To: Faculty Senate
From: Mary Wack, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education *MW*
Date: 26 March 2019
Subject: Additional Information Pertaining to Proposed Change to Rule 53

As President Schulz remarked in the State of the Union address, "evolution is necessary to remain relevant and valued." In order to fulfill our land grant mission of access, we need to evolve the ways in which we conduct our academic business of matriculating students into degree pathways and supporting them to achieve their degrees.

Our current system of widespread limited certification is a disincentive to attracting top students and is, in the words of one dean, not only unfair but "inherently poor business practice to imply that we will provide access to a degree and then not provide that access." Uncertified students leave the university at disproportionate rates (75% of those who leave in a given year are uncertified); of enrolled students with 60 credits, a full 40% are not certified; 10% of current seniors are not certified. Needless to say, these students are losing time and money, with no certainty of a return in the form of a degree.

Revising Rule 53 is the opportunity of a generation to modernize students' pathways to degrees. It gives departments more flexibility than they have now (by removing university limits on certification) and more control over quality, as they determine the optimal sequencing of progress requirements. Over time it becomes a means of planned growth by enabling a more predictable and growth-oriented revenue stream into the department. While there will be known and unknown bumps in the transition, within a relatively short time the new system will become the new normal, with advantages to students, departments, and the university.

The Academic Affairs Committee raised a number of concerns and considerations. The following sections address them to the best of present knowledge.

1. **Plausibility of an effective date of Fall 2020 for the new approach to entry into the major (continuous progression model).**

The timeline appears to some as too short to put into place the needed changes. A related recommendation is to pilot change on a limited scale before moving forward.

The changes will affect most departments to a minor degree; some departments will face more complex scenarios. See the Sport Science example on an attached document for a department with limited certification where the impact will be small.

Enterprise Systems has shared that there are existing tools that can be adapted to automate the process of checking students' progression. Already CCB and VCEA run special certification reports that can be modified for any department as progression reports.

In addition, Enterprise Systems will run simulations on the past three years of student data using departments' proposed progression criteria. If the results are too broad or two narrow, the criteria

can be re-sequenced and run again until the department is satisfied that the sequence meets its students' needs. In this way pilots can be run on a large scale without pushing back the effective date.

Related to the timeline was a concern from AAC about the amount of faculty time it might take to work through how current certification requirements could be sequenced for a continuous progression model. The before-and-after document for Sport Science is an example of how the central offices can prepare "90% solutions" for validation or revision by departments, thus minimizing faculty time spent on the mechanics of conversion, and reserving it for substantive changes.

Given that simulations can be run starting immediately, it will be the task of the initial working group to study a sampling of departments in order to devise templates that cover various certification scenarios. These can then be provided to departments so that each one does not have to reinvent the wheel in terms of sequencing the progression criteria.

There was a parallel concern regarding changes to the catalog, both in the departmental section and within courses that contain references to certification. A similar process can be followed whereby the Registrar's Office, in conjunction with the initial working group, develops language and options that can be proposed to departments who will ratify or alter it as appropriate. That will save faculty time and allow for consistency across departments.

2. Involvement of advisors and faculty

AAC members were also concerned that the working group be composed of those "on the ground" with certification issues, namely advisors and faculty. The initial working group, whose membership is detailed on a separate document, is composed primarily of advisors from around the system. Given the timeline, it is important that members be available this summer to run the simulations and develop templates. Faculty will be involved upon return in the fall as their departments move into simulations. New members can be added as needed as issues both anticipated and unforeseen arise.

3. Someone has to do the work; what will it cost?

The primary work will be borne by central offices: Enterprise Systems, the Academic Success and Career Center, Institutional Research, and the Registrar's Office. For these offices, the changes fall within their missions and scope of ordinary work. The potential pinch point in some offices may be staff shortages at key points in the transition. The Registrar's Office and the Provost's Office can commit to providing temporary project assistance to IR, ASCC and Registrar's staff as needed. The highest estimate thus far is 80 additional hours of work for validation and testing (IR), which will be about $5,000.

Advisor training will be folded into the existing mechanisms and expectations: fall and spring advising forums and the required hours in the Advisor Learning Program. It is estimated that 2-3 hours will suffice.

Some faculty and perhaps advisors will validate the translation of certification criteria into progression criteria. This is estimated at 1 to 4 hours, depending on complexity, and falls within the scope of normal business for maintaining a degree.

Some faculty will be involved in approving or revising proposed language involving course prerequisites. This is estimated at 1-2 hours, depending on complexity.

At this point it is not possible to estimate the cost to system-wide website changes, as the infrastructure is completely decentralized. Where units or colleges have regular update processes, this should not be a problem.

Finally, the issue of the cost of change should be seen within the context of the cost of doing business as usual. Two points to keep in mind:

- 130 Washington students or 60 nonresident students represent approximately $1 million in tuition revenue. Currently a substantial portion of tuition revenue tied to course enrollments returns to the colleges.
- A college degree generates about $1 million in additional lifetime earnings to the holder.

