Institutional Compact Reporting

Leading the Way

Access. Success. Impact.

2013-18 Master Plan

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission

Institutional Compact Reporting Elements

Master Plan 2013-2018

INTRODUCTION

The new master plan of the Higher Education Policy Commission (Commission) for the years 2013 through 2018 focuses the efforts of the system on three mutually reinforcing areas: **access** to higher education, student **success**, and the **impact** our institutions have on the state. Consistent with Series 49 Legislative Rule on the accountability system of the Commission, each institution will develop a Compact to address the goals in each of the focal areas and annually submit a report on progress. The Commission is setting a consistent model upon which master plan efforts are to be based. This model consists of setting tangible **objectives** for the master plan time period, developing and carrying out institutional **strategies** to move the institution toward meeting the objective, and developing and executing **assessment** to evaluate progress and effectiveness of the strategies and to guide future efforts.

In the master plan, there are two types of objectives. The first are objectives where the Commission recognized the need for progress on the same exact challenge at all institutions (e.g., enrollment, retention rates, graduation rates). The Commission has identified uniform quantitative metrics for the system and, with institution input, set targets for the system to reach. Institutions, through the Compact process, will set targets for their institutions on these metrics, develop strategies for the master planning time period to meet the targets, and create a means of assessment. Reporting in subsequent years will consist of: 1) data updates; 2) narratives explaining progress on the metrics and strategies; and 3) the results of the assessment and how the results will guide future efforts.

The second type of master plan objectives include efforts focused on access and ensuring academic quality where there is need of progress for all institutions, but differences in mission and context require that institutions have the latitude to identify the specific focus of their efforts and develop **comprehensive plans** for addressing the challenge. These comprehensive plans are to be consistent with institution mission, articulate objectives and strategies to meet them, and set forth how the institution will assess its progress. Subsequent Compacts will report on activities based on their comprehensive plans during the reporting year, the results of assessment, and decisions made based on that assessment for the next year's activities.

Tools. Institutions will be asked throughout their Compact documents, both in the initial year and in subsequent updates, to illustrate how their efforts utilize important best practices or tools set forth in the master plan. These tools are **collaboration, fiscal responsibility,** and **assessment**. The integration of assessment was addressed above. The Commission is asking institutions to employ collaboration both within the institution across departments and functions, and beyond their institution with other community stakeholders to maximize resources, reduce duplication, and approach problems in a holistic way. Collaboration is particularly important with our K-12 colleagues as we work together to ensure academic readiness of students and adequate preparation of elementary and secondary teachers. Institutions are asked to employ and report on collaboration in identifying objectives, and developing and implementing strategies. Furthermore, as the three areas of the master plan (access, success, and impact) are intended to be mutually reinforcing efforts, institutions will be asked to provide evidence that efforts in different areas of the plan inform one another. The Compact documents themselves will be integrated, holistic documents reflecting the reinforcing aspects of the three focal areas. Finally, the Commission encourages institutions to work collaboratively on their Compact submission and will request information on the individuals involved in preparing the document and the nature of their involvement.

Fiscal responsibility recognizes that the state of West Virginia and institutions of higher education play a role in the cost of education through financial aid, finance policy, and institutional efficiency. Additionally, fiscal responsibility entails the strategic allocation of limited resources to efficiently enhance educational opportunities and outcomes. Institutions will be asked in their Compacts to report on how their strategies and plans responsibly employ resources (human, financial, infrastructure, or other) to meet the institution's aims.

Institutional Compacts and annual Compact updates must be approved by the respective governing boards and the Commission. By November 1, 2013, institutions will submit their five-year targets on each of the system established quantitative metrics and the rationale for determining the targets. By November 1, 2014, each institution will submit their first Compact document. It will consist of: 1) the first year of data on the quantitative metrics along with the proposed institutional strategies and means of assessment, and 2) the institution's proposed comprehensive plans. Before becoming effective, the proposed institution Compacts must be approved by the Commission.

