the teams’ meetings and to assist as the teams develop their final reports. She encouraged the committee members to let staff know if institutions in their states might be interested in participating in the Equity Scorecard project if additional external funding is obtained.

Dubois asked what steps institutions are encouraged to take once they have documented the relative gaps in educational outcomes for students of color at the course, major, and institution-wide levels. Benally said the Equity Scorecard project helps institutions to develop increased recognition of the existence and scope of inequities and to pinpoint areas that create educational barriers for minority students. The process has been found to increase awareness and motivate campuses to inspect more closely what is behind some of the issues and problems. She said some campuses have continued to work with Bensimon and the CUE staff to involve faculty in discussions of how their institutions can help students to improve their performance in math, science, and engineering courses. Other institutions have focused on building relationships with feeder institutions to help strengthen students’ academic preparation and competencies.

Robert Kustra said he encourages WICHE and the USC Center for Urban Education facilitators to work with faculty to examine how they are teaching underrepresented students and to help them gain enhanced understanding of students’ cultural differences and learning styles. John Haeger added that recent studies have shown that students in many urban institutions who participate in remedial courses tend to graduate at a higher rate than transfer students and first-time freshmen.

Mock suggested that she would like to invite some of the participants from the pilot project institutions to a future committee meeting to share their experiences within the Equity Scorecard, as well as to invite Benally and Bensimon back to describe outcomes from the project. She encourages the committee members to share information about the project with their state institutions and to direct them to WICHE for guidance on how to become involved with the initiative.

Information Item
The Student Exchange Program

Mock introduced Margo Stephenson (Schultz) as the new coordinator of the Student Exchange Program, following the retirement in late May 2004 of long-time WICHE employee Sandy Jackson.

Stephenson described the three programs that expand access for students in the West at the professional, graduate, and undergraduate levels. The oldest of the programs is the Professional Student Exchange (PSEP). Thirteen Western states
Stephenson mentioned that some WICHE states continue to provide financial support through PSEP to students who are enrolled in out-of-region institutions, especially in the field of dentistry. She said this raises questions about the equity of sending students to programs in states that do not pay WICHE dues when other professional programs exist within the WICHE region. Stephenson said WICHE is considering whether out-of-region schools enrolling PSEP students should be charged an administrative fee; staff will present a recommendation on this issue at the May commission meeting.

She also described the second WICHE exchange program: the Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP). This program includes 147 unique and distinctive graduate programs and has 443 students enrolled. Some three dozen institutions in 14 states (all but California) participate. Sixteen new WRGP programs were approved in 2004 and additional programs will be solicited in fall 2005. Students enrolled in WRGP programs pay resident tuition. Examples of the participating programs and institutions include: chemical physics, University of Nevada, Reno; East Asian languages and literatures, University of Hawaii at Manoa; hotel administration, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; infrared astrophysics, University of Wyoming; medical informatics, University of Utah; mining and earth systems engineering, Colorado School of Mines; raptor biology, Boise State University; and water resource administration, University of New Mexico.

The Western Undergraduate Exchange is the third and most popular program offered through WICHE. Over 20,000 students currently participate. Students enrolled in WUE institutions pay 150 percent of in-state tuition. The participating states and institutions determine which programs they will offer and how many WUE students they will enroll; institutions can also base WUE admissions decisions on students’ academic records. Students do not need to demonstrate financial need to participate in WUE. Doris Ching said the University of Hawaii is considering whether it can afford to continue its participation in WUE and said a WUE tuition rate of 200 percent of resident tuition would provide more institutional revenue. David Longanecker said WICHE’s ultimate responsibility is to protect affordable access for students. He said institutions can use admissions controls (including higher admissions standards and/or limiting WUE participation to specific fields) to balance their revenue needs. Phil Dubois said this issue could be discussed at a future meeting and cautioned against changing the WUE rate without giving sufficient notice to institutions and students.

Mock next described WICHE’s collaboration with the Midwest Higher Education Compact’s Master Property Program, an insurance and risk management program. The commission authorized this partnership at its May 2004 meeting, and the collaboration was approved by the compact’s commission in June 2004. Since that time, the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN) has joined the program as the first Western institution to participate. It is estimated that they will save $500,000 in one year on insurance premiums by purchasing through the MPP institutional consortium. Since July, WICHE staff has met with the risk managers at institutions throughout Colorado and Wyoming and also plans to meet with institutional administrators in other WICHE states.

To participate in the Master Property Program, institutions must have a deductible of $25,000 or more and participate in a group loss fund that provides the first level of coverage on member claims. The coverage that institutions are able to obtain is broadened by the larger asset base of the members. Institutions must show that they have an excellent history of risk management and loss control before they are eligible for membership. Institutions benefit from the programs’ economies of scale, excellent claims handling, comprehensive engineering services, loss control workshops, and web-based databases of asset valuations. Mock encouraged the commissioners to inform their state institutions about the program. She noted that institutions in six WICHE states are required to purchase their property insurance through their states’ risk management program; they include: Idaho, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, and Utah.

The committee adjourned to join the other commissioners for the Committee of the Whole session.
## WICHE FY 2006 Workplan: Priority Themes & Activities

### Existing Activities

**Finance**
- Annual Tuition and Fees report (GF)
- WCET’s Technology Costing Methodology project handbook (FIPSE)
- Multiyear policy projects on higher ed finance and financial aid (Lumina Foundation)
- Performance measurement improvement in the Western states public mental health programs
- Multistate policy forum (Lumina)
- Institute for Governors’ Policy Advisors (Lumina)
- Property insurance and risk consortium (self-funding)
- Legislative Advisory Committee

**Access**
- Student Exchange Programs: Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP), Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP), Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE)
- Accelerated Learning Initiatives (U.S. Dept. of Education)
- Pathways to College Network (GE Fund, James Irvine Foundation, FIPSE and others)
- Escalating Engagement (Ford)
- Multiyear policy projects on higher ed finance and financial aid (Lumina Foundation)
- High school graduates projections by state, race/ethnicity, and income
- Children’s mental health improvement projects in Wyoming and South Dakota
- Student mobility and the utility of WUE (Warshew and Ford)
- Equity Scorecard project (Ford and USC subcontract)
- Accelerated Learning Options (Lumina)
- Multistate forum for high-growth states (Lumina)
- Multistate forum on 1st dollar for access (Ford)

**Innovation & Info-technology**
- Support of the NorthWest Academic Forum’s regional initiatives (NWAF)
- NEON, the Northwest Educational Outreach Network (FIPSE)
- Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications initiatives
- EduTools work to provide comparisons of electronic learning resources (WCET)
- Building regional participation in the American TelEdCommunications Alliance (self-funding)
- Best practices in online student services (WCET)
- EduTools for AP courses (WCALO)
- AP teacher professional development online (WCALO)
- Audits of institutions’ student services online (self-funding)

**Workforce**
- Escalating Engagement (Ford)
- Mental health student exchange
- Workforce Briefs (GF)
- Building partnerships for competency: public mental health workforce development
- Rural mental health training initiatives

**Accountability**
- Regional benchmarks (GF)
- Electronic Regional Factbook: Policy Indicators for Higher Education (GF)
- Policy Insights on a range of higher education issues (GF)
- Guidelines in distance-delivered education for the regional accrediting agencies by WCET
- Facilitation of the Western States Decision Support Group for Public Mental Health (SAMHSA)
- Electronic alerts and clearinghouse (GF)
- SPIDO (GF)
### New Directions
(proposals have been approved by the commission)

#### Finance
- Technology Costing Methodology simplified spreadsheets (WCET)
- Policy work on residency
- WICHE service repayment program

#### Access
- PSEP centralization
- Methodological review of *Projections of High School Graduates* (Spencer)
- Student mobility

#### Innovation & Info-technology
- Quality measures in e-learning (WCET and Lumina)
- EduTools course evaluations (WCET)
- EduTools for AP Online (WCALO)
- Expanding professional advisory councils (health professions, vet medicine)

#### Workforce
- Developing Student Exchange Program responses to critical workforce shortages
- Assisting colleges of education with teachers of digital natives (WCET)
- Assessing institutional readiness for open source (WCET)
- Creating principles of good practice for the creation of open educational resources material (WCET)

#### Accountability
- Collaboration with NCHEMS, SHEEO and WICHE on database maintenance and exchanges

### On the Horizon
(proposals not yet submitted to the commission or past proposals that are being recast)

#### Finance
- New Directions (proposals have been approved by the commission)

#### Access
- New traditional students

#### Innovation & Info-technology
- Expansion of NEON
- Exploiting the development of portal technologies
- Establishing the Center for Transforming Student Services (CENTSS)
- Founding AdjunctMatch

#### Workforce
- WICHE licensure and credentialing service
- Recruiting leaders for Western higher education
- Assisting states in identifying academic program development needs

#### Accountability
- Follow-up initiatives responding to the National Center on Public Policy and Higher Education’s report cards
- Readiness for change
DISCUSSION ITEM

Member States’ Use of Out-of-Region Schools for WICHE’s Professional Student Exchange Program

Background
At the November 2004 commission meeting, staff sought preliminary input from commissioners regarding whether WICHE should assess a fee to the out-of-region institutions that receive students from the West through the Professional Student Exchange Program. This discussion item describes the current status of the out-of-region contracts and outlines potential implications of assessing an administrative fee.

Nine out-of-region institutions received $845,000 in PSEP support fees in academic year 2004-05. Currently, WICHE does not receive any compensation from the schools to administer these contracts, nor do the states where these institutions operate pay WICHE dues. These dollars represent lost tuition revenues to professional schools located in the WICHE dues-paying states. A total of 53 students are studying at out-of-region institutions this academic year in the fields of dentistry (41 students), optometry (nine students), and osteopathy (three students).

Out-of-Region Schools Receiving Students in 2004-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-Region School/State</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Students’ States of Residence</th>
<th>Total Fees Paid to School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry: Support Fee = $17,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton (NB)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NV, NM, ND, WY</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette (WI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Nebraska Medical Center (NB)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ND, WY</td>
<td>$137,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri-Kansas City (MO)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>$120,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometry: Support Fee = $11,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Southern College of Optometry (TN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>$11,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pennsylvania College of Optometry (PA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>$11,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Illinois College of Optometry (IL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CO, ND</td>
<td>$44,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nova Southeastern University (FL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>$33,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Ohio State University - College of Opt. (OH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteopathy: Support Fee = $16,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.T. Still Univ., Kirksville (MO)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>$48,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine: Support Fee = $24,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*** University of Kansas (KS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ND, UT, WY</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OUT-OF-REGION FEES = $854,000

NOTES:
* These Optometry schools do not have a contract with WICHE; arrangements are made through WICHE’s “Scholars” agreement on a year-to-year basis.
**Ohio State University’s College of Optometry has a contract with WICHE, but no WICHE students are currently attending.
*** WICHE has a contract with the University of Kansas’ Veterinary Medicine program, but no WICHE students are currently attending.
**Staff Recommendation**

After further analysis, staff does not recommend assessing an administrative fee at the current time, for two primary reasons. First, staff believes that additional students will enroll over time in the two new dental schools in the WICHE region: the Arizona School of Dental & Oral Health in Mesa, AZ, and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas School of Dental Medicine. This will likely reduce PSEP enrollments in the four out-of-region dental programs.

Secondly, staff is concerned that assessing a fee would further impede access for WICHE’s optometry students, especially if the two participating schools would pass the fees along to the PSEP students. A shortage of optometry schools exists in the West. The only public optometry school, located at the University of California, Berkeley, stopped admitting new PSEP students as of academic year 2004-05 because WICHE’s support fee did not fully compensate the resident/nonresident tuition differential. PSEP students now have only two options within the WICHE region, and both are private schools: Pacific University and Southern California College of Optometry. If WICHE students are not admitted at these schools, Colorado will provide support for these students to attend out-of-region schools in order to assure the state has a sufficient number of optometrists to fill the states’ workforce needs. North Dakota also sends a small number of students to the Illinois College of Optometry.
DISCUSSION ITEM
Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE):
Preserving Access through the 150 Percent Formula

Background
Since its creation in 1988, the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) has flourished, broadening access to higher education for students throughout the West. More than 20,000 students are enrolled at 127 WUE institutions this year. This includes four-year institutions and two-year campuses. Fourteen states are active participants, and in recent months, several California institutions have indicated they want to join. Participating institutions admit WUE students at a special tuition rate that is 150 percent of the institution’s regular resident tuition. Virtually all undergraduate fields are available to WUE students at the participating colleges and universities. Some institutions have opened their entire curriculum on a space-available or first-come, first-serve basis; others offer only designated programs. Students and their families saved an estimated $112 million in tuition during academic year 2004 through this program.

At the November 2004 commission meeting, two commissioners requested that staff investigate the pros and cons of increasing the WUE tuition rate from 150 to 200 percent. The following information analyzes the program’s current status and addresses the potential implications of a WUE tuition increase: chiefly, narrowed access.

Taking a Closer Look
Staff is concerned about the potential impact on access if the WUE tuition rate is increased to 200 percent. Several states rely on WUE to attract nonresident students to their campuses, while states with burgeoning enrollments use WUE as an important mechanism to expand access options for their students. The following tables are taken from the “WUE Enrollment Report,” summarizing enrollment numbers, as well as net flows of WUE migration by state, as of fall 2004.

Western Undergraduate Exchange
Fall 2004 Enrollment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Of Attendance</th>
<th>AK</th>
<th>AZ</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NV</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>UT</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>WY</th>
<th>Attendance Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska (4)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona (18)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado (24)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii (2)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho (6)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana (11)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada (7)</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico (9)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota (11)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon (6)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota (6)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah (9)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (5)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming (8)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>16,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL (127)</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>20,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WUE Ebbs and Flows.** An exodus is not occurring. Three Colorado institutions opted to discontinue their participation in WUE this year, due to the state’s financial constraints. They are: Colorado State University, Fort Collins (306 WUE students); University of Northern Colorado (486 WUE students); and Western State College (52 WUE students). These institutions may return to the program at a later date, once they become comfortable with the state’s new voucher program and have a chance to observe how it affects their enrollments.

Despite the departure of the three schools, others have joined WUE this year or anticipate they will. The University of Arizona (Tucson campus) and Eastern Arizona College have joined within the past six months. Strong interest in the program has been expressed by Western New Mexico University; California State University (CSU) Chico, CSU Humboldt; CSU Stanislaus; and CSU Dominguez Hills. CSU Humboldt has made a verbal commitment to join the network in the near future, and we expect that others will follow. We are also exploring participation in WUE with the CSU campuses of Pomona, Monterey Bay, and Sonoma, as well as with the College of the Desert, among others.

**WUE’s Heavy Hitters.** Nevada, Hawaii, Wyoming, and Colorado are the top four receiving states; each welcomes an average of 2,000 students annually through the WUE network. The top receiving institutions with an enrollment greater than 300 students are listed on the following table.

Outbound, Washington sends the most students (2,609), followed by Colorado (2,153), California (1,844), and Alaska (1,708).
Staff Recommendation

WUE was created to offer students access to a broader range of higher education opportunities. Students and their parents clearly like WUE; the program has consistently grown by an average of 10 percent annually over the last five years.

Staff does not recommend increasing the tuition rate from 150 to 200 percent. Most states are looking to increase their resident and nonresident tuitions over the next few years. If WUE tuition increased to 200 percent, students would be doubly penalized.

More institutions want to participate than leave the program under the current 150 percent tuition rate. If certain WUE institutions wish to decrease the number of WUE students they receive, they can consider the following strategies:

- Raise (or lower) the required GPA and or SAT/ACT scores.
- Establish an early application deadline.
- Set a cap on the number of WUE students they receive per year.
- Restrict WUE student access to specific programs that are in high demand by in-state residents.

Students benefit from WUE, but so do institutions and their states. WUE helps institutions to build an enrollment base to strengthen programs, improve efficiency by filing excess capacity, and provide student diversity. Institutions that border neighboring states value the program as it enables them to serve the citizens of nearby communities.

States benefit from WUE in several ways. Many of their residents are able to attend affordable institutions in other Western states at no expense to the state. Students may decide to remain in the receiving state following graduation, helping the state to build an educated workforce.

### INSTITUTION WUE ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
<td>2,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii, Manoa *</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii, Hilo</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montana</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hills State University</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU Bozeman</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Community College</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave Community College</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The University of Hawaii Manoa tightened its admissions standards for the WUE program in February 2005. WUE applicants for fall 2005 and beyond must now have a 3.0 GPA or greater (an increase of .2) and must have a composite SAT score of 1060 or better (an increase of 40 points).
INFORMATION ITEM
The Northwest Educational Outreach Network (NEON)

Summary
NEON, the Northwest Educational Outreach Network, was created as a collaboration of the Northwest Academic Forum (NWAF) and WICHE to help institutions and states to share academic programs and resources using distance delivered education. NWAF is an association of academic officers representing 32 public colleges and universities and state higher education agencies in 10 states; WICHE serves as the secretariat and fiscal agent for NWAF. We are developing NEON with a three-year grant of $616,000 from the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). NEON’s mission is to: 1) increase student access to high-demand academic programs using electronically delivered courses; and 2) leverage regional academic resources that can be shared across states and institutions.

Distance-delivered degree or certificate programs, each involving multiple institutions, are being expanded or created in three disciplines through NEON: nursing (Ph.D.), logistics and global supply chain management, and library media (graduate certificates). A new dimension of the consortium is a proposed NEON Course Exchange that will be piloted with five NWAF institutions over a 30-month period, beginning in July 2005.

Background
Regional Ph.D. in Nursing – The NEON nursing Ph.D. consortium has reached out to 18 institutions in the 15 WICHE states to encourage collaborations that will expand access to Ph.D. programs. One important “access partnership” that has developed involves the Oregon Health and Sciences University School of Nursing (OHSU SON), which is offering its Ph.D. program in nursing to rural Western states and institutions that do not have doctoral programs in nursing. Students from the University of Alaska Anchorage are enrolled this fall in the OHSU program as a result of NEON’s efforts; and others at Idaho State University and the University of Wyoming will enroll next fall.

