



State Council of
Higher Education for Virginia

Recommendations of the Restructuring Task Force

Senate Finance
Subcommittee on Education

December 4, 2008



Outline

- Enabling resolution
- Data collection and review
- Task Force membership
- Task Force activities
- Task Force work structure
- Proposed changes
- Assessment timetable
- Summary of recommendations



Enabling Resolution

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
- Goals addressed: Affordability, Academic Standards – Productivity, Articulation Agreements, Economic Development, Patents and Licenses, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Campus Safety and Security



Summary of Recommendations

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