

State Performance Agreement Committee Stakeholder Meeting – July 10, 2008

In Attendance:

Aldo Melchiori, Senate
Bruce Botka, Governor's Office
Chris Thompson, HECB
Cindy Morana, COP
Jane Sherman, WSU
Julie Suchanek, TESC
Katie Youngers, HECB
Larry Ganders, WSU
Libby Street, CWU
Marc Webster, OFM
Randy Hodgins, UW

Randy Spaulding, HECB
Shelley Johnson, CWU
Sherry Burkey, WWU
Terry Teale, COP
Tim Yowell, Senate

On phone:
Deb Stephens, SBCTC
Mark Lundgren, CWU
Paula Gilman, WWU
Theresa Martin, EWU

Chris Thompson stated his purpose for calling the meeting: to have an informal discussion and exchange of ideas about where everyone is in the process of developing draft performance agreements for compliance with HB 2641.

He also provided an update on the state committee, which will probably meet again in mid-August; that meeting will likely focus on initial proposals from institutions and on analysis submitted by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). NCHEMS is under contract to look at productivity relative to resources (funding) at each of the six public baccalaureate institutions in Washington, in comparison to similar institutions in the Global Challenge States.

The state committee doesn't have an elaborate set of criteria, guidelines, or specific expectations, though the legislation does speak to a particular interest in degree production, including STEM & health care fields. Given that this is the first go-round, the committee is likely to be pretty flexible.

Institution Progress Reports

Randy Hodgins (UW)

UW regents will approve outline of performance agreement next week. Includes four main components:

- Operating & Capital Investments - Per student funding based on 5806 and tied in to 6-year capital plan.
- Enrollment & Degree Production - Enrollment piece consistent with what a separate group on campus is doing for HECB 10-year projections, so this piece is 10-year even though performance agreement is only 6-year. Degree production: total, baccalaureate, advanced, areas of state critical need/high-demand.

- Metrics: “university performance and outcomes” - 16 or 17 total measures in 3 categories:
 - Evidence of contribution to state’s economy
 - Evidence of efficiency and equity
 - Quality
- Enabling legislation - statutory changes UW thinks are necessary along with funding to support degree production, metrics, etc.

Will be public document by next week; can share electronically. Will gather committee again in September to incorporate state feedback until have an agreement/proposal.

Sherry Burkey (WWU)

Performance committee has met and broken into sub-committees, and has a working document. Will take to August trustees meeting in an outline form. Focusing on three areas:

- Facilities, environment, capital issues
- Increasing access & degree production - demography, diversity, master plan connections, accountability measures, K-12 pipeline, enrollment planning, benchmarks on 6-year graduation rates, freshman retention, etc.
- Responsiveness to economic and workforce needs - high-demand proposals, tuition policy, flexibility from state regulations, benchmarks on high-demand bachelor’s degrees in STEM and health care.

There was a brief discussion here in which institution representatives expressed that they are actively aligning indicators with current accountability framework and other similar initiatives.

Libby Street (CWU)

Document went to board in June, will take second draft in August. Four main areas of focus:

- Access, efficiency, and affordability
- Economic development and high-demand
- Quality
- Stewardship

CWU is sticking close to accountability framework. Also talking about how to get appropriate levels of funding for activities related to K-12 pipeline. Look at variables like diversity, graduation rates, degrees/certificates produced. Increase in percentage of courses online is an access issue. Overall, CWU has a lot of narrative – wondered if others do also.

Julie Suchanek (TESC)

Evergreen’s agreement is highly narrative - requires more translating than more traditional schools. Grounding performance agreement in mission: clearly it’s Evergreen’s language and approach to education.

Randy Hodgins (UW)

UW has no words, only numbers. Wanted to get data & direction first, work on narrative later.

Theresa Martin (EWU)

EWU is less on the narrative side, is at mid-point in developing draft. Framed to match very closely with operating budget request for 2009-11. Wanting to keep internal consistency across

different types of documents. Accommodated almost all of the current accountability measures. Five categories include:

- Cost - reducing student debt.
- Access & articulation - transitioning and access for first generation & low income.
- Quality - straight out of strategic plan – indicators already in plan.
- Diversity - also from strategic plan.
- Student success and degree attainment - also out of strategic plan mostly. Also support for under-prepared students and reducing overall time to degree, rather than graduation rate. Also high-demand degree production & freshman retention.