NEON has also created, in partnership with the Western Institute of Nursing, the NursingPhD.org website (www.nursingPhD.org). The site provides information on all of the doctoral programs offered in the 15 Western states and guides prospective students on several important decisions, such as matching their scholarly interests with faculty research expertise and career opportunities. NEON also conducted a survey of all of the schools of nursing in the West to determine what master’s programs are currently available and this information is available on the NursingPhD.org Website.

Supply Chain Management Graduate Certificate – Also through NEON, three institutions in the WICHE region are creating an online graduate certificate program in supply chain management. This is a growing field in the business and military sectors that involves managing supply chains to move materials and component parts into and within businesses and organizations, and to customers. The three partner institutions for this new online program are Boise State University, the University of Alaska Anchorage, and the University of Hawaii Manoa. The certificate will be offered by each institution at the same tuition rate; students will be able to enroll at any of the three institutions, and courses taken from any of the partnering institutions will serve as resident credit. A team of five faculty members, representing the three institutions, are collaborating to develop the state-of-the-art curriculum.

The certificate program will include nine credit hours of core courses that will be taken by all students seeking the certificate and six credit hours of concentration courses. The three core courses include: logistics, supply chain management, and supply chain measurement. The concentration courses are: radio frequency identification, travel and transportation, lean operations, and a capstone course. Each of the partner institutions is developing specific core and concentration courses for the joint program.

The first NEON supply chain management courses will be offered during the spring semester 2006. All discussion, assignments, and tests will be handled online. Each university will be allotted 10 seats in each course, for a maximum enrollment of 30 students per course. Students will move through the program as a cohort enabling them to undertake group activities and research and to share professional experiences with one another.
Graduate Level Library Media Certification – The third NEON academic program involves extending online programs in library media certification to rural Western states that do not provide these programs through state-supported institutions. There is a growing shortage of certified school library media specialists in many Western states, fueled by staff retirements, a shortage of distance-delivered educational opportunities in this field, and the discontinuation of higher education library media preparation programs in several Midwestern states. Montana State University Bozeman and the University of Washington are working with North Dakota’s Department of Public Instruction, Library Association, and State Library to make their programs available in North Dakota. The MSU program has also been approved for accreditation by Alaska, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

The NEON Course Exchange
Now in its third and final year of FIPSE funding, the NEON project is focused on developing an organizational framework that will foster institutional collaboration and leverage NWAF members’ academic resources using electronically delivered courses. A business plan has been developed and approved by the NWAF Executive Committee that identifies funding and implementation strategies for a proposed NEON Course Exchange, beginning with five pilot institutions in July 2005. The strategies lay the foundation for a scaled-up program in 2008 and beyond – involving substantially more NWAF institutions and possibly other WICHE states.

Central administrative costs for the NEON Course Exchange are estimated at approximately $265,000 for the 30-month pilot. These funds will acquire software and technology support, hire administrative personnel, cover support services necessary to operate the course listing and exchange activities, and develop the NEON regional network that is envisioned for the future. Funding for these expenses will be derived from three sources: residual FIPSE grant funds of $35,700; partner institution fees totaling $131,250 over the 30-months ($5,200 per institution in 2005 and $10,500 per institution in 2006 and 2007); and revenues from student fees to be charged at $75 per student per course. The NEON Course Exchange budget assumes that more than $50,000 of the annual revenue will be generated by a total of 700 students paying the $75 course enrollment fee at the five partner institutions during the period from July 2005 through December 2007.

The target market for the services offered by the NEON Course Exchange will be the institutions that choose to partner to facilitate an exchange of courses and student enrollments. Institutions participating in NEON will make seats in their online classes available to students (primarily upper division undergraduate and graduate students from diverse majors) enrolled at the other partner institutions. Academic advisors will serve as the exchange facilitators – they will match students’ curricular needs with courses offered by the partner institutions.

Partner institutions will benefit from the NEON Course Exchange by:

• Enrolling students in online courses that have additional capacity, providing for more cost effective use of institutional resources and easing the enrollment process for students.

• Sharing instructional resources with partner institutions at a time when financial constraints and increasing student numbers combine to limit higher education programs. The NEON database will help academic administrators to identify existing courses as they consider institutional, state, and regional needs for various academic programs.

• Facilitating the transfer or cross-listing of the partner institutions’ courses.

• Enabling the administrative “backroom” processes (e.g., course lists and grading) between campuses via the NEON software.

• Participating in a multi-institutional network that will leverage faculty resources to better serve students in the region. Over time, interinstitutional relationships will develop that may lead to greater course sharing, development of new joint online programs, and collaborative academic planning.

Students who use the NEON Course Exchange will benefit in the pilot phase of this project by:

• Having more timely access to specific courses that are not available at the student’s home institution. Information about the available course offerings will be provided via a database with information on available slots. (These students may be denied an opportunity to enroll in a course at their home campus for a variety of reasons: courses may be closed due to under- or over-enrollment demand or the departures of faculty going on leave, retiring, or
terminating. In other cases, a required face-to-face course may be offered, but scheduling conflicts may lead some students to pursue an online course.)

- Avoiding payment of fees for provisional admission at the participating universities.
- Obtaining tuition savings in some cases; if there is a difference between resident and nonresident tuition for online courses, the student will pay 150 percent of resident tuition or nonresident tuition, whichever is less.

Governance and administrative responsibilities for the NEON Course Exchange will be divided as follows:

1. NWAF Executive Committee as Advisory Committee. The NEON Executive Committee members will help recruit the five pilot institutions, and they will identify regional and institutional academic needs and propose solutions appropriate for NEON activities and services.

2. NEON Policy Committee. This committee will make decisions on the policies and procedures governing the course exchange. Each institution that partners in the project will select an individual to represent the campus on the committee.

3. Campus-based leadership. Institutional administrators will also play a critical role on the NEON management team in determining the policies governing the exchange of courses and evaluating the course exchange outcomes. The chief academic officer at the five institutions will work closely with the unit heads on their campuses in dealing with academic advising and online delivery of courses.

4. WICHE-based leadership. Fiscal and administrative functions will be the primary responsibility of WICHE personnel. A NEON project director will be recruited to administer the pilot project and will be located at the WICHE offices in the Programs and Services unit. Revenues generated from three revenue sources (NEON grant residual funds, institutional fees and student enrollment fees) will cover the staffing and administrative costs during the July 2005 – December 2007 pilot.

**Next Steps for the NEON Course Exchange**

The next step in implementing the NEON Course Exchange is to identify pilot institutions that are willing to make the necessary personnel and financial commitments to the 30-month pilot. This will set in motion the process to create the NEON planning and implementation teams on each campus and to hire the support personnel at WICHE. Another key priority is finalizing the acquisition of software that will support the course listing and exchange functions (two existing systems are under consideration). These activities will be pursued during May, June, and July 2005.
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Chair Jane Nichols convened the Issue Analysis and Research Committee on November 8, 2004, with self introductions of members and staff. She suggested a slight reorganization of the agenda to allow time for Sally Johnstone to present on Monday afternoon. The minutes of the May 17, 2004, committee meeting were approved without revisions.

Cheryl Blanco gave a brief update on three potential future projects discussed at the previous committee meeting. She mentioned that a new proposal considered by the committee in May was submitted to the Ford Foundation, but no feedback was available from the foundation. A proposal submitted to Lumina Foundation for Education for a national study of accelerated learning options (e.g., advanced placement, dual enrollment, and International Baccalaureate) was funded at $150,000 over 18 months. Plans to submit a proposal to Spencer Foundation to conduct a methodological review of our high school graduates work are underway. Staff hopes to have a proposal ready by the end of this calendar year.

Chair Nichols asked Sally Johnstone to update the committee on the activities of the WCET. Johnstone reviewed WCET’s latest projects, which included:

- Membership growth to 250 organizations in 43 states and on five continents.
- Web-based student services audits for Arizona Board of Regents, Athabasca University, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.
- EduTools research on learning object repository software for Utah, Virginia, and Georgia.
- Commercial publication of *The Distance Learner’s Guide*, second edition, by Prentice Hall.
- Completion of online course tutorial for using Technology Costing Methodology tools, developed in conjunction with NCHEMS.
• Assistance to the University of Alaska with ICT management issues, a systemwide distance-learning plan, and management of the statewide Alaska Distance Education and Technology Consortium.
• Strategic planning assistance to British Open University and New School University (NY).
• Consultations with and speeches to dozens of groups around the world
• Annual conference, to be held Nov. 10 – 13 in San Antonio, TX, with 450 attendees.
• Hewlett Foundation-sponsored meetings on open content and computer gaming strategies for education.
• Participation in two UNESCO-sponsored forums

For the remainder of the afternoon session, Blanco updated members on WICHE’s Changing Direction project. She reviewed the purpose of the grant and how it relates to WICHE’s workplan efforts around access and finance issues. Since we have reached the end of the project’s first year last month, she summarized the many activities held in Year 1. During the past year, Hawaii and Idaho joined the project as technical assistance states. Commissioner Gary Stivers gave an overview of what Idaho is working on; in addition to building consensus among key education and policy leaders, he would like to come out of this experience with strategies to help the state move forward. Commissioner Doris Ching explained that Hawaii is looking at ways to move from waivers to scholarships. The governor is very supportive of these discussions, and the Changing Direction project is helping the state have productive conversations with legislators. Staff have scheduled several activities for Year 2, including the addition of a third cohort of technical assistance states. Blanco noted that invitations to participate in the third cohort will be sent to State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEOs) over the next few weeks. In reviewing activities planned for the second year, she asked for members’ thoughts on topics for a multistate policy forum next year. Among the topics mentioned were:

• Focusing on high-growth states and challenges for access and success.
• Retention.
• Student transition points (e.g., high school to college, two-year to four-year transfer).
• Accelerated mechanisms.

Some committee members supported the idea of combining student transitions and retention. Others suggested topics focusing on financial aid and college participation: How do you find more money for financial aid? Do you redirect merit aid to need-based aid? How does a state overcome low participation rates, especially when high school graduations rates are strong?

As the announced meeting time had ended, the committee adjourned for the day.

When the committee reconvened on Tuesday morning, Vice Chair Deckert chaired the committee in the absence of Chair Nichols. The major topic for discussion was a draft of the WICHE Benchmarks 2004 report. Blanco reviewed the purpose of the document and outlined the sections and the accompanying tables. She underscored the idea that the primary goal of the morning’s conversation was to determine if this is the right information to serve as benchmarks that we can update annually. In reviewing the paragraph at the beginning of the document, Blanco pointed out that this paragraph was set up to provide context for the benchmarks; in addition to data on per capita income, educational attainment, and high school graduation projections, she asked if there were other important pieces of information that might be included. Committee members suggested adding population by age and by race/ethnicity, degree attainment by income level, and college enrollments by income level. Staff will provide an update on the availability of data on these items at the next committee meeting.

As discussion followed on the benchmarks around participation and completion, several questions were asked about the data supporting the analysis and the figures as well as the relationships among the benchmarks. Of particular concern were the linkages that could be made across Figures 1 through 5. Staff was asked to revisit the benchmarks for these figures, the way the data are presented, and the “story” that connects them. This discussion consumed the committee’s allotted meeting time, and the committee agreed to continue reviewing and discussing the benchmarks on conference calls over the next five months before the May commission meeting.

The committee adjourned to rejoin the Committee of the Whole session.
ACTION ITEM

Issue Analysis and Research Committee Conference Call Meeting Minutes
March 30, 2005

Members Present:
Jane Nichols, chair (NV)
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Members Absent:
Ryan Deckert (OR), vice chair
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Don Carlson (WA), ex-officio
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Rick O’Donnell (CO)
Letitia Chambers (NM)
Richard Kunkel (ND)
James Sager (OR)
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Debora Merle (WA)

Staff Present:
Erin Barber
Cheryl Blanco
Sally Johnstone
David Longanecker
Brian Prescott

Chair Jane Nichols convened the conference call for the Issue Analysis and Research Committee on March 30, 2005, with self introductions of members and staff. The primary purpose of the call was to review an updated Benchmarks document provided by staff; no action items were included, in case there was not a quorum.

Before the committee began discussion, Blanco mentioned that the November 2004 committee discussion focused on specific suggestions on the figures, with many comments related to the “readability” of the access section. She said the current draft attempts to address those concerns, particularly with a redesign of the initial figures and replacement of several separate figures with the “pipeline” figure. Commissioner Gudis, noting that some figures included national comparative data, asked if national data should be included in all of the figures. In response, Chair Nichols asked what the purpose of the publication was. Blanco replied that it was to provide the commission with a mechanism for assessing the region’s progress in improving access – including participation, completion, equity, and affordability – and financing of higher education. Chair Nichols pointed out that we would like people to “buy into” these benchmarks. Gudis suggested that the opening paragraph be modified to reflect whether public policy is making a difference. Other suggestions on the opening contextual paragraph were to include the year of the data and, if possible, information on average cost of attendance. Commissioner Ogawa asked about the term “FTE,” and staff explained why it is used and how it differs from “headcount” numbers – both are used in postsecondary data. Chair Nichols questioned if the document would provide updated information for each of the figures in the future. Staff replied that annual data would be available on most of the indicators, but there may be a few that could not be updated annually. This may be a limiting factor, and commissioners will consider this further at the May meeting. Length of the document is important, and staff suggested that the Benchmarks be contained in four pages to increase its utility with a wide constituency.

There was much discussion about the access benchmarks: participation, completion, equity, and affordability. In general, commissioners were comfortable with the pipeline representation in Figure 1. Suggestions for the access benchmarks included clarifying and amplifying some of the text, revising a few of the figures for consistency (Figures 6 and 11), and correcting or explaining data or titles (Figures 3, 4, 9, 11, and 12). Commissioners were interested in the poverty data and asked staff to suggest other ways of displaying this information at the next committee meeting.
Due to time limitations for the call, the committee did not discuss the final set of benchmarks, related to finance. Chair Nichols asked that additional comments and suggestions be sent to Blanco as soon as possible, as the Benchmarks report should go to the full commission in November.

Under “other business,” David Longanecker mentioned that the workplan has substantial new ideas. He requested that committee members look at it closely before the May meeting, as we will need a robust discussion at that time.

Chair Nichols thanked everyone for participating and providing thoughtful suggestions and adjourned the conference call.
# WICHE FY 2006 Workplan: Priority Themes & Activities

## Existing Activities

### Finance
- Annual Tuition and Fees report (GF)
- WCET’s Technology Costing Methodology project handbook (FIPSE)
- Multistate policy projects on higher ed finance and financial aid (Lumina Foundation)
- Performance measurement improvement in the Western states public mental health programs
- Multistate policy forum (Lumina)
- Institute for Governors’ Policy Advisors (Lumina)
- Property insurance and risk consortium (self-funding)
- Legislative Advisory Committee

### Access
- Student Exchange Programs: Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP), Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP), Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE)
- Accelerated Learning Initiatives (U.S. Dept. of Education)
- Pathways to College Network (GE Fund, James Irvine Foundation, FIPSE and others)
- Escalating Engagement (Ford)
- Multistate policy projects on higher ed finance and financial aid (Lumina Foundation)
- High school graduates projections by state, race/ethnicity, and income
- Gil dern’s mental health improvement projects in Wyoming and South Dakota
- Student mobility and the utility of WUE (Worship and Ford)
- Equity Scorecard project (Ford and USC subcontract)
- Accelerated Learning Options (Lumina)
- Multistate forum for high-growth states (Lumina)
- Multistate forum on 1st dollar for access (Ford)

### Innovation & Info-technology
- Escalating Engagement (Ford)
- Building partnerships for competency: public mental health workforce development
- Rural mental health training initiatives
- Best practices in online student services (WCET)
- EduTools for AP courses (WCAI0)
- AP teacher professional development online (WCAI0)
- Audits of institutions’ student services online (self-funding)

### Workforce
- NEON, the Northwest Educational Outreach Network (FIPSE)
- Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications initiatives (FIPSE)
- EduTools work to provide comparisons of electronic learning resources (WCET)
- Building regional participation in the American TelEdCommunications Alliance (self-funding)
- Best practices in online student services (WCET)
- EduTools for AP courses (WCAI0)
- AP teacher professional development online (WCAI0)
- Audits of institutions’ student services online (self-funding)

### Accountability
- Regional benchmarks (GF)
- Electronic Regional Factbook: Policy Indicators for Higher Education (GF)
- Policy Insights on a range of higher education issues (GF)
- Guidelines in distance-delivered education for the regional accrediting agencies by WCET
- Facilitation of the Western States Decision Support Group for Public Mental Health (SAMHSA)
- Electronic alerts and clearinghouse (GF)
- SPIDO (GF)
### New Directions
(proposals have been approved by the commission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Innovation &amp; Info-technology</th>
<th>Workforce</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Costing Methodology simplified spreadsheets (WCET)</td>
<td>PSEP revitalization</td>
<td>Methodological review of Rejections of High School Graduates (Spencer)</td>
<td>Developing Student Exchange Program responses to critical workforce shortages</td>
<td>Collaboration with NCHEMS, SHEEO and WICHE on database maintenance and exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On the Horizon
(proposals not yet submitted to the commission or past proposals that are being recast)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Innovation &amp; Info-technology</th>
<th>Workforce</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy work on residency</td>
<td>New traditional students</td>
<td>Expansion of NEON</td>
<td>WICHE licensure and credentialing service</td>
<td>Follow-up initiatives responding to the National Center on Public Policy and Higher Education's report cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE service repayment program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring the development of portal technologies</td>
<td>Recruiting leaders for Western higher education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing the Center for Transforming Student Services (CENTSS)</td>
<td>Assisting states in identifying academic program development needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Founding AdjunctMatch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness for change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ACTION ITEM**

**Establishing the Center for Transforming Student Services**

**Summary**
WCET, in partnership with the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) and Seward, Inc., is establishing the Center for Transforming Student Services (CENTSS) to provide institutions with the tools and training they need to develop and deliver high-quality student services online. Through the center, WCET will continue its research on and development of an audit tool to evaluate online student services across four generations of sophistication. It will also expand its research and writing on best practice models in online student services; develop a one-stop, searchable website, featuring a broad collection of electronic student services resources; provide several communication tools to enhance the sharing of information on technology-enabled student services among institutions; and offer workshops, webcasts, and consulting services to assist institutions in redesigning their services to increase student success and retention.