In subsequent years of the master planning cycle, each institution will submit its Compact update no later than November 1. A team of reviewers consisting of Commission staff and campus representatives will review each Compact report annually to determine if institutions are making sufficient progress in achieving objectives, implementing strategies that will produce continued progress, and utilizing the best practices of collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. The review team will make recommendations regarding approval of the Compacts to the Commission which will vote to approve them at a quarterly meeting.

The Commission may request further information or revision of the institutional Compact prior to its approval. If the Commission determines that an institution is not making sufficient progress overall or in a particular area, the Commission may: direct the institution to modify its strategies; direct the institution to develop a remediation plan overall or in a particular area; direct the Chancellor to work with the institution's board of governors and/or president to remedy the deficiencies or to develop a remediation plan; withhold approval of a salary increase for the institution's president; and/or take other action consistent with its statutory responsibilities that is necessary or appropriate to ensure that adequate progress is made in the future.

Requests for changes to an institution's Compact targets and overall focus of strategies and plans may only occur prior to or with the 2015 Compact submission and must be approved by the institution's board of governors as well as the Commission. Institutions may make adjustments, however, to their strategies and plans throughout the course of the master planning cycle as a result of their assessment efforts.

In order to enhance the transparency of the system's progress toward meeting the goals of the master plan, the Commission will publish each institution's Compact after approval on the master plan area of the Commission's website. The Commission will also develop a means for sharing and promoting exemplary campus efforts.

I. HOW LEADING THE WAY AND THE INSTITUTIONAL COMPACTS FIT TOGETHER

In each of the focal areas of Leading the Way, there is an overarching goal and several system objectives to be achieved over the time period of the plan. As previously mentioned, some objectives have very specific pre-determined metrics on which progress toward the objectives is to be measured. System targets on these metrics have been set, partially based on input from the campuses in the fall of 2012. For these objectives, as part of the Compact process, institutions will set campus targets on each of the metrics and present rationales. Institutions will also develop and submit strategies as their means for achieving the targets. The quantitative data and strategy reporting processes are defined in detail in Sections II and III of this document.

Other master plan system objectives do not have specific metrics but rather direct campuses to work on and provide documentation of the institution's efforts in important areas in each focal area. Some of these ask institutions to develop comprehensive plans that involve the setting of objectives, articulation of strategies, and development of means of assessment. Other objectives are less comprehensive and request summaries of institutional strategies and activities in a particular area. Detailed information about these parts of the Compact reporting process is provided in Section IV of this document.

The Commission's role in the Compact process is multifaceted. Commission staff will provide the data for most of the quantitative metrics, review Compact submissions, and make recommendations for approval to the Commission. However, beyond these functions, the Commission is committed to a broader vision of involvement as articulated in Leading the Way. The Commission will strive throughout the master planning and Compact cycle to inform, coordinate, and support. During the 2013-14 academic year when institutions are formulating their strategies and plans, and in subsequent years, Commission staff will inform Compact efforts through providing best practices research and literature, support them by offering professional development opportunities, and coordinate by bringing campus personnel from across the state together to learn, share, and problem solve. In subsequent years, the Commission will foster transparency and accountability through annually publishing institution Compacts on its website. Furthermore, it will develop ways to acknowledge and promote successful efforts, not only to recognize institutions for their hard work, but also to share effective practices across the state.

ACCESS

In the focal area of access the four objectives contribute to the goal of increasing access to postsecondary education for both traditional and non-traditional aged West Virginians. One objective has system metrics for which campuses will develop institutional targets and strategies and two objectives involve comprehensive plans in important access areas. One objective, increasing the college-going rate of recent high school graduates, has a system target but no specific campus reporting responsibility. It is assumed that progress toward meeting this objective will arise from the collective work of the Commission and the campuses in other aspects of access.

Table 1. Access Goal, Objectives, Metrics, and Institutional Compact Responsibility
Goal: Increase access to postsecondary education for both traditional and non-traditional aged West Virginians.