EWU has 3 pages of narrative and 4 pages of performance indicators.

There was a discussion here of targets and how institutions are setting baselines. Thompson reiterated that these are initial proposals with little statutory guidance, so these decisions are really up to institutions to do what makes sense for them.

Larry Ganders (WSU)

WSU will probably organize its agreement around centers of excellence – areas where already strong, that if improved further would give the state an institution that would service it well in many, but not all, of its high-demand areas. Trying to specialize in certain areas. Committee is meeting regularly, will stay active through the fall negotiation process. Regents gave preliminary approval to a very broad outline. Will take it up again at a July summer retreat.

Questions and Concerns

Relationship of performance agreements to accountability framework

Institution representatives wondered how explicitly performance agreements should adhere to existing accountability or other frameworks and/or whether the accountability framework might be altered as a result of performance agreement activity.

Thompson expressed that there is some desire for overlap, that the measures and so forth laid out in the framework and budget may also appear in the performance agreements; conversely there are likely to be some measures that appear in only one. There will likely be a fair amount of overlap and alignment, but not total replication. Discussions are occurring at the HECB in regard to ways that multiple requirements and activities might be coordinated or brought together more clearly.

The performance agreement process may help in terms of refining and defining high-demand fields, gaining more consistency in terms of what is considered high-demand. That conversation could lead to changes in accountability framework. There has been discussion of STEM and health care fields filling that role. NCHEMS will be looking at degree production in STEM and health care relative to resources.

Role of NCHEMS contract in performance agreement process

Representatives of the comprehensives expressed concern over the comparison institutions submitted to NCHEMS. Most feel that the institutions to which they are being compared are not truly their “peer” institutions. **Terry Teale (COP)** indicated she would contact Ann Daley and

Carol Jenner (OFM) to ensure that the Global Challenge peer lists that are currently under discussion with regional representatives, TESC representatives and OFM are consistent with those that NCHEMS will use for its study. Thompson will contact NCHEMS to discuss the possibility of doing comparisons with research universities first so as to provide additional time to develop comparison institutions for comprehensives, however there has been a push for NCHEMS timeline to align with OFM work.

Institution representatives overall also expressed concern about the timeline – NCHEMS is to submit their report at the same time that institutions submit draft performance agreements, which does not allow time to develop responses, address concerns, etc. Thompson indicated he will follow up with NCHEMS to find out what performance measures and variables NCHEMS will be using in their assessments and hopefully get that information to institutions in advance of the due date. He also indicated that they would likely use criteria similar to those in their previous reports, which are available for review.

Thompson explained that any and all adjustments to timeline and work plan will likely be minor, as NCHEMS is required to be done with their work on the assessment portion of the contract by August 15. Ann Daley, executive director of HECB, and Victor Moore, director of OFM, already requested and received some leniency on the timeline. The feasibility of further adjustments is unknown, but will be explored.

Institutions asked for clarification on what work the NCHEMS contract includes. Thompson summarized it as an examination of productivity relative to resources for Washington's six baccalaureate institutions in relation to similar institutions in the Global Challenge States. The other piece of the contract has NCHEMS review draft performance agreements following submittal in order to give feedback and make recommendations that will help the state committee assess the initial proposals from institutions.

Thompson also expressed that preliminary proposals are likely to be assessed first based on alignment with the master plan, second on alignment with the accountability framework, and last on NCHEMS analysis.

There was some discussion of indicators and the extent to which NCHEMS indicators would be imposed to the detriment of unique institution indicators that might be more useful. Conclusion was that there will be some foundational indicators established by NCHEMS, however there is room for unique indicators reflecting the mission of specific institutions, particularly if usefulness is well defended.

Thompson also shared that NCHEMS will be delivering their report to the committee via the HECB, and that it could be shared with institutions in advance of the committee meeting.

ADJOURNMENT.