**Background**
In *Beyond the Administrative Core: Creating Web-Based Services for Online Learners*, a LAAP (Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships) project funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) from 2000-2003, WCET worked with three institutions and a corporate partner to design new web-based academic advising, orientation, and tutoring services. These new services, customized and personalized for the individual student, are designed to improve student success and retention and to provide staff with the types of tools and information they need to better serve students. Through this project, WCET identified methodologies that help institutions, regardless of their size or mission, to understand the best ways of using technology to reinvent their services. From 2003-2005, WCET worked with MnSCU on the initial development of an audit tool to measure the sophistication of 20 online services.

**Relationship to WICHE’s Mission**
Good student services, such as academic advising, orientation, tutoring, and library services, are essential to a student’s academic success. Although traditional students may access these services on campus, a growing population of part-time and distance students who cannot come to campus have limited or nonexistent access. Given the National Center for Educational Statistic’s 1998 estimate (the most recent available) that 2.25 million students were studying online at U.S. colleges and universities, it is imperative that institutions find ways to service this burgeoning population. Indeed, today, all students expect to access many services over the web. By using well-designed technology solutions, institutions can more effectively and efficiently serve both the on- and off-campus populations. Thus, this project supports WICHE’s mission to improve access to higher education.

**Goal**
The goal is to help institutions learn how to provide high-quality student services online to increase student success and retention and to publicly recognize those that do.

**Description of Activities**
The Center for Transforming Student Services will:

- Provide a website rich in searchable resources, designed to help institutions build more effective student services for the online environment. This will include a showcase of best practices in e-services, guidelines for putting services online, and papers and presentations on selected e-student service topics.
- Continue to refine and expand the audit tool to help campuses evaluate the sophistication of their online services and learn how they compare to other schools with like characteristics. Both an online self-assessment version and an independently reviewed version will be available.
- Conduct on-site workshops on selected e-student service topics (on a contract basis or a registration basis).
- Conduct webcasts on selected topics.
- Provide an online forum to facilitate institutions’ sharing of information and advice on the use of technology in delivering student services.
- Provide public recognition for campuses with best practices in student services by presenting annual best practice awards.
- Publish an electronic newsletter featuring current thinking and best practices in e-student services.
Action Requested
Approval to seek, receive, and expend approximately $300,000 in funds to support the activities of the Center for Transforming Student Services.
ACTION ITEM

Founding AdjunctMatch: An e-Resource for Institutions and Online Faculty

Summary
The demand for online instructors is on the rise, and higher education institutions are increasingly turning to part-time faculty for the expansion and instructional support of their distance education programs. College administrators need a reliable and cost-effective system for finding qualified instructors quickly. In response to this need, WCET is launching AdjunctMatch, an online service, to facilitate the adjunct hiring process for both colleges and universities and for individuals seeking part-time employment to teach online and by other distance-learning modalities.

This launch has three phases. Phase I, which began in March 2005, is a one-year pilot to refine the service and evaluate its viability. It is limited to 10 to 15 member institutions, with representatives serving on an advisory board. Phase II, to begin in mid to late summer 2005, will allow more WCET member institutions to post positions and test the services through February 2006. If the earlier phases are successful, WCET will open AdjunctMatch to all other institutions in March 2006.

AdjunctMatch will be supported by a combination of participation fees and advertising revenue. Ultimately, several participation plans will be offered to institutions: an annual subscription for unlimited postings; a monthly plan for multiple postings; and a single posting plan. WCET members will receive a discount off the regular cost of the plans.

Background
In November 2002, WCET members of the caucus representing two-year institutions asked WCET to consider offering a service to assist them in finding qualified adjunct faculty to teach online. Many had shrinking budgets and could not hire more tenured faculty or needed an instructor with a special expertise they could not find locally. Still others were looking for ways to keep talented instructors – particularly those teaching in special subject areas whose declining enrollments were resulting in reduced course loads. If an instructor could teach a course for another institution, perhaps he/she could afford to stay. In response, WCET worked with a small committee of members to identify the kind of service they wanted and to explore current offerings in the marketplace. As part of that exploration, WCET formed a partnership with a corporate developer of a web service with much of the functionality that members were seeking. In November 2004, WCET conducted a demo of a prototype for AdjunctMatch at its annual conference. Based on the enthusiasm for the prototype, WCET invited representatives from 10 institutions who expressed interest at the conference to serve on an advisory board for a one-year pilot of AdjunctMatch as a new member service. This advisory board recommends and reviews new features and functionality for the AdjunctMatch site. It also advises on marketing plans, advertising criteria, and other aspects of the business plan.

Relationship to WICHE’s Mission
AdjunctMatch will help institutions reach a broader audience of potential instructors for their part-time online teaching positions at a very affordable cost. By increasing the size of the applicant pool and providing tools to help institutions ensure that they are considering the most qualified candidates, AdjunctMatch will assist institutions in continuing to offer instruction in courses that might otherwise be cancelled. This supports WICHE’s mission to assure access and excellence in higher education in the West.

Goal
Although the development of a more efficient service by which institutions and e-learning faculty find union is the initial aim of AdjunctMatch, the ultimate goal is to increase the quality of instruction offered via e-learning. By analyzing the use of AdjunctMatch, WCET will learn about current needs and trends and will use that information to project future demands and gaps, giving the field more time to prepare instructors in selected subject areas.
Description of Activities

AdjunctMatch will:

- Provide a website where institutions can list e-learning positions for local, regional, national, or international consideration.
- Provide institutions with tools to screen candidates using optional prescreening/virtual interview questions to reduce the time involved in reviewing resumes.
- Provide institutions with a secure area where they can organize position applications in one convenient place for review by a hiring team of selected individuals.
- Provide candidates for adjunct positions with a secure account where they can keep and update their resume and apply for positions.
- Produce reports analyzing the aggregate data, to determine trends and gaps in the e-learning employment market.

Action Requested

Approval to seek, receive, and expend approximately $200,000 in funds to support the activities of AdjunctMatch.
INFORMATION ITEM
State Policies and Issues Related to Residency

Summary
After receiving numerous suggestions and comments from commissioners, staff is proposing consideration of a proposal to be submitted to a foundation or other organization to conduct an inventory and analysis of state policies related to residency and an analysis of issues that relate to residency requirements within and across states. The State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) organization has indicated an interest in collaborating with us on this work. A study of this nature is consistent with our issue areas of access and financing.

Background
Residency requirements for higher education purposes that are established by states for their institutions and systems involve significant issues that relate to both access and the financing of higher education. These requirements are gatekeepers for access in that they provide protection through lower tuition rates for in-state students. They also align the contributions that taxpayers implicitly provide for higher education with the benefits they receive as “residents.” Finally, these requirements are important finance strategies through their high value as potential revenue generators, since out-of-state tuition is often three or four times the amount of in-state tuition.

Residency policies are widely used across the states for identifying tuition levels for students, yet limited comprehensive analyses have been conducted on the policies in higher education or on residency policies, as defined by other agencies. The project proposed by the Policy Analysis and Research unit would attempt to answer several questions about these policies, including:

What are the different residency policies in the 50 states?

1. How do residency requirements in noneducation areas, such as residency definitions for tax purposes, licensure, and voting, relate to how students establish residency when pursuing postsecondary education in the state?
2. How do residency requirements for postsecondary education vary by other factors, such as level (undergraduate vs. graduate) and delivery (traditional classroom courses vs. technologically delivered)?
3. What is the relationship between residency and finance policy? How do higher education systems and institutions use residency requirements and policies to influence revenues and the financing of higher education in the states?
4. What are the innovative emerging approaches to residency requirements for tuition purposes in the states?
5. What are the criteria for determining residency? Do the criteria differ for different types of institutions or programs?
6. Are there exemptions from existing residency requirements? If so, what are they and why do they exist?

In addition to addressing the questions above, this project will allow staff to expand WICHE’s online searchable database – the State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIDO) – and the Clearinghouse collection. Currently, residency policies are encompassed in another domain; creating a new domain and additional capacity in the Clearinghouse to identify and link to state policy studies on residency issues will provide a more robust resource for the education community and researchers.

Next Steps
Staff will continue to explore funding opportunities to support a national study of state residency requirements. Upon initial approval from the Issue Analysis and Research Committee, staff will return to the commission with an action item to move forward on a formal proposal.
INFORMATION ITEM
Policy Analysis & Research Unit Update

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Policy Analysis & Research
Continuing Projects – May 2005

Financing

INITIATIVES & ACTIVITIES

Changing Direction: Integrating Higher Education Financial Aid and Financing Policy (Phase 2) - A grant from Lumina Foundation for Education supports this continuation project. Phase 1 activities occurred between November 2001 and August 2003; Changing Direction moved into Phase 2 in September 2003 with additional funding of $1 million over three years to support expansion and broadening of the scope of this project. New areas under this grant include financing and retention issues. Project activities include offering technical assistance to 14 states on integrating financial aid, tuition, and appropriations policies; convening multistate policy forums; cosponsoring leadership institutes for legislators, governors' education policy advisors, and regents; sponsoring state roundtables; and commissioning research and policy papers.

Legislative Advisory Committee - To ensure that we engage state legislators in a variety of ways, WICHE created the Legislative Advisory Committee, composed of two legislators from each of the 15 WICHE states, in 1995. The purpose of the Legislative Advisory Committee is to: (1) inform the WICHE Commission’s Executive Committee and staff about significant legislative issues which pertain to higher education and related state issues; (2) provide input on WICHE initiatives; and (3) advise staff on program and participant considerations related to WICHE’s regional or subregional educational policy workshops. In recent years, the committee has convened in conjunction with the annual meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL).

STATE SERVICES & BENEFITS

- Access to state technical assistance to explore integrating financial aid, tuition, and appropriations decision making, revenue structures, and student retention.
- Copies of publications, such as commissioned papers, the data inventory, and special surveys.
- Access to SPIDO (State Policy Inventory Database Online) with tuition policies and summaries from 50 states.
- Participation in a national dialogue on innovative ways to bring financial aid and financing policy together.
- Involvement in multistate policy forums on financing and financial aid policies, revenue structures, and student retention.
- Cosponsorship of state roundtables on any of the key issues covered in this project.
- Participation in leadership institutes for legislators, executive office education staff, regents, and state-level commissioners.
Access and K-16

**INITIATIVES & ACTIVITIES**

**Pathways to College Network** - An alliance of major foundations, nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, and the U.S. Department of Education, working to improve college access and success for large numbers of underserved youth. WICHE has been the lead organization in developing and implementing the public policy and financial aid components of *Pathways.* As a lead partner, WICHE participated in the national release of *A Shared Agenda,* the alliance’s call to action for creation of an education system in America that encourages all young people to prepare for college. WICHE also expanded SPIDO, its free, searchable online policy inventory database, with policies from the 50 states related to: tuition and fees, teacher quality, financial aid, articulation and alignment, early outreach programs, remediation, data and accountability, equity, and governance.

**Western Consortium for Accelerated Learning Opportunities (WCALO)** - An initial three-year grant (2000-2003) from the U.S. Department of Education supported a nine-state consortium (Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, and Utah) focused on increasing the number of students from underrepresented populations who participate in accelerated learning options (e.g., AP, dual enrollment). The total three-year award of over $3.2 million has supported a variety of activities in the states and at the consortium level to promote accelerated learning. Our special studies and projects involved the states in working groups around access issues as we produced reports and modules addressing regionwide concerns with such topics as teacher and counselor professional development, online learning, and serving American Indian students. We were granted no-cost extensions through September 30, 2005, to conclude unfinished projects. In collaboration with the Idaho State Board of Education, we have applied for a new grant in the 2005 competition.

**Accelerated Learning Options: A Study of State and Institutional Policies and Practices** - Findings from this project will help guide policymakers and institutional leaders in K-12 and higher education on how to best channel limited resources for students. The study will also assist them in designing policies and practices that will more effectively broaden the opportunity for underrepresented students to participate in accelerated learning in order to be more competitive. Major project activities include a national policy inventory, a survey of institutional policies among public two- and four-year and private institutions, a transcript analysis, and student focus groups. The project’s final report will be released early in 2006.

---

**STATE SERVICES & BENEFITS**

- Collaboration on state case studies.
- Tailored technical assistance around P-16 issues.
- Access to SPIDO (State Policy Inventory Database Online).
- Access to a range of publications and strategy briefs around P-16 and access for underrepresented students.
- Funding for online AP courses, teacher and counselor professional development, pre-AP activities with programs like GEAR-UP, and other activities.
- Participation in the consortium network of K-12/SHEEO representatives.
- Participation in working groups on issues around online AP, serving American Indian students with accelerated learning, teacher pre-service AP models, counselor training, and student progress.
- State roundtables on accelerated learning.
- Exposure to other state’s approaches to accelerated learning for low-income and rural students.
Access and K-16

INITIATIVES & ACTIVITIES

**Expanding Engagement: Public Policy to Meet State and Regional Needs** ~ A grant from the Ford Foundation to work with states on concerns around quality and accountability in a time of stable or declining enrollments. Our emphasis here is on helping states that don’t anticipate enrollment increases to examine different strategies that respond to their specific demographic issues.

**Escalating Engagement: State Policy to Protect Access to Higher Education** ~ A new proposal to the Ford Foundation to expand and accelerate the work we have started, both in terms of access as a key issue area and the involvement of policymakers. In addition to activities such as policy forums, state technical assistance, roundtables, and commissioned papers, we have requested support for the Legislative Advisory Committee.

**Knocking at the College Door: Projections of High School Graduates by State, Income, and Race/Ethnicity** ~ The 6th edition of this report was released in January 2004. This popular publication extends the projections from 2012 to 2018 and adds SES (socioeconomic status) data to our model, enabling us to project high school graduates not only by race/ethnicity but also by family income for the 50 states. Complementary publications include individual state profiles and Policy Insights reports.

**Following the Sun: Trends, Issues, and Policy Implications of Student Mobility** ~ Staff will continue to seek funding for a project on student mobility. The purpose of this project would be to assist states in building their capacity to measure and understand the impact of student mobility and to effectively address related public policy issues. A related project began in 2004, with Christopher Morphew from the University of Kansas. Morphew is exploring student migration patterns, looking specifically at who benefits from these patterns, what evidence exists that these patterns serve states’ higher education and economic needs, and what political and policy factors contribute to these patterns.

**Other Publications** ~ Ongoing work that informs the access conversation in the West includes our regional fact book, an annual report on tuition and fees in public institutions, our Policy Alerts and Stat Alerts e-mail notices, state-specific pages on our Web site to show census data, our short report series titled Policy Insights, and an informational bulletin titled Exchanges.

STATE SERVICES & BENEFITS

- Roundtables for states.
- Small, state focus groups of carefully selected top-level policymakers to define the issues.
- Subregional policy forums.
- Regional policy forums.
- Ford/WICHE Fellows for emerging professionals in higher education policy analysis and research.
- Research papers and white papers on access, accountability, and workforce issues.

- Access to high school projections data by race/ethnicity and income for 50 states.
- Individual state profiles.
- Policy Insights reports to explore policy implications of the data.
- State roundtable on mobility issues.
- Tailored technical assistance to examine student mobility in the state.
- Subregional forums on student mobility.
- Current demographic information and other data on higher education issues.
- Reports, studies, and related information from an array of sources to support informed policy making.
Accountability

**INITIATIVES & ACTIVITIES**

**Expanding Engagement: Public Policy to Meet State and Regional Needs** ~ The Ford grant also supports our work on accountability and has enabled us to assist states with roundtables and technical assistance. We also utilize several other venues – subregional multistate conferences, publications, briefing papers, and research reports – to promote discussion and action among policy makers and policy shapers on accountability issues.

**State Services & Benefits**

- Access to state-specific technical assistance.
- Convening state roundtables.
- Access to consultants, facilitators, and other external expertise.
- Participation in regional and subregional policy forums.
- Access to new publications and reports on accountability issues.

Workforce

**INITIATIVES**

**Expanding Engagement: Public Policy to Meet State and Regional Needs** ~ Our efforts on workforce issues are supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation and have centered on four areas: nursing, college faculty, information technology workforce, and teacher education.

**Escalating Engagement: State Policy to Protect Access to Higher Education** ~ This new proposal to the Ford Foundation will work to expand and accelerate our efforts related to workforce issues. Workforce activities may include policy forums, state technical assistance, roundtables, and commissioned papers.

**STATE SERVICES**

- Access to analytical information on workforce issues.
- Participation in regional and subregional workforce forums.
- Access to technical assistance, consultants, and facilitators.
- Small state focus groups of carefully selected top-level policymakers to define the issues.
Initiatives

Expanding Engagement: Public Policy to Meet State and Regional Needs ~ With support from our Ford Foundation grant, we sponsored a regional policy forum in October 2003, titled Weathering the Perfect Storm: Information Technology in a Limited Resource Environment. A summary of major policy issues that emerged during the forum is included in one of our Exchanges reports.

Western Consortium for Accelerated Learning Opportunities (WCALO) ~ An initial three-year grant (2000-2003) from the U.S. Department of Education supported a nine-state consortium (Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, and Utah) to increase the numbers of students from underrepresented populations who participate in accelerated learning options (e.g., AP, dual enrollment). The total three-year award of over $3.2 million has supported a variety of activities, in the states and at the consortium level, which promote accelerated learning. One of our special projects this year involves further development of an online resource, using EduTools to help teachers and administrators assess key features of online advanced placement courses. Our proposal for another three-year grant provides for further expansion of EduTools for advanced placement courses and other innovative approaches.