Students who leave WSU without degrees incur substantial losses in future earnings as well as reduced life-chances, while the university loses tuition dollars that otherwise could be used to expand access and increase quality. Here's some indicators of the scale of the issue, using some limited-certification colleges as illustrations (which could be multiplied by adding in the rest):

- Of 300 who start in Nursing across the WSU system, 40 to 50 will earn a Nursing degree; an additional 100 will earn a WSU degree; and 120+ will leave WSU without a degree. For the 2016 cohort, 126 students left WSU by the beginning of the 3rd year.
- Of about 850 who start in the Voiland College of Engineering and Architecture, 45% or about 380+ will get an engineering degree; about another 20% will get a WSU degree; and over a third will leave WSU without a degree, or about 300 students.
- Of about 700 students who aspire to business degrees, a little over 40% attain those degrees; another quarter get a different WSU degree; and about a third leave WSU without a degree, roughly 250 students.*

This loss of over 650 potential degrees represents more than <u>$5 million in lost tuition revenue</u> as well as over <u>$600 million in lost earnings for the students</u>. Of course, not every student who leaves is academically qualified for their first intended major, nor will changes to certification retain every student.

To this add the lost market of highly prepared students who never come to WSU because we cannot offer them assurance of a place in their desired major and we have strong arguments for changing our model.

*Numbers taken from "Retention in the Major/College/WSU" reports developed annually by Institutional Research, covering 2013-18 cohorts. Numbers are approximations because of differences in cohort size and annual retention percentages from year to year.

Sport Science	
Current Process of Certification	**Proposed Progress in Major**
1st Year * Complete/Pass KINES 138, 199, 201 + 262 *earn a "C" or better in KINES 199 + 262 * Complete a minimum of 24 semester credits * 2.75 cumulative GPA (minimum)	**1st Year** * Complete/Pass KINES 138, 199, 201 + 262 *earn a "C" or better in KINES 199 + 262 * Complete a minimum of 24 semester credits * 2.75 cumulative GPA (minimum)
2nd Year - 1st Term *Students meeting criteria as outlined in 1st year, are encouraged to apply for **Certification** to the major. Complete/submit a written statement (max. 2 pgs.) describing relevant work experience/involvement in extracurricular activities related to Sport Science. *Timeline: Sept. 1-30/Feb. 1-28* Note: Written statement combined w/ grades earned in KINES courses and cumulative GPA will be evluated for certification. CERTIFIED - Student continues in major NOT CERTIFIED - Student can enroll in 100 & 200 level coursework in the major and may reapply to certify in Feb./Sept.	**2nd Year - 1st Term** *Maintain a minimum 2.75 cumulative GPA *Complete self evaluation to include a written statement describing relevant experience and involvement related to major (Sept. 1-30/Feb. 1-28) Note: Self evaluation combined w/ grades earned in KINES courses and cumulative GPA will be evluated for progress in the major. **Self Evaluation Milestone** PASS - Student continues in major NEEDS IMPROVEMENT - Student takes steps to improve performance/profile (i.e. grades, cum GPA, activities, written statement); resubmit self evaluation in Feb. 1-28/Sept. 1-30) for review.
2nd Year - 2nd term *Students meeting minimum Certification criteria may reapply to certify (Feb.1-28/Sept. 1-30). CERTIFIED - Student continues in major NOT CERTIFIED - Student can enroll in 100 or 200 level coursework in the major. Student can reapply for certification durinng the next term (Sept. 1-30/Feb. 1-28).	**2nd Year - 2nd term** *Re-evaluate progress by completing/submitting a new self evaluation. (Feb.1-28/Sept. 1-30) **Self Evaluation Milestone** PASS - Student continues in major FAILURE TO PROGRESS: Performance in the major and self-evaluation is unsatisfactory; Student is released from the major to explore other majors.
3rd Year - 1st term UNCERTIFIED - Students can continue to enroll in 100 or 200 level courses within the major and reapply for Certification for a third time (Sept./Feb.)	

RULE 53 WORKING GROUP

Initial Working Group on Rule 53

The charge of the initial working group, whose membership is still in formation as of 3/25/19, is to surface issues and opportunities related to the proposed change to Rule 53, and to suggest solutions that minimize workload on departments while achieving university goals. Topics include sequencing of progression criteria, minors, course descriptions, and others.

As issues and solutions are identified, others will be tapped for specific subsidiary task forces.

Kasey Schertenlieb, Director, Advising and Enrollment, VCEA

Sara Stout, Director, Murrow Student Services

Colette Casavant, Academic Coordinator/Advisor 2, CAHNRS

Darryl Craig, Academic Coordinator, Sport Science, Education

CAS representative TBD

CCB representative TBD

Mysti Meiers, Academic Coordinator/Advisor 3, TriCities

Terese King, Executive Director, University-Wide Advising and Director, ASCC

Waylon Safranki, Director, Transfer Clearinghouse

Vancouver representative TBD

Resource staff/units:

Blaine Golden (Registrar's Office, degrees, graduation)

Becky Bitter (Registrar's Office, AAC staff, catalog)

Gary Saunders (Enterprise Systems)

Richard Backes (Enterprise Systems)

Provost's Office