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May 13, 2008 Council meeting:

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia will create a restructuring task force comprised of Council members, Council staff, and college representatives (with input from legislators or legislative staff) to recommend to the Council technical corrections to the Higher Education Restructuring Act or to the certification process that will enhance the effectiveness and the intent of the Act.
Data Collection and Review

- June – surveyed institutions, coordinated with JLARC survey
- July – reviewed survey results
Task Force Membership

• August – Task Force
  – Five Council members
    • Alan Wurtzel, Chair
    • Robert Ashby
    • Gilbert Bland
    • Eva Hardy
    • Susan Magill
  – Six institutional representatives
    • John Bennett, VCU
    • Bob Green, VMI
    • Lin Rose, JMU
    • Leonard Sandridge, UVA
    • Wil Stanton, RU
    • Monty Sullivan, VCCS
Task Force Activities

- **September/October** – Task Force meetings
  - Reviewed
    - Restructuring Act/process
    - Measures
    - Certification process
    - Institutional survey results
  - Solicited input from wide audience
- **October**
  - Task Force recommendations submitted to SCHEV
  - SCHEV approved Task Force recommendations
Task Force Work Structure

- Narrowed focus to select issues
- Two subgroups
  - Alan Wurtzel - subgroup
    - Reviewed individual measures
    - Examined reporting burden
  - John Bennett - subgroup
    - Reviewed certification criteria
    - Considered exceptions to measures
Proposed Changes

– §4-9.02 – General Provisions – 2008 Appropriation Act

– General changes

• Gives SCHEV flexibility to determine targets and thresholds on an institution-by-institution basis

• Provides consistency in language among individual standards

• Establishes measures that were requested by the General Assembly

• Applies to education-related standards – does not propose changes to financial and administrative standards
Proposed Changes

– Introductory section
  • Reinforces SCHEV’s responsibility to approve institutional targets and thresholds
  • Gives SCHEV flexibility in determining institutional certification
SCHEV Flexibility

- Factors outside an institution’s control
  - Federal changes
  - State changes
  - Student selection/choice
- Short-term failure
- Miss one year, will probably miss the next year
- Measure tensions/dependencies
Assessment Timetable

Classifies standards into two broad categories based on assessment period

- Annual Assessments
- Biennial Assessments
Annual Assessments

- Tend to be core to the institution’s instructional mission
- Primarily quantitative
- Tend to have annual targets and thresholds
- Assessed every year as part of the certification process
- Goals addressed: Access, Affordability, Breadth of Academics, Academic Standards, Student Retention and Timely Graduation, Articulation Agreements and Dual Enrollment, and Research
Biennial Assessments

• Tend to be outside an institution’s primary instructional mission

• Tend to be report-based rather than quantifiable – more qualitative in nature

• Difficult to measure changes over a single year

• Lessens annual reporting burden – some incorporated into six-year plans

• SCHEV will review institutional results and include in certification every other year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Biennial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>In-State Enrollment</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underrepresented enrollment</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree awards</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need-based borrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of Academics</td>
<td>High-need degrees</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>SACS program review</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degrees per FTE faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention &amp; Graduation</td>
<td>100-200 courses</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention rate</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degrees per FTE students</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation and Dual Enrollment</td>
<td>Transfer agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree transfers</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual enrollment</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research expenditures</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patents and licenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Education</td>
<td>K-12 partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Safety and Security</td>
<td>Campus Safety and Security</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>