State Services

- Participation in regional and subregional policy forums on supporting information technology in a time of limited resources.
- Access to technical assistance, consultants, facilitators, and analytical information on workforce issues.
- Small, state focus groups of carefully selected top-level policymakers to define the issues.
- Free web-based assessment of online advanced placement courses through EduTools.
- Exposure to other state’s innovative approaches to accelerated learning for low-income and rural students.
Tuesday, May 17, 2005

11.00 am - 12.00 noon
Treadwell Room, 1st Floor

Committee of the Whole – Business Session

Consent Agenda

- Approval of the Committee of the Whole meeting minutes of November 8-9, 2004 12-3
- Approval of the Executive Committee meeting minutes of November 2004, January 2005, February 2005, and April 2005 (Tab 1)

Non-consent Agenda

- Report and recommended action of the Executive Committee, WICHE Vice Chair Dubois (Tab 1)
- Report and recommended action of the Programs and Services Committee, Committee Chair Dubois (Tab 10)
- Approval of FY 2006 workplan – committee’s recommendations (Tab 10)
- Report and recommended action of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee, Committee Chair Nichols (Tab 11)
- Approval of FY 2006 workplan – committee’s recommendations (Tab 11)
- Establishing the Center for Transforming Student Services (Tab 11)
- Founding AdjunctMatch: An e-resource for institutions and online faculty (Tab 11)
- Approval of the budget and salary/benefit recommendations for FY 2006 12-15
- Approval of the workplan for FY 2006 12-23
- Election of new vice chair for CY 2005

Meeting evaluation 12-35

Other business

Adjournment
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Table of Contents

Participants ................................................................. 12-4

Committee of the Whole (first session, November 8, 2004)

Approval of the May 2004 meeting minutes ................................................................. 12-8

The History of WICHE: The First Forty Years ................................................................. 12-8

Report of the chair ........................................................................................................ 12-8

Report of the executive director ..................................................................................... 12-9

Report of the Nominating Committee .............................................................................. 12-9

Committee of the Whole (second session, November 9, 2004)

Report and action of the Executive Committee (minutes, tab 1 of this agenda book)

Action Item: Audit report for FY 2004 ........................................................................ 12-10

Report of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee (minutes, tab 11 of this agenda book) .............................................................................................................. 12-10

Report of the Programs and Services Committee (minutes, tab 10 of this agenda book) .............................................................................................................. 12-10

Action Item: Revisions to the bylaws ............................................................................. 12-11

Information Item: FY 2005 budget update ..................................................................... 12-11

Action Item: Election of chair and vice chair ................................................................. 12-12

Tribute to outgoing chair ............................................................................................... 12-12

Remarks from the new chair ........................................................................................ 12-13

Audit Committee members named ................................................................................. 12-13

Selection of 2005 Executive Committee members ....................................................... 12-13

Report of the Site Selection Committee ....................................................................... 12-13

Meeting evaluation .......................................................................................................... 12-14

Adjournment .................................................................................................................. 12-14

Special events held during this meeting ....................................................................... 12-14
Participants

Commissioners
*Executive Committee member 2004

ALASKA
*Diane M. Barrans, WICHE Vice Chair 2004
Executive Director
Alaska Com. on Postsecondary Education
Juneau

Johnny Ellis
State Senator
Anchorage

Marshall L. Lind
Former Chancellor of Higher Education
University of Alaska Fairbanks
Juneau

ARIZONA
*Lawrence M. Gudis
Senior Vice President
Apollo Group
Axia College
Phoenix

John Haeger
President
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff

Joel Sideman
Executive Director
Arizona Board of Regents
Phoenix

CALIFORNIA

COLORADO
*William G. Kuepper III
Senior Policy Advisor
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
Denver

Guest: Janet Kuepper

HAWAII
*Doris Ching
Vice President for Student Affairs
University of Hawaii System
Honolulu

HA W A I I (continued)
Roy T. Ogawa
Attorney at Law
Honolulu

Guest: Lorine Ogawa

Roberta M. Richards
State Officer
Hawaii Department of Education
Honolulu

IDAHO
Richard Bowen
President
Idaho State University
Pocatello

Robert W. Kustra
President
Boise State University
Boise

*Gary W. Stivers
Executive Director
State Board of Education
Boise

Guest: Linda Stivers

MONTANA
Ed Jasmin
Immediate Past Chairman
Montana Board of Regents
Big Fork

Guest: Bobbi Jasmin

*Sheila Stearns
Commissioner of Higher Education
Montana University System
Helena

Cindy Younkin
State Representative
Bozeman
NEVADA
Jane A. Nichols
Former Chancellor of the University and Community College System of Nevada
Department of Education Leadership
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno

*Carl Shaff
Educational Consultant
Nevada State Department of Education
Reno

NEW MEXICO
Letitia Chambers
Executive Director
New Mexico Commission on Higher Education
Santa Fe

*Patricia Sullivan
Assistant Director
Waste-Management Education and Research Consortium (WERC)
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces
Las Cruces

NORTH DAKOTA
Richard Kunkel
Member
State Board of Higher Education
Devils Lake

Robert Potts
Chancellor
North Dakota University System
Bismarck

OREGON
Ryan P. Deckert
State Senator
Portland

SOUTH DAKOTA
Robert Burns
Distinguished Professor
Political Science Department
South Dakota State University
Brookings

*S. David Harkins
Past Chair 2001
President
South Dakota Board of Regents
Pierre

SOUTH DAKOTA (continued)
*Charles Ruch, Immediate Past Chair 2003
President
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology
Rapid City
Guest: Sally Ruch

UTAH
Richard E. Kendell
Commissioner of Higher Education
Utah System of Higher Education
Salt Lake City

*E. George Mantes
Regent, State Board of Regents
Salt Lake City
Guest: Mary Ann Mantes

WASHINGTON
*Don Carlson, WICHE Chair 2004
State Senator
Vancouver

*Deborah Merle
Governor’s Policy Advisory for Higher Education
Olympia

WYOMING
Philip L. Dubois
President
University of Wyoming
Laramie

*Klaus Hanson
Professor of German and Chair
Department of Modern and Classical Languages
University of Wyoming
Laramie

WICHE GUESTS
Thomas Boyd
Associate Dean of Academic Programs
Colorado School of Mines
Golden, CO

Julie Davis Bell, Speaker
Education Program Director
National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)
Denver, CO
WICHE Guests (continued)

Pat Callan, Speaker
President, National Center for Public Policy
in Higher Education
San Jose, CA

Pam O. Inmann
Executive Director
Western Governors’ Association
Denver, CO

Dennis Jones, Speaker
President, National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems (NCHEMS)
Boulder, CO

Richard Jonsen
Former WICHE Executive Director, 1989-1999
Louisville, CO

Dewayne Matthews
Former WICHE Commissioner from New Mexico,
former WICHE staff member, and Vice President for
State Services
Education Commission of the States
Denver, CO

Aims McGuinness, Jr.
Senior Associate
National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems (NCHEMS)
Boulder, CO

Terese Rainwater
Project Manager
The National Collaborative for Postsecondary Education
Policy
Education Commission of the States (ECS)
Denver, CO

Philip L. Sirotkin
Former WICHE Executive Director, 1976-1989
Boulder, CO

Diane Vines
Former WICHE Commissioner and past Chair 1997
Consultant, Arnica Creative Services
Portland, OR

WICHE Staff

Frank Abbott
Senior Policy Advisor

Scott Adams
Research Associate and Technical Assistance Associate
Mental Health Program

Candy Allen
Graphic Designer
Programs and Services/Communications

Suzanne Benally
Consultant, Equity Scorecard Project Programs and Services

Cheryl Blanco
Director
Policy Analysis & Research

Mimi Bradley
Postdoctoral Fellow
Mental Health Program

Anne Finnigan
Communications Associate
Programs and Services/Communications

Kelly Israelson
Senior Accounting Specialist
Administrative Services

Sally Johnstone
Director
WCET

David Longanecker
Executive Director

Michelle Médal
Administrative Assistant
Policy Analysis and Research and
Programs and Services/Communications

Demi Michelau
Project Coordinator
Policy Analysis & Research

Craig Milburn
Accounting Manager
Administrative Services

Jere Mock
Director
Programs and Services/Communications
WICHE Staff (continued)

Dennis Mohatt
Program Director
Mental Health

Marv Myers
Director
Administrative Services

Brian Prescott
Research Associate
Policy Analysis and Research

Jenny Shaw
Administrative Assistant
Mental Health Program

Margo Stephenson (Schultz)
Program Coordinator
Student Exchange Programs
Programs and Services/Communications

Marla Williams
Assistant to the Executive Director
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (first session)
Chair Ruch called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. on Monday, November 8, 2004.

Approval of the Minutes

The History of WICHE
Chair Carlson reported that at last November’s meeting, in honor of WICHE’s 50th anniversary, a booklet was distributed that summarized Frank Abbott’s publication, A History of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education: The First Forty Years. Frank Abbott is a former director of WICHE’s Student Exchange Program and a former director of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. His principal activity at WICHE these past several years has been writing this history of the organization. His many years of dedicated and detailed work have come to fruition; the history book is now available for purchase from WICHE. Commissioners have already received a copy, and it is a companion piece to the new WICHE Commissioners Handbook. David Longanecker said WICHE owes Frank an enormous amount of gratitude and appreciation, and he asked Frank to stand and be recognized and asked if he would like to say a few words.

Frank Abbott thanked Chair Carlson for his kind remarks. Abbott said when he was 20 years old, 20 years seemed like an eternity. When he reflected on the fact that he came to WICHE in 1984, he realized that was 20 years ago; somehow it seemed like yesterday. It was long enough ago to give him a chance to get a very real feeling for this organization and its quite wonderful staff and its equally wonderful and remarkable commission. His friends include significant and memorable people from both groups. The commissioners have been a great bunch of people, who are representative of most, if not all, of the differing ideas that Westerners seem to possess. The staff is outstanding, hard working, and dedicated to what WICHE is all about. It was a wonderful opportunity to have WICHE’s support – an office, a computer, and so forth – while he put this history together. Abbott hoped the commissioners will have a chance to weigh and to read the document. There are pieces of it that are not only interesting but important for the well-being of the organization. Abbott said that through the years, we do learn some things from the past. He thanked WICHE for the opportunity to put the history together and was aware of places where it could have been done in greater depth, but hoped it would serve a useful purpose, be of some interest, and perhaps help, as time went on.

David Longanecker thanked Frank for his work on the first 40 years of this organization, and said he looks forward to his next volume on the Dick Jonsen/David Longanecker years. Longanecker said what is really neat about the book is that it shows there are no new ideas. The ideas that he and Dick have come up with over the past 15 years are the same ideas that Harold Enarson, Bob Kroepsch, and Phil Sirotkin had in years past.

Longanecker also thanked Loren Wyss, a former WICHE commissioner from Oregon, whose family foundation, the Wyss Foundation, provided resources for the publication of this document.

Report of the Chair
Don Carlson, WICHE Chair

Chair Carlson said that in Washington, the governor’s race is still going on; however, in his own race for reelection to the Washington State Senate, he had lost. It was a very close race; out of 45,000 votes in his district, he lost by some 450 votes. This does not mean that higher education issues go away. He is delighted to continue to support WICHE’s cooperative efforts in Washington and across the Western region. He said that WICHE and its staff play very significant roles. He thanked the unit directors, as well as all of those who make the unit directors look good. And he thanked the executive director, David Longanecker, whom he then called upon for his report.

Washington Commissioner James Sulton said he wanted to say a few words about Don Carlson, on behalf of the individuals in the state of Washington. He said Don has been an important figure in higher education in the state. While Don was very busy during his tough campaign, he took time to meet with him as the new director of the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board, to discuss the state’s Master Plan for Higher Education and other issues that might seem mundane to anyone outside of the higher education realm. There were several Democrats in the state of Washington who made sure he knew who Don Carlson was and who praised his leadership (and Don is a Republican!). When he arrived as a newcomer to the state, Don came right in on the scene to tell him about how important WICHE was to him and to the citizens of the state. He has appreciated Don’s service to the state and his collegiality.
Report of the Executive Director
David Longanecker, Executive Director

David Longanecker said progress on the workplan approved by the commission in May continues. He said WICHE is having a very good year. The workplan’s theme this year is “Staying the Course,” and staff are working with the 15 member states to help them understand the need to maintain the commitment to WICHE’s mission, which is, “broad access to high-quality postsecondary education for the citizens of the West,” despite the continuing financial difficulties many of our states continue to face.

Looking forward to the May meeting, and with the 2006 workplan in mind, and as times are evolving, WICHE may need to consider some new focus areas. The “Staying the Course” theme has been a very good one as we pull out of these tough economic times; however, there are things happening in higher education that suggest some regressions, and the staff will be bringing some ideas for your consideration at the May meeting.

Longanecker said he would be remiss not to thank the staff for the exceptional work that they do for WICHE. Yesterday afternoon, when the new commissioners were being briefed by the senior staff, he said he was so proud of them and the people who support them. This organization has exceptional senior staff, but they are only exceptional because of the exceptional junior staff behind them helping them to do good things for WICHE. He just wanted the commissioners to know how important WICHE’s staff are to him.

Finally, he paid tribute to Marla Williams – who, he acknowledged, he too often forgets to mention because he has wrongly come to take her for granted. And he said that, in fact, is just terrible because Marla is such an important part of the fabric of this organization. His active schedule wouldn’t be possible if he didn’t have Marla back at the office. He calls on Marla for a number of things: she is exceptional and an exceptionally close colleague. He is indebted to her and would like the commissioners to recognize how important she is to him and to WICHE.

Report of the Nominating Committee
Chuck Ruch, Committee Chair

Commissioner Ruch of South Dakota, committee chair, on behalf of the Nominating Committee – Cam Preus-Braly of Oregon and Gary Stivers of Idaho – nominated Diane Barrans of Alaska as chair and Phil Dubois of Wyoming as vice chair of WICHE for 2005. (Note: The election of chair and vice chair occurs on the second day of the commission meeting, during the second session of the Committee of the Whole.)

Commissioner Ruch thanked the Nominating Committee members and other commissioners who offered suggestions and ideas throughout the nominating process.

Chair Carlson said elections for these nominations will be held on Tuesday, during the Committee of the Whole session, beginning at 11:00 a.m.

The Committee of the Whole recessed on Monday, until Tuesday, November 9, at 11:00 a.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (second session)

Chair Carlson reconvened the Committee of the Whole at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 9, 2004.

Report and Action of the Executive Committee
Diane Barrans, Vice Chair

Purchase of an Office Facility
Vice Chair Barrans reported that the Executive Committee heard a fairly detailed report on the status of WICHE’s purchase of an office facility. She said David Longanecker described the three facilities currently under consideration by WICHE and its partner organizations: NCHEMS (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems) and SHEEO (State Higher Education Executive Officers). He also described the various possible financing mechanisms
associated with the purchase of an office facility, in combination with the $3 million loan from the Ford Foundation. Chair Carlson said the Executive Committee will act on behalf of the full commission to grant authorization for the purchase of an office facility, and this will occur via conference call meetings within the next two months.

**Action Item**
**Audit Report for FY 2004**

Vice Chair Barrans reported that the Executive Committee reviewed and approved the audit report for FY 2004 and recommended its advancement for approval to the Committee of the Whole.

**VICE CHAIR BARRANS, ON BEHALF OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MOVED APPROVAL OF THE AUDIT REPORT FOR FY 2004. The motion passed unanimously.**

Vice Chair Barrans also reported that the committee heard a report by Dennis Mohatt, director of the Mental Health Program at WICHE, about the activities of the program, including its recent award of a four-year, $500,000 per year grant to establish a research center focused on rural mental health policy issues.

(Please refer to the committee minutes located elsewhere in this agenda book for additional details about the Executive Committee meeting.)

**Report of the Issue Analysis and Research Committee**
**Ryan Deckert, Committee Vice Chair**

(Note: The committee meeting was split, with part of the meeting taking place on Monday afternoon and part on Tuesday morning.)

Commissioner Deckert, committee vice chair, reported on behalf of Committee Chair Jane Nichols. He said Commissioner Nichols had to leave the WICHE Commission meeting to attend WCET’s annual meeting in San Antonio, TX. Committee Vice Chair Deckert said on Monday, the committee heard Sally Johnstone’s report about WCET’s activities. Also on Monday, the committee heard a report from Cheryl Blanco on the Changing Directions project activities. Today, he said the committee focused on issue analysis and the annual 2004 Benchmarks report. The committee had a 30-page document to review and worked though all of page one. It was able to provide some feedback about the information to be contained in the Benchmarks document, which is slated for publication in time for the May meeting. The committee will have further discussions about this document during conference call meetings to be held over the next few months.

(Please refer to the committee minutes, located elsewhere in this agenda book, for additional detail about the Issue Analysis and Research Committee meeting.)

**Report of the Programs and Services Committee**
**Phil Dubois, Committee Chair**

(Note: The committee meeting was split, with part of the meeting taking place on Monday afternoon and part on Tuesday morning.)

Commissioner Dubois, committee chair, said the committee heard reports on the Equity Scorecard project, as well as an overview of the Student Exchange Programs that was particularly helpful for new commissioners. It also heard a report about progress on the new insurance program offered through WICHE, in partnership with MHEC (Midwestern Higher Education Compact). He said the insurance program is a good one that will save institutions money, and he plans to look into it further for Wyoming’s institutions. Some states have legislative barriers or restrictions prohibiting institutions from participating in the new insurance program, and the WICHE staff are prepared to assist states in overcoming these barriers. Jere Mock is the staff contact for this program.

Dubois reported that at the meeting in May, the committee will discuss the idea of implementing a fee for institutions outside of the WICHE region who participate in PSEP. Another agenda item for the May meeting will be a discussion
about increasing the tuition rate for the WUE (Western Undergraduate Exchange) program. Tuition for WUE is currently at 150 percent of in-state tuition, and it has been suggested that this rate be increased to 200 percent of in-state tuition.

(Please refer to the committee minutes, located elsewhere in this agenda book, for additional detail about the Program and Services Committee meeting.)

Action Item
Revisions to the Bylaws

Chair Carlson reported that during its August 10 conference call meeting, the Executive Committee amended and approved the advancement of the proposed changes to the bylaws to the full commission for action at this November’s commission meeting. At last May’s meeting, the commission reviewed a version of the proposed changes to the bylaws, but due to the timing guided by the bylaws, no action could be taken. The proposed revisions result from an in-depth evaluation of the organization and a review of the role of the WICHE commissioner by former New Mexico commissioner and past WICHE chair (in 2000) Everett Frost.

Carlson said the proposed revisions occur primarily in the following areas:

1. Article II, Membership, Section 4 and Section 5, describes the powers of the WICHE Commission, and the duties and functions of the WICHE commissioner.
2. Article IV, Officers, Terms, Duties, changes the title of “chairman” to “chair,” and the position of past chair is made formal (this position has been functioning as described in the revision and this formalizes that position).
3. Section 4, Annual Authorizations of Officers, Delegation of Authority, provides an annual and automatic authorization for the officers and executive director to perform certain fiscal and administrative functions.
4. Section 5 creates an Audit Committee of the commission.
5. Article VI, Sections 1 through 5, describes the role and responsibilities of WICHE’s executive director.

A question was raised about the chair and vice chair’s authority to vote as stated in Section 4. David Longanecker pointed out that this is clarified in Section 5, which states that “notwithstanding any other provision of the bylaws, in no case shall there be more than one vote per state.” Otherwise stated, the chair and vice chair are allowed to vote on behalf of their states, but no state may cast more than one vote, and each state’s delegation of three determines how their state’s one vote will be cast.

COMMISSIONERS RUCH/POTTS (M/S) APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE BYLAWS. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Carlson said approval of the revisions to the bylaws includes the establishment of the Audit Committee, which will participate in the annual audit of the organization. He said incoming Chair Diane Barrans will be appointing members to this committee and asked that any interested commissioners contact her about serving.

Information Item
FY 2005 Budget Update

Chair Carlson called on David Longanecker, who reported that WICHE’s overall budget situation is good and proceeding as projected. Longanecker said what is contained in the agenda book is the budget that was approved by the commission in May. Normally at this meeting, the commission reviews a very preliminary budget for the next fiscal year. Because of some things going this fall, next year’s preliminary budget will not be a part of this meeting, but this item will continue to be on the agenda in future years. A review of next year’s preliminary budget isn’t essential this year because there isn’t anything unusual about budget, as has been the case in years past, when considerable retrenchment within the organization was necessary.

Longanecker said WICHE’s budget is on track as projected for FY 2005. He referred to the budget material located under tab 10, p. 25, of the agenda book, which reports the actual and approved general fund budget for FY 2004 and the approved and estimated general fund budget for FY 2005. FY 2003 ended somewhat better than anticipated, leaving the budget in better shape, moving into FY 2004. However, because California’s dues have not been received this year, it may be necessary to use a portion of the $238,000 in contingency funds (line 36 of the budget), earmarked
for this potential dues shortfall from California. A portion of that fund may also be necessary for unrealized indirect cost recoveries from grants and contracts. Longanecker explained that at the time the budget is developed, it is necessary to project indirect cost income from unrealized grants and contracts, and usually these projections are met or exceeded. This year, some of the projected income may not materialize, making it necessary to draw on the contingency fund for this and for California’s dues shortfall. Some may be wondering why the budget is done this way. WICHE was uncomfortable projecting income from unrealized grants and contracts as had been done in the past, and without the projected income the budget was much too conservative. This is one reason for putting the projected indirect income in the contingency line. Another reason for this line item is that we didn’t want California to be let off the hook by not including their dues in the revenue line even though we weren’t sure we were going to receive them. What we have done is report California’s dues in arrears, as an account receivable, and we anticipate that we will receive those at some point in the future. However, it isn’t likely that we will be receiving dues from California during this fiscal year. Of course, we remain hopeful that this will change. California’s budget for this year does not contain funds for WICHE’s dues, and its budget for next year has not yet been developed.

Commissioner Shaff asked how long WICHE will carry California in this state of nonpayment. Longanecker said the commission has established a five-year process for dealing with states that become delinquent in paying dues. California has just started year two of the five-year process. After five years of delinquency, the state’s relationships and services are severed; however, as a signatory state to the Western Regional Education Compact, California would have to formally withdraw from WICHE. Longanecker said he believes the problem in California, in great part, is that WICHE does not have good lines of communication with the governor’s office or with others in the state. However, most of WICHE’s work in California over the past year has been with legislative leadership who worked hard to get money put into California’s budget for WICHE. In fact, they succeeded in doing this; however, the money was distributed without instructions to pay WICHE and the department that received the funds was under no obligation to pay WICHE, and it didn’t.

Chair Carlson asked about WICHE’s need for new equipment for the upcoming office move and if the equipment purchased for WICHE’s initial move from the University of Colorado campus to its current location could be moved and used again in the new facility. Longanecker said line 32 of the budget contains funds slated for the office move, and line 33 contains funds slated for office furniture and equipment for the new office facility. Every year WICHE has been putting money aside to make sure it has the capacity to fund the office move. The furniture items purchased for the initial move, the modular office units, are very high quality, and these units will move with WICHE. This will help with some of the costs, but there will still be costs associated with a new location that WICHE will not be able to avoid. We do not have any funds to furnish the Learning Center in the high tech fashion originally planned. After the move, WICHE will focus on getting the Learning Center furnished and equipped through an external funding source.

Chair Carlson said this budget does not require any action and it is only informational.

**Action Item**

**Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Chair Carlson reported that there was a motion on the floor to elect Diane Barrans of Alaska as chair and Phil Dubois of Wyoming as vice chair of the WICHE Commission. He asked if there were further nominations. With no other nominations from the floor, he called for the vote on the motion:


**Tribute to the Outgoing Chair**

David Longanecker thanked Don Carlson for a wonderful year under his leadership as chair of WICHE. He also thanked him for his 10 years of leadership in the organization. He said few commissioners have made as substantial a commitment to WICHE as Don has made over the past 10 years. Don is an extremely strong supporter of WICHE, but he has not been an uncritical one. He has improved this organization during his tenure. On behalf of the staff and the commissioners, David presented Don with a small token of appreciation for his service as chair of this organization. He said that Don had been a wonderful chair, a valued friend, and an important part of WICHE.
Remarks from the New Chair

Diane Barrans thanked the commission and said she appreciates the opportunity to serve WICHE in this new capacity. She said she is grateful to those from whom she has learned over the past several years. She has served as a WICHE commissioner since 1991 and has had the opportunity to observe the leadership of Tad Perry, Chuck Ruch, Diane Vines, Everett Frost, and Don Carlson and to listen and learn from each of them. She congratulated Phil Dubois on his election as vice chair and said she looks forward to working with him and Don Carlson in the coming year.

Barrans said her own history with WICHE goes back 16 years, to 1988, when she began as the state certifying officer for Alaska, and then, as mentioned, beginning in 1991, worked as a WICHE commissioner for Alaska. During her first few meetings, she had some concern that as a nonacademic with a specific financial aid administration background she might not have much to contribute to WICHE’s policy discussions. However, she quickly learned a couple of things about this organization, including the fact that WICHE’s commissioners share a strong collegial style of interaction, regardless of professional affiliations or roles. A fundamental strength of the WICHE Commission is the diversity that the commissioners bring, overlaid with WICHE’s shared goals of extending access to students in the region and of promoting quality educational policy development. The commissioners’ participation as members of this body serves not only the region but each respective state, providing a link to the student access programs as well as the education policy resources. WICHE participation enhances our professional lives. As Barrans looks through Frank Abbott’s history of WICHE, she is struck by a couple of things. The first was the subchapter titled “Meeting Women’s Needs,” because it was only one page long! She indicated that she had teased Frank about that yesterday. Second, and certainly more importantly, as the strength and validity of WICHE’s programs and services have increased over the years, one element Frank points to is materially relevant: the high level of communication by former commissioners. When today’s commissioners are very engaged, and when their predecessors were very engaged, the programs were on track and relevant to the state’s needs. When there was a period of disengagement, staff filled that void and went in the direction that they felt was serving the organization’s best interest, but with a lack of validation from the member states. She encouraged her fellow commissioners to maintain the current high level of engagement that she has witnessed in recent years. Fortunately, WICHE is managed and staffed by individuals who are committed and talented at facilitating engagement. Barrans encouraged each of the commissioners to actively participate because their experience and perspective are extremely valued by this organization. Again, she thanked her colleagues for the opportunity to serve as their chair.

Audit Committee Members Named

Chair Barrans announced the appointment of the following individuals to the Audit Committee: Commissioner Don Carlson of Washington, who will serve as the chair of the Audit Committee, with Commissioner Ed Jasmin of Montana, Commissioner Jane Nichols of Nevada, and former Commissioner Linda Blessing of Arizona as members. Barrans reported that there was still one position on the committee that remained to be filled and asked that interested persons contact her. (Note: The remaining position was subsequently filled by Commissioner Roy Ogawa of Hawaii.)

Selection of 2005 Executive Committee Members

Executive Committee Members for 2005 were elected as follows:

- Diane Barrans (AK), chair
- Phil Dubois (WY), vice chair
- Don Carlson (WA), immediate past chair
- Marshall Lind (AK)
- Joel Sideman (AZ)
- Robert Moore (CA)
- Bill Kuepper (CO)
- Roberta Richards (HI)
- Gary Stivers (ID)
- Sheila Stearns (MT)
- Carl Shaff (NV)
- Patricia Sullivan (NM)
- David Nething (ND)
- Camille Preus-Braly (OR)
- Tad Perry (SD)
- Richard Kendell (UT)
- James Sulton (WA)
- Committee vice chair (WY)

Report of the Site Selection Committee

Chair Barrans announced the commission meeting dates and locations through May 2009 (see the full list of meeting dates and places following this paragraph). She said that while the Site Selection Committee selected the states, based on rotation, the cities for those states should be recommended by the state’s delegation. Commissioners should report to the WICHE staff the city selected for the meeting one to two years prior to the scheduled meeting date.
Scheduled meetings are as follows:

May 16-17, 2005, Juneau, AK
Nov. 7-8, 2005, Colorado
May 15-16, 2006, North Dakota

Nov. 6-7, 2006, Colorado
May 14-15, 2007, Montana
Nov. 5-6, 2007, Colorado

May 12-13, 2008, South Dakota
Nov. 3-4, 2008, Arizona
May 11-12, 2009, Colorado

Chair Barrans said the next meeting of the commission will be held in Juneau, and the Alaska commissioners look forward to welcoming everyone to the “great land.”

Meeting Evaluation

The evaluation forms for the meeting are located in tab 10 of the agenda book. Earlier in the meeting, Chair Carlson had emphasized the importance of completing these forms and getting them back to the WICHE staff.

The meeting adjourned.

Special Events Held During this Meeting

• What’s Up in the WICHE West? And What’s WICHE Been Up to Lately? Speakers: David A. Longanecker, executive director of WICHE; and Cheryl Blanco, director of the Policy Analysis and Research unit at WICHE.

• Policy Discussion: Measuring Up 2004. Speaker: Pat Callan, president of the National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education.


• Policy Discussion: New Adventures with Technology: Open Educational Resources. Speaker: Sally Johnstone, director of WCET at WICHE.

• Policy Discussion: Elections and Politics. Speaker: Julie Davis Bell, education program director of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL).
ACTION ITEM
Budget and Salary/Benefit Recommendations for FY 2006

Background

Table 1 provides current estimates of WICHE’s general fund and non–general fund income and expenditures for fiscal year 2005, which include actual income and expenditures through March 31, 2005, with estimates for the final three months of FY 2005. To the right are similar columns for the proposed budget for FY 2006.

Tables 2 and 3 provide more detailed information pertaining to the general fund portion of the budget. Table 2 shows income for FY 2005 (column C) will be slightly lower than anticipated because of the delinquent dues (line 3 and footnote c) and slightly lower indirect cost recovery; however, this is partially offset by higher than anticipated interest income, primarily associated with higher interest rates (see line 4 and footnote d) and some additional small contracts (line 6). Expenditures have been slightly lower than originally budgeted, if the indirect cost sharing change approved by the Executive Committee in April is excluded. The net result is an anticipated deficit of $82,262 (column C, line 22) in the general fund budget (we had budgeted for a surplus of $1,488 (column B, line 22)), primarily associated with California’s nonpayment of its dues for FY 2005.

Tables 2 and 3 also contain the proposed general fund budget for FY 2006. On Table 2, the proposed FY 2006 budget appears (column F), reflecting a proposed budget surplus of $3,865 (see line 22). Estimated income is $1,969,000 (line 8), which reflects an increase of $78,000 from the budget approved for FY 2005. The full payment of dues from all 15 states is anticipated during FY 2006. Three factors account for the revenue changes from FY 2005: (1) the increase in the dues from $105,000 to $108,000 per state (footnote b); (2) projected higher interest income (footnote d); and (3) less indirect cost recovery as a result of less external funding. Proposed expenditures are $1,965,135 (line 21), representing an increase of $75,623 (4.0 percent) from the approved FY 2005 budget.

Tables 4 and 5 provide for similar information for the non–general fund accounts, including income and expenditure estimates for FY 2005 and budget figures for FY 2006.

The proposed budget for FY 2006 on Table 2 also provides for the general fund staff salary and benefit cost increases of $45,929 (column F, line 18). Table 6 provides details on items related to the proposed salary and benefit recommendations, including an increase of 3.5 percent for performance-based salary increases. (Note: WICHE does not give staff across-the-board or cost-of-living increases.) In addition to merit salary increases, this action item includes recommendations for a few equity salary adjustments, one-time bonuses for four to six staff members; benefit costs related to the salary increases (i.e., retirement plan, life insurance, workers’ compensation, unemployment compensation, and Social Security); and costs not related to the salary increases (i.e., estimated increases in health/dental insurance premiums, Social Security, and workers’ compensation). Staff members continue to pay for a significant and increasing portion of their benefit costs, primarily those associated with increasing health insurance premiums for dependent coverage, as well as paying for their share of contributions to Social Security.

Table 7 details WICHE’s new facility costs for FY 2006. The $463,401 total includes: $228,035 for principal and interest payments on WICHE’s facility loans (from the Ford Foundation and the Colorado Educational and Cultural Facilities Authority), $161,778 for operating expenses, $28,161 for the building’s maintenance and reserve accounts, and $45,427 for miscellaneous expenses, such as furniture and property/liability insurance premiums. (Note: The Ford Foundation does not require interest payments during the first year of its loan to SHEPC.)

In summary, the general fund budget proposed for FY 2006 is the staff recommendation for a WICHE program that provides service to member states as well as a wide range of highly significant projects. General fund income not only provides the funds for basic WICHE program activities, such as the Student Exchange Program and the Policy Analysis and Research unit, but it also provides an organizational structure that allows WICHE to become involved in other regional resource-sharing activities in higher education, many of which are supported by nonstate dollars. The proposed general fund budget will support overall net operating expenses of approximately $4.9 million in FY 2006.

Action Requested

Approval of the FY 2006 general fund budget as detailed on Table 2 and the salary and benefit recommendations included on Table 2 and detailed on Table 6.

Juneau, Alaska
Table 1. General Fund and Non–General Fund Accounts:
Overview for FY 2005 and FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimate for FY 2005</th>
<th>Proposed Budget for FY 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>Non-Gen. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues/Fees</td>
<td>1,470,000</td>
<td>458,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Registration Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,629,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Sharing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>129,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>1,827,000</td>
<td>3,471,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>794,864</td>
<td>868,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>298,739</td>
<td>290,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Fees &amp; Subcontracts</td>
<td>97,687</td>
<td>820,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>217,906</td>
<td>515,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Photocopying</td>
<td>21,142</td>
<td>42,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rent</td>
<td>262,110</td>
<td>135,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Postage</td>
<td>25,795</td>
<td>44,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Service</td>
<td>84,920</td>
<td>87,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Expense</td>
<td>47,530</td>
<td>60,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Sharing (ICS)</td>
<td>58,569</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>1,909,262</td>
<td>3,116,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23 Surplus (Deficit) for the Fiscal Year</strong></td>
<td>(82,262)</td>
<td>354,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. General Fund Budget Estimate for FY 2005 and FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Member dues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) $1,575,000</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(b) $1,620,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Delinquent dues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(d) 125,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>316.7%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(d) 426,011</td>
<td>12,974</td>
<td>316.7%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Indirect cost recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(e) 24,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(e) 14,000</td>
<td>-36.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Miscellaneous income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>(f) 24,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(f) 14,000</td>
<td>-36.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Total Revenue</td>
<td>1,891,000</td>
<td>1,827,000</td>
<td>(64,000)</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SEP - Programs</td>
<td>262,295</td>
<td>258,579</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>(g) 259,716</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>(1,137)</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Policy Analysis &amp; Research</td>
<td>272,273</td>
<td>278,279</td>
<td>(6,006)</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>225,575</td>
<td>46,698</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>52,704</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Communications &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>215,968</td>
<td>208,952</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>(h) 241,911</td>
<td>(25,943)</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
<td>(32,959)</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Commission Meeting Expense</td>
<td>114,948</td>
<td>110,751</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>(i) 110,100</td>
<td>4,848</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>(4,922)</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Executive Director’s Office</td>
<td>368,443</td>
<td>366,161</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>(j) 371,083</td>
<td>(2,640)</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>(5,210)</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Administrative Services</td>
<td>438,985</td>
<td>438,042</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>(k) 426,011</td>
<td>(1,137)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>(1,137)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>200,620</td>
<td>169,929</td>
<td>30,691</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>(l) 230,190</td>
<td>(29,570)</td>
<td>-14.7%</td>
<td>(60,261)</td>
<td>-35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Indirect Cost Sharing Expenses</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>58,569</td>
<td>(51,269)</td>
<td>-702.3%</td>
<td>45,550</td>
<td>(38,250)</td>
<td>-524.0%</td>
<td>13,019</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Staff Salaries &amp; Benefits Cost Increases for FY 2006</td>
<td>(g) 45,929</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(g) 45,929</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Program Development Fund</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(h) 20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(h) 20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Total Expenditures</td>
<td>1,889,512</td>
<td>1,909,262</td>
<td>(19,750)</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>1,965,135</td>
<td>(75,623)</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>(55,873)</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Surplus (Deficit) for the Fiscal Year</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>(82,262)</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>160%</td>
<td>86,127</td>
<td>-104.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Reserves:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Beginning of the Fiscal Year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Minimum Reserve</td>
<td>(h) 226,741</td>
<td>226,741</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(h) 235,816</td>
<td>9,075</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9,075</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Reserves Available</td>
<td>(l) 552,504</td>
<td>552,504</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(l) 153,781</td>
<td>(398,723)</td>
<td>-72.2%</td>
<td>(398,723)</td>
<td>-72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Total Reserves - Beginning of the Fiscal Year:</td>
<td>779,245</td>
<td>779,245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>389,597</td>
<td>(389,648)</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
<td>389,597</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Encumbered Reserves During the Fiscal Year:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Surplus (Deficit) Applied to Reserves</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>(82,262)</td>
<td>(83,750)</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>160%</td>
<td>86,127</td>
<td>-104.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Total Reserves - End of the Fiscal Year:</td>
<td>265,942</td>
<td>389,597</td>
<td>123,655</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>393,513</td>
<td>393,513</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>393,513</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Change in Total Reserves - Increase or (Decrease)</td>
<td>(513,303)</td>
<td>(389,648)</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>393,513</td>
<td>393,513</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>393,513</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Budget approved by the commission in May of 2004, adjusted for actual carry over from FY 2004 and actual benefit cost increases by unit.
(b) Dues as approved by the Executive Committee during a conference call on Feb. 25, 2003 for FY 2005 and FY 2006.
(c) Assumes California paying their FY 2005 state dues of $105,000. after June 30, 2005, but paying their FY 2006 state dues of $108,000 prior to June 30, 2006.
(d) Ave. daily balance: Estimate for FY 2005 is $5,021,000 at 1.89% ; and budget for FY 2006 is $4,479,000 at 2.80%.
(e) Includes legal fees, unallocated rent, and other miscellaneous costs not allocated to unit budgets.
(f) Preliminary estimate of salary and benefit cost increases for FY 2006.
(g) Minimum reserve level authorized by the Commission (12% of budgeted expenditures, per May 2000 Commission Meeting).
(h) Approved by the Commission at the Nov. 2000 meeting in Seattle, WA.
(i) Approved by the Commission at the May 2002 meeting in Santa Fe, NM.
### General Fund Budget: Detail for FY 2005

#### Table 3. General Fund Budget: Detail for FY 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF Core Acct.</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>Policy &amp; Inform.</th>
<th>Conncns/ Exec. Dir.</th>
<th>Commisn.</th>
<th>Admin. Srvcs.</th>
<th>Misc./ Other</th>
<th>Indirect Cost Sharing (ICS)</th>
<th>Program Developmt</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Surplus (Deficit)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,827,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Member Dues</td>
<td>1,470,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Misc. Income</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total Revenue</td>
<td>1,827,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,827,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Fund Budget Detail for FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF Core Acct.</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>Policy &amp; Inform.</th>
<th>Conncns/ Exec. Dir.</th>
<th>Commisn.</th>
<th>Admin. Srvcs.</th>
<th>Misc./ Other</th>
<th>Indirect Cost Sharing (ICS)</th>
<th>Program Developmt</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Surplus (Deficit)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Member Dues</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Misc. Income</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total Revenue</td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Fund Budget Detail for FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF Core Acct.</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>Policy &amp; Inform.</th>
<th>Conncns/ Exec. Dir.</th>
<th>Commisn.</th>
<th>Admin. Srvcs.</th>
<th>Misc./ Other</th>
<th>Indirect Cost Sharing (ICS)</th>
<th>Program Developmt</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Surplus (Deficit)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Member Dues</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Misc. Income</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total Revenue</td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Fund Budget Detail for FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF Core Acct.</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>Policy &amp; Inform.</th>
<th>Conncns/ Exec. Dir.</th>
<th>Commisn.</th>
<th>Admin. Srvcs.</th>
<th>Misc./ Other</th>
<th>Indirect Cost Sharing (ICS)</th>
<th>Program Developmt</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Surplus (Deficit)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Member Dues</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Interest</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Indirect Cost Recovery</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Misc. Income</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total Revenue</td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,969,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Non–General Fund Accounts

Estimate for FY 2005 and Proposed for FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td>458,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conference Registration Fees</td>
<td>189,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>2,629,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indirect Cost Sharing</td>
<td>58,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>129,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>3,471,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>914,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WCET</td>
<td>990,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NM CHE</td>
<td>11,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NCHEMS</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MHEC</td>
<td>9,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MiCTA</td>
<td>10,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>USC</td>
<td>55,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>51,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NWAF</td>
<td>35,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NEON 2</td>
<td>47,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NEON 3</td>
<td>138,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Advanced Placement (AP)</td>
<td>409,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AP Idaho</td>
<td>7,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>High School Grads</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TERI</td>
<td>9,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lumina Changing Directions</td>
<td>246,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ford 3</td>
<td>173,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lumina Accelerated Learning</td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>New Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>3,116,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) for the Fiscal Year</strong></td>
<td>354,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Non–General Fund Accounts
Detail by Unit Estimate
for FY 2005 and Proposed for FY 2006

**FY 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
<th>Policy Analysis</th>
<th>WCET</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Membership Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>279,600</td>
<td>179,000</td>
<td>458,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Conference Registration Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,639</td>
<td>189,639</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>394,246</td>
<td>853,722</td>
<td>471,143</td>
<td>910,845</td>
<td>2,629,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Indirect Cost Sharing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,827</td>
<td>35,742</td>
<td>58,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Misc. Income</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>105,724</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>129,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>397,984</td>
<td>859,209</td>
<td>1,070,908</td>
<td>1,143,587</td>
<td>3,471,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
<th>Policy Analysis</th>
<th>WCET</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td>89,729</td>
<td>172,604</td>
<td>326,948</td>
<td>279,613</td>
<td>868,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td>22,590</td>
<td>75,661</td>
<td>62,882</td>
<td>89,607</td>
<td>250,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost Sharing</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,827</td>
<td>35,742</td>
<td>58,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>361,409</td>
<td>850,568</td>
<td>990,203</td>
<td>914,695</td>
<td>3,116,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surplus (Deficit) for the Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
<th>Policy Analysis</th>
<th>WCET</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>36,574</td>
<td>28,561</td>
<td>80,705</td>
<td>228,892</td>
<td>354,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
<th>Policy Analysis</th>
<th>WCET</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>New Contracts &amp; Grants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</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>2 Membership Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>283,080</td>
<td>178,500</td>
<td>461,580</td>
<td>14.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Conference Registration Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>212,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>212,400</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>102,406</td>
<td>813,841</td>
<td>294,635</td>
<td>812,012</td>
<td>2,272,894</td>
<td>72.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Indirect Cost Sharing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>32,050</td>
<td>45,550</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Misc. Income</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129,082</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>151,582</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>106,906</td>
<td>815,841</td>
<td>932,697</td>
<td>1,040,562</td>
<td>3,146,006</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
<th>Policy Analysis</th>
<th>WCET</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>New Contracts &amp; Grants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td>36,240</td>
<td>176,544</td>
<td>358,884</td>
<td>317,898</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>976,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>12,115</td>
<td>65,386</td>
<td>123,955</td>
<td>116,541</td>
<td>33,797</td>
<td>351,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulting Fees &amp; Subcontracts</strong></td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>179,750</td>
<td>85,599</td>
<td>170,045</td>
<td>476,594</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel &amp; Meeting Expenses</strong></td>
<td>36,782</td>
<td>259,907</td>
<td>125,325</td>
<td>71,780</td>
<td>521,794</td>
<td>17.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing &amp; Photocopying</strong></td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>28,356</td>
<td>14,165</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>48,411</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Rent</strong></td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>21,345</td>
<td>51,830</td>
<td>48,969</td>
<td>145,944</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone &amp; Postage</strong></td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>7,465</td>
<td>14,989</td>
<td>14,056</td>
<td>41,353</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology Service</strong></td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>17,402</td>
<td>35,423</td>
<td>31,320</td>
<td>100,131</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies &amp; Expense</strong></td>
<td>616</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>37,442</td>
<td>41,067</td>
<td>83,407</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td>7,621</td>
<td>28,425</td>
<td>69,334</td>
<td>90,504</td>
<td>214,054</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>113,578</td>
<td>796,816</td>
<td>912,946</td>
<td>904,980</td>
<td>2,959,547</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surplus (Deficit) for the Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
<th>Policy Analysis</th>
<th>WCET</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>New Contracts &amp; Grants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</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><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>(6,672)</td>
<td>29,025</td>
<td>19,751</td>
<td>135,582</td>
<td>8,773</td>
<td>186,459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6. Salary and Benefit Recommendations for FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B # of staff affected</th>
<th>C General Fund</th>
<th>D Non-Gen Fund</th>
<th>E TOTAL COST</th>
<th>F Average Increase per FTE</th>
<th>G Percent of Total Salaries</th>
<th>H Percent of Eligible Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nonexempt Staff - Merit Increases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,425</td>
<td>$747</td>
<td>$2,172</td>
<td>$1,143</td>
<td>1.75% N</td>
<td>1.75% N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exempt Staff - Merit Increases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,662</td>
<td>33,759</td>
<td>56,421</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>3.50% E</td>
<td>3.50% E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equity Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.23% T</td>
<td>0.23% T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bonuses on July 1, 2005</td>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,681</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,681</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.50% T</td>
<td>0.50% T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TOTAL SALARY INCREASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,768</td>
<td>36,506</td>
<td>71,274</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>4.11% T</td>
<td>3.65% T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BENEFIT COST INCREASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,161</td>
<td>11,718</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1.32% T</td>
<td>1.32% T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TOTAL SALARY &amp; BENEFITS BASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,929</td>
<td>48,224</td>
<td>94,153</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>5.42% T</td>
<td>5.42% T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Nonexempt staff salaries
E = Exempt staff salaries
T = Total staff salaries (exempt and nonexempt staff)
### Table 7. Facility Cost Summary for FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Principal &amp; Interest</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Bldg. Maint. Reserve</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SHEPC Contributions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Principal &amp; Interest Pymts.</td>
<td>$125,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$161,778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$161,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Building Maint. Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,161</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Total SHEPC Payments</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>$125,035</td>
<td>$161,778</td>
<td>$28,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lines 2 through 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 CECFA Loan Payments</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sub-total - Building Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lines 6 and 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Storage Locker</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,872</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(off-site SecurCare)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Systems Furniture</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,488</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Learning Center &amp; Kitchen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Property/Liability Insur.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,147</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Bottled Water Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,920</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 New Office Furniture</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Misc/Other Items</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Reserve Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sub-total - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,427</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lines 8 thru 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Gross Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,205</td>
<td>$28,161</td>
<td>$463,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a** WICHE contribution agreement amount (rent) for SHEPC, which includes:
  All utilities (electricity, gas, water, and sewer), building repairs & maintenance, parking, snow removal, trash removal, recycling, landscaping and maintenance (mowing), building security, HVAC, lighting, janitorial cleaning and supplies, and etc.
- **b** Payments for $800,000 equity loan for WICHE through CECFA.
- **c** Depreciation for furniture - depreciated over 7 years (84 months).
- **d** Depreciation for furniture - depreciated over 10 years (120 months).
Higher education in the West is evolving rapidly in response to the twin pressures of heightened demand and constrained resources. The dual commitment that the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education has historically made – to ensure broad access to higher education and to help states use their higher education resources as innovatively as possible – reflects those pressures. Our commitment is to assist states and institutions, through regional programs, research, and resource sharing, so that they can educate a broad range of students, including minority and older or returning students. WICHE’s 2006 workplan focuses on helping our 15 member states – Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming – to achieve outcomes they could not accomplish independently.

WICHE’s core issues include access, finance, workforce issues, accountability, and technology. This year, we’ll be taking a fresh look at those issues, honing in on topics like the “new traditional student,” student mobility, the digital divide, and differing concepts of state residency. In addition, the beginning of FY 2006 will see WICHE established in the State Higher Education Policy Center, a new center in Boulder formed in conjunction with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). A program-related investment (low interest loan) from the Ford Foundation has helped us to establish this new center.
Finance
WICHE has several projects and programs focused on finance issues. Changing Direction: Integrating Higher Education Financial Aid and Financing Policy is an initiative of the Policy Analysis and Research unit that focuses on aligning policy dealing with financial aid, financing, and appropriations. Funded by Lumina Foundation for Education, this three-year continuation project has supported the restructuring of policies and practices to maximize participation, access, and success for all students. Funding support allows us to extend our scope to examine the impact of revenue and expenditure constraints on the future viability of higher education. The project is engaging policymakers and higher education leaders in key policy issues around the ability of states to sustain their investment in higher education. It will assist states in evaluating the ways they generate and sustain revenues for higher education and how this affects issues such as access, delivery, and quality. Fourteen target states – Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Washington – are developing scenarios that will help them design a fiscal plan to sustain their investment in higher education through a period of constrained resources and expenditures.

Due to increases in tuition and fees, students and their families today are paying a larger share of postsecondary education costs. One of the ways WICHE helps to soften the impact of these increasing costs is through our three Student Exchange Programs (SEP). The programs provide students in the West with opportunities to attend out-of-state institutions in the region at reduced costs; enable states to share educational resources; and allow higher education institutions to more effectively manage their enrollments – crucial strategies as many Western states struggle financially to support their higher education systems. This year, more than 21,000 students and their families saved some $112 million in reduced tuition costs by participating in just one of our programs, the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE); students also saved via our two postgraduate programs, the Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) and the Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP). In addition to continuing to administer PSEP, WRGP, and WUE, WICHE’s Programs and Services unit will work with our member states to seek opportunities to broaden student participation in each program. See the next section, on access, for a full description of SEP.

Helping colleges and universities to control costs is also the focus of a new WICHE collaboration with the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC). In May 2004, the WICHE Commission approved expanding MHEC’s insurance and risk management programs to interested institutions in the WICHE region. Over the past decade, MHEC’s Master Property Program (MPP) has leveraged better property insurance rates for institutions in six Midwest states. The program provides comprehensive property coverage related to higher education needs and enhances institutions’ risk management and asset protection strategies. Its excellent engineering and loss control services are tailored to member institutions’ requirements, as well as to the group as a whole. The program has generated more than $19 million in savings for participating institutions and affords its members the opportunity to earn dividends based on annual loss ratios. Members currently include 46 institutions (71 campuses) with total insured values of $44 billion. The University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN) is the first system in the WICHE region to participate in this regional collaboration; the system is saving a half-million dollars this year on its $2.6 billion in insured assets. During FY 2006, staff will contact other institutions and higher education systems in the WICHE region to invite their participation in this program.

WCET (Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications), the Cooperative advancing the effective use of technology in higher education, is involved in several projects that focus on finance: for details, see box on page 5.

Access
Expanding access to higher education has been WICHE’s overarching mission since the 1950s. The Programs and Services unit supports this mission by administering three Student Exchange Programs.
The Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE), which enrolled more than 20,000 students in public two- and four-year institutions in the West this year, allows out-of-state students to pay 150 percent of the resident tuition rate, saving themselves and their families $111.7 million in tuition costs in 2004-05. Some 127 campuses have opened their doors to WUE students; colleges and universities can tailor the program (including admission requirements and available programs of study) to their individual campus needs. Fourteen of the 15 WICHE states participate (California sends students to other states, but only one of its schools receives WUE students). We are completing a study of WUE student out-of-state migration patterns to better understand how this regional exchange affects student access and success, as well as states’ diverse higher education and economic needs. Christopher Morphew of the University of Kansas is the lead researcher for the project, with Lumina Foundation for Education grant support.

The Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP) helps students in 12 WICHE states to participate in 14 professional education programs in other Western states. In 2004-05, nearly 700 students took advantage of this program. Each state determines the fields and the number of students it will support. Programs are available in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, physical therapy, occupational therapy, optometry, podiatry, osteopathic medicine, physician assistant, graduate nursing, graduate library studies, pharmacy, public health, and architecture. Currently, we are considering whether other fields with significant workforce shortages should be added to our regional exchange.

The Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP) enables students to enroll in some 144 distinctive graduate programs and pay resident tuition. Some three dozen institutions in 14 WICHE states (all but California) participate. New programs are added to WRGP every two years (the next invitation to nominate programs will be extended in fall 2005). Some of the participating programs and institutions include: chemical physics, University of Nevada, Reno; East Asian languages and literatures, University of Hawaii at Manoa; hotel administration, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; medical informatics, University of Utah; neuroscience, Washington State University; oceanography, University of Hawaii at Manoa and Oregon State University; rural health nursing, University of Wyoming; paleontology, South Dakota School of Mines & Technology; petroleum engineering, Colorado School of Mines; and water resource administration, University of New Mexico.

Increasing student access to higher education via technology and distance education is also an important issue for WICHE. One of the future faces of student exchange will be NEON (Northwest Educational Outreach Network), whose focal point is learning at a distance, particularly in high-demand professions. NEON is a collaboration between WICHE and the Northwest Academic Forum (NWAF), a 10-state group of institutions and state policymakers which fosters regional resource sharing and promotes innovative and collaborative efforts among its member institutions; WICHE is NWAF’s secretariat. See the section on innovation for more on NEON. Another example of technology working to expand access is WCET’s EduTool’s project: for details, see box on page 5.

Closing the educational achievement gap for historically underrepresented students is another priority for WICHE and for institutions throughout the West. WICHE is partnering with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) at the University of Southern California to expand its Equity Scorecard project to more institutions. Developed by Estela Mara Bensimon, professor of higher education and the director of the CUE, the project helps institutions to better understand how they are improving the educational success of racial and ethnic minority students (and where they are not successful), and then helps teams of faculty members and administrators to develop strategies for addressing deficiencies. CUE received a planning grant to support expansion of the Equity Scorecard project beyond California to other institutions in the West. WICHE is working with CUE on a demonstration project at two institutions in Colorado: Fort Lewis College in Durango and Metropolitan State College of Denver. We will also work with CUE staff in seeking external funding to enable other institutions to participate in the Equity Scorecard process.
The Policy Analysis and Research unit offers analysis, support, and data to constituents on access as well as other issues. One of its major endeavors for 2005: its work with the Pathways to College Network, an alliance of private and corporate foundations, nonprofits, educational institutions, and the U.S. Department of Education. Pathways’ goal is to improve access to higher education for disadvantaged students, and to help prepare them to take advantage of what higher education has to offer. The Pathways Network – which includes researchers, policy analysts, educators, K-12 administrators, government, business, foundations, and community organizations – seeks to identify the best ways of putting disadvantaged students on the path to college. Its educational and community organizations are working together to open college doors for low-income students. To support this effort, WICHE annually updates its online searchable policy inventory, SPIDO (State Policy Inventory Database Online), and assists with the implementation of the network’s national report, A Shared Agenda. WICHE also helps oversee the project’s major components and directs its policy component and financial aid/affordability research efforts. New research efforts may be directed toward assessing the impact of financial aid on student mobility, particularly among low-income students.

The Changing Direction project, described earlier, examines how to structure financing policy and financial aid to maximize access and participation. Part of this effort involves not just access to higher education but success in persisting to degree completion. Under our current grant, we are broadening the scope of the project to examine retention in higher education and how financial aid and financing policies impact student persistence.

A third continuing Policy project related to access is the Western Consortium for Accelerated Learning Opportunities (WCALO) – a project funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education’s Advanced Placement Incentive Program. A partnership whose nine members are Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, and Utah, WCALO’s goal is to increase the number of low-income and rural students succeeding in accelerated learning courses. States participate in the consortium in a variety of ways, including: supporting students from low-income families with fee reimbursement for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate exams; providing professional development for teachers, administrators, and counselors; subsidizing online accelerated learning courses; and participating in the consortium’s network of state education agency and SHEEO representatives.

A related project, initiated in FY 2005 and extending through FY 2006 – Accelerated Learning Options: A Study of State and Institutional Policies and Practices, funded by Lumina Foundation for Education – allows staff to look more closely at accelerated learning and works to increase the number of low-income and underrepresented students participating and succeeding in college. While accelerated options are widely used across the states, limited analyses have been conducted on associated policies, either at the state level or the institutional level; additionally, the research is nearly void of critical analyses of cost efficiency, accessibility, and effectiveness of these programs, most particularly as they affect the participation and success of low-income students in postsecondary education. The findings from this project will help guide policymakers and institutional leaders in K-12 and higher education on how to best channel limited resources for students. They will also assist them in designing policies and practices that will broaden the opportunity for underrepresented students to participate in accelerated learning, so they can be more competitive and enjoy the same kinds of higher education options more privileged students do.

A new proposal under consideration by the Ford Foundation, Escalating Engagement: State Policy to Protect Access to Higher Education, will support our work around access with the Western states. Policymakers are facing very difficult decisions as they slowly begin to see revenues returning. Not only must higher education compete for these limited dollars with other state agencies and federal commitments, but individual systems, sectors, and institutions within states will vie for additional dollars to replace those lost in the early years of the decade. Few states will make the case that new funds should be channeled toward access for underrepresented students. Through this project, we will make that case with policymakers and policy shapers, both to raise the visibility of “first dollar for access” and to examine the “new traditional student” among our key constituents in the West.

Lastly, the release of the 6th edition of our Projections of High School Graduates – which, for the first time, included projections by family income level, in addition to race and ethnicity – provides another dimension to our research and aids us in providing policymakers and educators with the data they’ll need to make informed decisions about the effect of changing demographics on higher education. A related demographic issue is residency – specifically, the differing concepts of residency. Students and families, who are more mobile than in the past, are finding that states often have several different definitions of residency, depending on whether it is defined for the purpose of higher education, or for other activities conducted in a state, or for such things as taxation and licensing.
Innovation & Information Technology

WCET continues to work with institutions and state agencies as they fully integrate technologies into their academic and student support activities: for details, see the box below. Through our WCALO project, the Policy unit has collaborated with WCET to create and activate an independent Web-based resource containing reviews of online AP courses. Called EduTools for Online Advanced Placement Courses, this searchable database is a new way for educators and administrators to examine the availability and quality of online Advanced Placement courses in order to make more informed decisions on which courses will best serve students. The site provides independent reviews of courses, focusing on content, instructional design, and technical characteristics. During FY06, the site will be expanded to include additional courses and providers.

WICHE provides staff support to the 10-state Northwest Academic Forum (NWAF), a regional consortium that fosters interstate and interinstitutional cooperation and advocates technology-based solutions to higher education access issues. Thirty-one master’s and doctoral-level institutions and 10 states participate in the forum; they are represented by their provosts, vice presidents of academic affairs, and state academic officers. Since 1984, the forum has addressed regional higher education issues and fostered new initiatives aimed at resource sharing, helping to create WCET, the Northwest Academic Computing Consortium, and NorthWestNet. The forum’s 2005 annual meeting, at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) in Richland, WA, on April 22-23, focused on strategies to elevate higher education’s role in research and economic development in the Northwest. Top academic and research leaders from the 10 states learned more about PNNL’s leading-edge research in environmental molecular sciences, homeland security applications, nanotechnology innovations for biology and photonics, and developing biotechnology solutions. Staff is working with PNNL administrators to broaden research and employment opportunities at the labs to students and faculty at NWAF member institutions.

WCET

WCET, the Cooperative advancing the effective use of technology in higher education, is a national leader in helping states and institutions use new technologies to improve education. Members representing more than 40 U.S. states and four continents cooperate in sharing information, identifying barriers to the use of telecommunication in education, evaluating technological approaches to education, and facilitating multistate approaches to technology-based learning. Its annual conference, held this year in New Orleans, draws together some of the world’s most innovative thinkers on technology and education. Current projects include:

• **EduTools: Web Resource for Comparisons**, supported by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, addresses the needs of institutions developing online education by giving administrators a single place to go for product and policy comparisons. This year, the system is being used by WICHE’s WCALO (Western Consortium for Accelerated Learning Opportunities) project and the Monterey Institute of Technology for Education as a host for course evaluations.

• The **Technology Costing Methodology** project involves implementing standard analytical principles to assess the costs of higher education’s use of technology; the project was developed by WCET and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems with support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE).

• Research on effective online student services: WCET is continuing its work with Web-based student services for online learners, with support from its corporate and state members.

• Developing worldwide awareness of open educational resources: This project, supported by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, is allowing WCET to study new IT developments, such as the policy implications of the open courseware movement worldwide.

• International work: WCET is partnering with a nonprofit group in the U.K., The Observatory for Borderless Higher Education, on a benchmarking project for institutions integrating information technology and distance learning into their overall management structure. U.S. institutions from California, Indiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Virginia, and Wyoming are working with peer institutions in England, Australia, and Brazil to benchmark their policies and practices. In addition, WCET continues to work with institutions and agencies (state, national, and international) as they fully integrate technologies into their academic and student support activities (as part of its global outreach, WCET worked with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization — UNESCO — to explore issues of use for copyrighted information and other information technology issues related to universities in developing nations).

• Quality assurance for web-based courses.

• Research on e-learning issues at traditional institutions.

• Consulting on statewide and campus e-learning projects.
The forum’s newest initiative is NEON, the Northwest Educational Outreach Network. The forum created NEON, in partnership with WICHE, to help institutions and states to pool their academic resources and expertise so that groups of institutions can share electronically delivered degree programs. WICHE is developing NEON with a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). Degree or certificate programs, each involving multiple institutions, are being expanded or created in three disciplines: nursing (Ph.D.), global supply chain management, and library media (graduate certificates). A regional NEON course exchange is also being considered as another element of this innovative consortium.

Staff is also sharing academic collaboration strategies developed through the NEON project with another new collaborative effort in the West. The NEXus (Nursing Education Xchange) project, also funded by FIPSE, is creating a partnership among five colleges and schools of nursing to allow students to enroll in electronically delivered doctoral nursing courses offered by the participating institutions. The consortium is based at the Western Institute of Nursing; the pilot project partners are: Oregon Health & Science University, University of Arizona, University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center, University of Northern Colorado, and the University of Utah. Staff members are researching the potential of creating a regional database to support NEON and NEXus institutions, and others in the future, as they participate in collaborative academic programs and course exchanges.

We are also working to build college, university, and other educational organizations’ participation in the American TelEdCommunications Alliance, a national initiative created in 2001 by WICHE and the three other regional higher education organizations (the Midwestern Higher Education Compact, the New England Board of Higher Education, and the Southern Regional Education Board) along with MiCTA, a national nonprofit technology association based in Michigan. The ATAlliance brings schools, colleges, and state education agencies together to improve services while offering a best pricing model, providing improved purchasing options and access to cutting-edge technologies and telecommunications via competitively bid contracts. The ATAlliance has expanded its services to include e-learning course management system products to help institutions keep pace with the exponential growth in online courses. The ATAlliance menu also includes voice, video, wireless, computer hardware and software, power and energy management programs, library equipment and office supplies.

Workforce & Society

In addition to managing our three Student Exchange Programs, Programs and Services produces a series of Workforce Briefs each year, detailing workforce projections in each of our 15 member states, with an emphasis on the health professions and other fields covered in PSEP.

WICHE is exploring the need to establish rural mental health training initiatives, such as regional exchange programs or collaborative training ventures between states and institutions. WICHE’s Student Exchange and Mental Health programs conducted a survey of higher education institutions in the West to learn more about existing programs that prepare rural mental health professionals, as well as to identify programs that may be interested in expanding their outreach. Areas of focus include: psychology, psychiatry, social work, child and family services, counselor education, physician assistant programs, public health, and psychiatric nursing. WICHE’s Mental Health Program is involved in other workforce training projects, as well. For more on the Mental Health Program, see box on page 7.

Over the past three years, the Policy Analysis and Research unit has received funding from the Ford Foundation to look at four workforce areas: nursing, information technology, teacher education, and faculty. The grant supported activities such as roundtables, policy forums, research, and briefing papers. Our latest proposal, under review by Ford, will allow us to focus more intensely on the connections between postsecondary education and state workforce and economic development. Over a three-year period beginning in FY 2006, the Policy unit will collaborate with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), the Council on Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL), the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC), and other groups and states to examine the nexus between higher education and the states’ needs for the right kind of individuals to support workforce and economic development. WICHE and its partners can promote informed, balanced discussions that lead to public policy decisions supportive of strong education and workforce development initiatives within the states in the West, as well as initiatives that address unique regional challenges faced by groups of states. Working with a few states annually, the project will provide technical assistance in analyzing state needs and priorities around economic development, the impact on workforce development, and the connections to higher education.
This year, we’ll continue to communicate with key constituencies to broaden their understanding of WICHE’s programs and services. Our Legislative Advisory Committee will convene its annual meeting in mid-August in conjunction with the annual meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures to discuss the fiscal challenges states are facing throughout the region and other important higher ed issues. We will continue to collaborate with other higher ed organizations and policy organizations to expand the reach of our work and to share resources.

**Accountability**

A number of continuing Policy Analysis and Research projects relate to accountability. Our short report series, *Policy Insights*, covers a wide range of higher ed topics, including accountability, while *Policy Alerts* and *Stat Alerts* provide weekly e-mail notices on new policy- and data-related reports. We also publish an annual *Tuition and Fees* report with detailed data on all public institutions in the West, as well as a regional fact book that provides a wealth of data on access, affordability, finance, faculty, technology, and workforce issues. We are developing performance benchmarks for the region so that we can determine how well the West is serving the needs of its citizens.

WICHE helps Western states to develop new strategic plans, designed to encourage greater accountability in relation to the states’ higher education investments. Our multiyear *Expanding Engagement* project provides an opportunity for policymakers, institutional leaders, and others in the higher ed community to better understand the relationships between finance and accountability issues. The release of the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education’s *Measuring Up 2004*, a state-by-state report card for higher education, also allows WICHE opportunities to assist policymakers with accountability issues. Through state technical assistance, roundtables, and small meetings with state leaders, WICHE has supported Western states’ efforts on a broad range of accountability issues. WICHE has been assisting several states, including Arizona, New Mexico, Montana, Oregon, and Utah.

**Mental Health Program**

The WICHE Mental Health Program seeks to enhance the public systems of care for persons with mental illnesses, children with serious emotional disturbances, and their families. The program approaches this mission through partnerships with state mental health authorities, advocacy and consumer groups, federal agencies, and higher education institutions. Activities focus upon direct technical assistance to state and local agencies, policy analysis and research, support of state mental health agency data analysis, and liaison activities with higher education to enhance workforce development. Current projects include:

- **WICHE Center for Rural Mental Health Research:** This federally funded research institute conducts studies that help inform health policy at multiple levels of decision making. Focused upon rural mental health, the research center is one of seven Rural Health Research Centers in the United States funded by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), Office of Rural Health Policy. Since most rural Americans obtain their mental health care through primary care providers, rather than specialty mental health providers, the initial focus of the research seeks to expand knowledge around supporting adoption of evidence-based practices in primary care and the potential impact of such adoption on health outcomes for the consumer.

- **Western States Decision Support Group (WSDSG):** Through a partnership in funding between the federal Center for Mental Health Services and 13 WICHE states, the WICHE Mental Health Program coordinates a regional effort to enhance and coordinate program evaluation and data driven decision support in the public mental health systems of the WICHE West. The WSDSG meets face-to-face three times yearly to focus upon regional issues of enhancing accountability through sound data management to support quality improvement, policy formation, and administration.

- **Workforce Development:** The WICHE Mental Health Program is engaged in an array of activities to improve the preparation and continuing education of the public mental health workforce in the WICHE West. The program produces a monthly series of Rural Mental Health Grand Rounds Webcasts, funded by the federal Center for Mental Health Services. These webcasts enable rural professionals to obtain training on current issues in mental health practice and continuing education credits, without the need or expense of travel. The Mental Health Program is also working with Alaska, Arizona and the WICHE region in general to improve collaboration in training between state mental health systems and higher education training programs. In addition, it is working with South Dakota and Idaho to develop specific training opportunities for staff of their community mental health programs to enhance quality care through professional skill development.

- **State-Specific Technical Assistance:** The WICHE Mental Health Program is routinely called upon by member states and others to facilitate activities focused upon system improvement, planning, and needs assessment. The program is working with Alaska to support its initiative around building an integrated delivery system. In Wyoming and South Dakota, the program continues to support the development of systems of care for children and families. Staff members frequently work with states across the region in areas of needs assessment and gap analysis.
# WICHE FY 2006 Workplan: Priority Themes & Activities

## Existing Activities

**Finance**
- Annual Tuition and Fees report (GF)
- WCET’s Technology Costing Methodology project handbook (FIPSE)
- Multistate policy forum (Lumina)
- Institute for Governors’ Policy Advisors (Lumina)
- Property insurance and risk consortium (self-funding)
- Legislative Advisory Committee

**Access**
- Student Exchange Programs: Professional Student Exchange Program (PSEP), Western Regional Graduate Program (WRGP), Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE)
- Accelerated Learning Initiatives (U.S. Dept. of Education)
- Pathways to College Network (GE Fund, James Irvine Foundation, FIPSE and others)
- Escalating Engagement (Ford)
- Multistate policy projects on higher ed finance and financial aid (Lumina Foundation)
- High school graduates projections by state, race/ethnicity, and income
- Children’s mental health improvement projects in Wyoming and South Dakota
- Student mobility and the utility of WUE (Northeastern and Ford)
- Equity Scorecard project (Ford and USCE subcontract)
- Accelerated Learning Options (Lumina)
- Multistate forum for high-growth states (Lumina)
- Multistate forum on 1st dollar for access (Ford)

**Innovation & Info-technology**
- Support of the NorthWest Academic Forum’s regional initiatives (NWAF)
- NEON, the Northwest Educational Outreach Network (FIPSE)
- Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications initiatives
- EduTools work to provide comparisons of electronic learning resources (WCET)
- Building regional participation in the American Telecommunications Alliance (self-funding)
- Best practices in online student services (WCET)
- EduTools for AP courses (WCalO)
- AP teacher professional development online (WCalO)
- Audits of institutions’ student services online (self-funding)

**Workforce**
- Escalating Engagement (Ford)
- Mental health student exchange (Ford)
- Workforce Brief (GF)
- Building partnerships for competency: public mental health workforce development
- Rural mental health training initiatives

**Accountability**
- Regional benchmarks (GF)
- Electronic Regional Factbook: Policy Indicators for Higher Education (GF)
- Guidelines in distance-delivered education for the regional accrediting agencies by WCET
- Facilitation of the Western States Decision Support Group for Public Mental Health (SAMSHA)
- Electronic alerts and clearinghouse (GF)
- SPIRE (GF)
### New Directions
(proposals have been approved by the commission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Innovation &amp; Info-technology</th>
<th>Workforce</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Costing Methodology simplified spreadsheets (WCET)</td>
<td>PSEP revitalization</td>
<td>Quality measures in e-learning (WCET and Lumina)</td>
<td>Developing Student Exchange Program responses to critical workforce shortages</td>
<td>Collaboration with NCHEMS, SHEEO and WICHE on database maintenance and exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological review of Projections of High School Graduates (Spencer)</td>
<td>Methodological review of Projections of High School Graduates (Spencer)</td>
<td>EduTools course evaluations (WCET)</td>
<td>Expanding professional advisory councils (health professions, vet medicine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>EduTools for AP Online (WICALO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assisting colleges of education with teachers of digital natives (WCET)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing institutional readiness for open source (WCET)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating principles of good practice for the creation of open educational resources material (WCET)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On the Horizon
(proposals not yet submitted to the commission or past proposals that are being recast)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Innovation &amp; Info-technology</th>
<th>Workforce</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy work on residency</td>
<td>New traditional students</td>
<td>Expansion of NEON</td>
<td>WICHE licensure and credentialing service</td>
<td>Follow-up initiatives responding to the National Center on Public Policy and Higher Education’s report cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE service repayment program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding the development of portal technologies</td>
<td>Recruiting leaders for Western higher education</td>
<td>Readiness for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing the Center for Transforming Student Services (CENTSS)</td>
<td>Assisting states in identifying academic program development needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Founding AdjunctMatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partner Organizations

WICHE projects are often supported via grants, contracts, or in-kind support from foundations, corporations, institutions, government agencies, and other organizations. Organizations supporting our recent projects include:

American Council on Education
Arizona Board of Regents
Association of Governing Boards
Athabasca University (Canada)
California Department of Mental Health
Center for Urban Education (University of Southern California)
Colorado Department of Education
Colorado Mental Health Institute
Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions
Council of State Governments-WEST
Education Commission of the States
The Ford Foundation
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
The Higher Education Funding Council of England
Lumina Foundation for Education
Midwestern Higher Education Compact
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
National Conference of State Legislatures
National Institutes of Health
New England Board of Higher Education
New Mexico Commission on Higher Education
Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development
Oregon Department of Human Services
Pathways to College Network (with funding from the Daniels Fund, the GE Fund, the James Irvine Foundation, the Ford Foundation, Lucent Technologies Foundation, Lumina Foundation, KnowledgeWorks Foundation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education)
South Dakota Department of Human Services
South Dakota Division of Mental Health
Southern Regional Education Board
Southwest Counseling Service (Wyoming)
State Higher Education Executive Officers
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
University and Community College System of Nevada
U.S. Department of Education
U.S. Department of Education: FIPSE
U.S. Department of Health & Human Services
Wyoming Division of Behavioral Health
The WICHE Commission

WICHE’s 45 commissioners are appointed by their governors from among state higher 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. Diane Barrans, executive director of the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education, is chair of the WICHE Commission; Philip L. Dubois, president of the University of Wyoming, is vice chair.

**ALASKA**
- *Diane M. Barrans (WICHE Chair, 2005), Executive Director, Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education*
- Johnny Ellis, State Senator
- *Marshall L. Lind, Former Chancellor of Higher Education, University of Alaska Fairbanks*

**ARIZONA**
- Lawrence M. Gudis, Senior Vice President/International Development, Apollo Group
- John Haeger, President, Northern Arizona University
- *Joel Sideman, Executive Director, Arizona Board of Regents*

**CALIFORNIA**
- Francisco J. Hernandez, Vice Chancellor, University of California, Santa Cruz
- Herbert A. Medina, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Loyola Marymount University
- *Robert Moore, Former Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission*

**COLORADO**
- *William F. Byers, Consumer and Public Relations Manager, Grand Valley Power*
- William J. Hybl, Chairman and CEO, El Pomar Foundation
- Richard O’Donnell, Executive Director, Colorado Commission on Higher Education

**HAWAII**
- Doris Ching, Vice President for Student Affairs, University of Hawaii System
- Ray T. Ogawa, Attorney at Law, Oliver, Lau, Lowhn, Ogawa & Nakamura
- *Roberta M. Richards, State Officer, Hawaii Department of Education*

**IDAHO**
- Richard Bowen, President, Idaho State University
- Robert W. Kustra, President, Boise State University
- *Gary W. Strivers, Executive Director, State Board of Education*

**MONTANA**
- Ed Jasmin, Immediate Past Chairman, Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education
- *Sheila Steams, Commissioner of Higher Education, Montana University System*
- Cindy Younkin, Former State Representative

**NEVADA**
- Jane A. Nichols, Professor, University of Nevada Reno
- Raymond D. Rawson, Former State Senator
- *Carl Shaff, Educational Consultant, Nevada State Department of Education*

**NEW MEXICO**
- Letitia Chambers, Former Executive Director, New Mexico Commission on Higher Education
- Dede Feldman, State Senator
- *Patricia Sullivan, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces*

**NORTH DAKOTA**
- Richard Kunkel, Member, State Board of Higher Education
- *David E. Nething, State Senator*
- Robert Potts, Chancellor, North Dakota University System

**OREGON**
- Ryan P. Deckert, State Senator
- *Camille Preus-Braly, Commissioner, Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development*
- James K. Sager, Senior Education Policy Advisor, Education & Workforce Policy Office

**SOUTH DAKOTA**
- Robert Burns, Distinguished Professor, Political Science Department, South Dakota State University
- James O. Hansen, Regent, South Dakota Board of Regents
- *Robert T. (Tad) Perry (Past Chair, 2002), Executive Director, South Dakota Board of Regents*

**UTAH**
- David L. Gladwell, Attorney and Former State Senator
- *Richard E. Kendell, Commissioner of Higher Education, Utah System of Higher Education*
- E. George Mantes, Regent, State Board of Regents

**WASHINGTON**
- *Don Carlson (Immediate Past Chair, 2004), Former State Senator*
- Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, State Representative
- *James Sultan, Jr., Executive Director, Higher Education Coordinating Board*

**WYOMING**
- Tex Boggs, State Senator and President, Western Wyoming Community College
- *Philip L. Dubois (WICHE Vice Chair, 2005), President, University of Wyoming*
- Klaus Hanson, Professor of German and Chair, Department of Modern and Classical Languages, University of Wyoming

*Executive Committee Member*
Executive Director’s Office
David Longanecker, executive director
Frank Abbott, senior advisor
Marla Williams, assistant to the executive director and executive secretary to the commission

Administrative Services
Marv Myers, director
Kelly Israelson, senior accounting specialist
Craig Milburn, director of accounting
Ann Szeligowski, accounting specialist
Jerry Worley, information technologies manager

Mental Health
Dennis Mohatt, director
Scott Adams, research associate
Mimi Bradley, postdoctoral fellow
Fran Dong, statistical analyst
Chuck McGee, project director
Jenny Shaw, project and administrative coordinator

Policy Analysis & Research
Cheryl D. Blanco, director
Erin Barber, administrative assistant II
Michelle Médal, administrative assistant IV
Demarée K. Michelau, project coordinator
Brian T. Prescott, research associate

Programs & Services
Jere Mock, director
Candy Allen, graphic designer
Anne Ferguson, administrative assistant I
Anne Finnigan, communications associate
Deborah Jang, web design manager
Michelle Medal, administrative assistant IV
Ken Pepion, director, Bridges to the Professoriate
Margo Schultz, program coordinator, Student Exchange Programs

WCET
Sally Johnstone, executive director
Sharmila Basu Conger, postdoctoral fellow
Rachel Dammann, conference assistant
Tim Dammann, web developer
Sherri Artz Gilbert, administrative/budget coordinator
Deborah Jang, web design manager
Russell Poulin, associate director
Patricia Shea, assistant director

Visit www.wiche.edu for a staff directory with phone numbers and e-mail addresses.
Meeting Evaluation  
WICHE Commission Meeting  
May 16 - 17, 2005  
Juneau, Alaska

Please give us your suggestions on the following areas:

Program (presentations and discussions, committee of the whole structure, and speakers):

Agenda Book (format, content):

Schedule (structure, schedule, pace of meeting):

Facilities (hotel, sleeping rooms, food):

Future topics for policy discussions:

Other comments you care to make:

Your name (optional):

Please return to:  
Marla Williams, WICHE, PO Box 9752, Boulder, CO 80301  
Fax: 303.541.0291; email: mwilliams@wiche.edu or dlonganecker@wiche.edu  

Please use the other side of the form or additional paper, if necessary.  
Thanks.
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The WICHE Commission

WICHE’s 45 commissioners are appointed by their governors from among state higher 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. Diane Barrans, executive director of the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education, is chair of the WICHE Commission; Philip L. Dubois, president of the University of Wyoming, is vice chair.

**ALASKA**

*Diane M. Barrans (WICHE Chair, 2005), Executive Director, Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education*
Johnny Ellis, State Senator
*Mashall L. Lind, Former Chancellor of Higher Education, University of Alaska Fairbanks*

**ARIZONA**

Lawrence M. Gudis, Senior Vice President/International Development, Apollo Group
John Haeger, President, Northern Arizona University
*Joel Sideman, Executive Director, Arizona Board of Regents*

**CALIFORNIA**

Francisco J. Hernandez, Vice Chancellor, University of California, Santa Cruz
Herbert A. Medina, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Loyola Marymount University
*Robert Moore, Former Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission*

**COLORADO**

*William F. Byers, Consumer and Public Relations Manager, Grand Valley Power*
William J. Hybl, Chairman and CEO, El Pomar Foundation
Richard O’Donnell, Executive Director, Colorado Commission on Higher Education

**HAWAII**

Doris Ching, Vice President for Student Affairs, University of Hawaii System
Ray T. Ogawa, Attorney at Law, Oliver, Lau, Lown, Ogawa & Nakamura
*Robero M. Richards, State Officer, Hawaii Department of Education*

**IDAHO**

Richard Bowen, President, Idaho State University
Robert W. Kustra, President, Boise State University
*Gary W. Strivers, Executive Director, State Board of Education*

**MONTANA**

Ed Jasmin, Immediate Past Chairman, Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education
*Sheila Steams, Commissioner of Higher Education, Montana University System*
Cindy Younkin, Former State Representative

**NEVADA**

Jane A. Nichols, Professor, University of Nevada Reno
Raymond D. Rawson, Former State Senator
*Carl Shaf, Educational Consultant, Nevada State Department of Education*

**NEW MEXICO**

Letitia Chambers, Former Executive Director, New Mexico Commission on Higher Education
Dede Feldman, State Senator
*Patricia Sullivan, Assistant Dean, College of Engineering, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces*

**NORTH DAKOTA**

Richard Kunkel, Member, State Board of Higher Education
*David E. Nething, State Senator*
Robert Potts, Chancellor, North Dakota University System

**OREGON**

Ryan P. Deckert, State Senator
*Camille Preus-Braly, Commissioner, Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development*
James K. Sager, Senior Education Policy Advisor, Education & Workforce Policy Office

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

Robert Burns, Distinguished Professor, Political Science Department, South Dakota State University
James O. Hansen, Regent, South Dakota Board of Regents
*Robert T. (Tad) Perry (Past Chair, 2002), Executive Director, South Dakota Board of Regents*

**UTAH**

David L. Gladwell, Attorney and Former State Senator
*Richard E. Kendall, Commissioner of Higher Education, Utah System of Higher Education*
E. George Mantes, Regent, State Board of Regents

**WASHINGTON**

*Don Carlson (Immediate Past Chair, 2004), Former State Senator*
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, State Representative
*James Sultan, Jr., Executive Director, Higher Education Coordinating Board*

**WYOMING**

Tax Boggs, State Senator and President, Western Wyoming Community College
*Philip L. Dubois (WICHE Vice Chair, 2005), President, University of Wyoming*
Klaus Hanson, Professor of German and Chair, Department of Modern and Classical Languages, University of Wyoming

*Executive Committee Member*
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Rick O’Donnell (CO)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Richard Bowen (ID)
Cindy Younkin (MT)
Ray Rawson (NV)
Patricia Sullivan (NM)
Richard Kunkel (ND)
Committee vice chair (OR)
Robert Burns (SD)
David Gladwell (UT)
Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney (WA)
Tex Boggs (WY)

Programs and Services
Phil Dubois (WY), chair
Carl Shaff (NV), vice chair
Diane Barrans (AK), ex officio

Marshall Lind (AK)
John Haeger (AZ)
Herbert Medina (CA)
Bill Hybl (CO)
Doris Ching (HI)
Bob Kustra (ID)
Ed Jasmin (MT)
Committee vice chair (NV)
Dede Feldman (NM)
Robert Potts (ND)
James Sager (OR)
Jim Hansen (SD)
George Mantes (UT)
Don Carlson (WA)
Committee chair (WY)

Audit Committee
Don Carlson (WA), chair
Linda Blessing (AZ)
Roy Ogawa (HI)
Ed Jasmin (MT)
Jane Nichols (NV)

2005 Nominating Committee
(Don Carlson (WA), chair
Cam Preus-Braly (OR)
Gary Stivers (ID)
WICHE Staff

**Executive Director’s Office**
David Longenecker, executive director
Frank Abbott, senior advisor
Marla Williams, assistant to the executive director and executive secretary to the commission

**Accounting and Administrative Services**
Marv Myers, director
Kelly Israelson, senior accounting specialist
Craig Milburn, director of accounting
Ann Szeligowski, accounting specialist
Jerry Worley, information technologies manager

**Mental Health**
Dennis Mohatt, director
Scott Adams, research associate
Mimi Bradley, postdoctoral fellow
Fran Dong, statistical analyst
Chuck McGee, project director
Jenny Shaw, project and administrative coordinator

**Policy Analysis and Research**
Cheryl D. Blanco, director
Erin Barber, administrative assistant II
Michelle Médal, administrative assistant IV
Demarée K. Michelau, project coordinator
Brian T. Prescott, research associate

**Programs and Services**
Jere Mock, director
Candy Allen, graphic designer
Anne Ferguson, administrative assistant I
Anne Finnigan, communications associate
Deborah Jang, web design manager
Michelle Médal, administrative assistant IV
Ken Pepion, director, Bridges to the Professoriate
Margo Schultz, program coordinator, Student Exchange Programs

**WCET**
Sally Johnstone, director
Sharmila Basu Conger, postdoctoral fellow
Rachel Dammann, conference assistant
Tim Dammann, web developer
Sherri Artz Gilbert, administrative/budget coordinator
Deborah Jang, web design manager
Russell Poulin, associate director
Pat Shea, assistant director

Staff members whose names are in **bold** have joined the WICHE staff since the last commission meeting.

The WICHE website, www.wiche.edu, includes a staff directory with phone numbers and email addresses.
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>AAC&amp;U</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>AAHE</td>
<td>American Association for Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aahe.org">www.aahe.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>AGB</td>
<td>Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.agb.org">www.agb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIHEC</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.airweb.org">www.airweb.org</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 TelEdCommunications Alliance</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atalliance.org">www.atalliance.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEL</td>
<td>Council for Adult and Experiential Learning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cael.org">www.cael.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>Council for Advancement and Support of Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.case.org">www.case.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.chea.org">www.chea.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>COE</td>
<td>Council for Opportunity in Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trioprograms.org">www.trioprograms.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAHEC</td>
<td>Consortium for Higher Education Collaboration</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/conahec/english">www.wiche.edu/conahec/english</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONASEP</td>
<td>CONAHEC’s Student Exchange Program</td>
<td>www/wiche.edu.conahec/conasep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG-WEST</td>
<td>Council of State Governments – West</td>
<td><a href="http://www.westrends.org">www.westrends.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>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-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>Acronym</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Website Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</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>ED-OSERS</td>
<td>Office of Special Education &amp; Rehabilitative Services</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/index.html?src=mr">www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/index.html?src=mr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED-OVAE</td>
<td>Office of Vocational and Adult Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/index.html?src=mr">www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/index.html?src=mr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPSE</td>
<td>Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/fipse/index.html">www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/fipse/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCAUSE</td>
<td>(An association fostering higher ed change via technology and information resources)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.educause.edu">www.educause.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Educational Testing Service</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ets.org">www.ets.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEE</td>
<td>Global Higher Education Exchange</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ghee.org">www.ghee.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACU</td>
<td>Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.whes.org/members/hacu.html">www.whes.org/members/hacu.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA</td>
<td>Higher Education Abstracts</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cgu.edu/inst/hea/hea.html">www.cgu.edu/inst/hea/hea.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHPEP</td>
<td>Institute for Higher Education Policy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ihep.com">www.ihep.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIE</td>
<td>Institute of International Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iie.org">www.iie.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nces.ed.gov/ipeds">www.nces.ed.gov/ipeds</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrel</td>
<td>Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mcrel.org">www.mcrel.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHEC</td>
<td>Midwestern Higher Education Compact</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mhec.org">www.mhec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA/CHE</td>
<td>Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.middlestates.org">www.middlestates.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOL</td>
<td>North American Council for Online Learning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nacol.org">www.nacol.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACUBO</td>
<td>National Association of College and University Business Officers</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nacubo.org">www.nacubo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAEP</td>
<td>National Assessment of Educational Progress</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard">www.nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPEO</td>
<td>National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nafeo.org">www.nafeo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFSA</td>
<td>(an association of international educators)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nafsa.org">www.nafsa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICU</td>
<td>National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.naicu.edu">www.naicu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASC</td>
<td>Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cocnasc.org">www.cocnasc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASFAA</td>
<td>National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nasfaa.org">www.nasfaa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPA</td>
<td>National Association of Student Personnel Administrators</td>
<td><a href="http://www.naspa.org">www.naspa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASULGC</td>
<td>National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nasulgc.org">www.nasulgc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA-CASI</td>
<td>North Central Association Commission on Accreditation and School Improvement</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncacasi.org">www.ncacasi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHEMS</td>
<td>National Center for Higher Education Management Systems</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncchems.org">www.ncchems.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSL</td>
<td>National Conference of State Legislatures</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncsl.org">www.ncsl.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPPHE</td>
<td>National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.highereducation.org">www.highereducation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEASC-CIHE</td>
<td>New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.neasc.org">www.neasc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBHE</td>
<td>New England Board of Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nebhe.org">www.nebhe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEON</td>
<td>Northwest Educational Outreach Network</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/NWAF/NEON">www.wiche.edu/NWAF/NEON</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGA</td>
<td>National Governors’ Association</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nga.org">www.nga.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPEC</td>
<td>National Postsecondary Education Cooperative</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nces.ed.gov/npec">www.nces.ed.gov/npec</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCEA</td>
<td>National University Continuing Education Association</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nucea.edu">www.nucea.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWAF</td>
<td>Northwest Academic Forum</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/NWAF">www.wiche.edu/NWAF</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAIR</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Association for Institutional Research</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unlv.edu/PAIR/rmair">www.unlv.edu/PAIR/rmair</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS-CoC</td>
<td>Southern Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sacsoc.org">www.sacsoc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEEO</td>
<td>State Higher Education Executive Officers</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sheeo.org">www.sheeo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEPC</td>
<td>State Higher Education Policy Center</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONA</td>
<td>Student Organization of North America</td>
<td><a href="http://www.conahec.org/sona">www.conahec.org/sona</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREB</td>
<td>Southern Regional Education Board</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sreb.org">www.sreb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREC</td>
<td>Southern Regional Electronic Campus</td>
<td><a href="http://www.electroniccampus.org">www.electroniccampus.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCF</td>
<td>United Negro College Fund</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uncf.org">www.uncf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGS</td>
<td>Western Association of Graduate Schools</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/wags/index.htm">www.wiche.edu/wags/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC-ACCJC</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges</td>
<td><a href="http://www.accjc.org">www.accjc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC-Sr</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wascweb.org/senior/wascsr.html">www.wascweb.org/senior/wascsr.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCET</td>
<td>Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu/telecom">www.wiche.edu/telecom</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGA</td>
<td>Western Governors’ Association</td>
<td><a href="http://www.westgov.org">www.westgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td>Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wiche.edu">www.wiche.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIN</td>
<td>Western Institute of Nursing</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohsu.edu.son.win">www.ohsu.edu.son.win</a></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>Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UAS</td>
<td>University of Alaska System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>ABOR</td>
<td>Arizona Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>CPEC</td>
<td>California Postsecondary Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>CCHE</td>
<td>Colorado Commission on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>UH</td>
<td>University of Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>ISBE</td>
<td>Idaho State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>Montana University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>NMCHE</td>
<td>New Mexico Commission on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>UCCS</td>
<td>University &amp; Community College System of Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>NDUS</td>
<td>North Dakota University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OUS</td>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>SDBOR</td>
<td>South Dakota Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>USBR</td>
<td>Utah State Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>HECB</td>
<td>Higher Education Coordinating Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>WCCC</td>
<td>Wyoming Community College Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>