System Objectives	System Metrics	Institution Compact Responsibility
1. Increase **enrollment** in public institutions overall and specifically in important target populations.	o Increase headcount enrollment to 73,500 students. o Increase annualized FTE enrollment to 68,000 students. o Increase first-time freshmen enrollment to 12,750 students. o Increase the enrollment of low-income students to 22,000 students. o Increase the enrollment of students from underrepresented racial/ethnic minority groups to 6,700 students. o Increase the enrollment of undergraduate adults age 25 and older to11,500 students.	**Initially:** Set campus target on each metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. The strategy must include activities that address at least one of the target populations (low-income, underrepresented minority, or adult students). **Annually:** Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategies including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
2. Increase the college-going rate of recent high school graduates.	Increase the percentage of West Virginia high school graduates continuing on to higher education in the following fall to the Southern Regional Education Board average.	NA
3. Development of comprehensive, collaborative **access efforts** at all institutions with subsequent reports on the success and outcomes of these efforts.	NA	**Initially:** Develop and submit the comprehensive plan for a collaborative access effort as described in Section IV of this document. **Annually:** Report on the progress of the plan including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
4. Development of comprehensive **financial aid plans at all institutions** that guide institution financial aid allocation, administration, and outreach with subsequent reports on the success and outcomes of this plan.	NA	**Initially:** Develop and submit the comprehensive financial aid plan as described in Section IV of this document. **Annually:** Report on the progress of the plan including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.

SUCCESS

In the focal area of success, the seven objectives contribute to the goal of increasing the number of students at system institutions completing quality academic programs. Four objectives have system metrics for which campuses will develop institutional targets and strategies and three objectives involve comprehensive plans or strategies in important success areas.

Table 2. Success Goal, Objectives, Metrics, and Institutional Compact Responsibility
Goal: Increase the number of students at system institutions completing quality academic programs.

System Objectives	System Metrics	Institution Compact Responsibility
1. Improve the outcomes of students requiring **developmental education.**	○ Increase the percentage of first-time freshmen passing developmental courses taken in math to 70%. ○ Increase the percentage of first-time freshmen passing developmental courses taken in English/writing to 75%. ○ Increase the percentage of first-time freshmen requiring developmental education in math who pass the first college-level math course to 60%. ○ Increase the percentage of first-time freshmen requiring developmental education in English/writing who pass the first college-level English/writing course to 70%.	**Initially:** Set campus target on each metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. **Annually:** Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategy including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
2. Increase the **retention rate** of students overall and specifically in important target populations.	○ Increase the first-year retention rate of full-time first-time, degree-seeking freshmen to 80%. ○ Increase the first-year retention rate of part-time first-time, degree-seeking freshmen to 50%. ○ Increase the first-year retention rate of low-income first-time, degree-seeking freshmen to 75%. ○ Increase the first-year retention rate of first-time degree-seeking freshmen from under represented racial/ethnic minority groups to 75%. ○ Increase the one-year retention rate of returning adult degree-seeking students to 65%. ○ Increase the one-year retention rate of degree-seeking transfer students to 76%.	**Initially:** Set campus target on each metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. The strategy must address at least one of the target populations (low-income, underrepresented minority, returning adult, and transfer students). **Annually:** Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategy including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
3. Increase the number of students making **progress toward on-time completion.**	○ Increase the percentage of fall, first-time freshmen earning 30 or more credit hours in their first academic year of college to 65%.	**Initially:** Set campus target on the metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. **Annually:** Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategy including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.

Table 2. Success Goal, Objectives, Metrics, and Institutional Compact Responsibility (Continued)

System Objectives	System Metrics	Institution Compact Responsibility
4. Increase the **four- and six-year graduation rates** of students overall and specifically important target populations.	o Increase the graduation rates of first-time, degree-seeking freshmen to 30% and 60% respectively. o Increase the graduation rates of low-income first-time, degree-seeking freshmen to 20% and 40% respectively. o Increase the graduation rates of first-time degree-seeking freshmen from under-represented racial/ethnic minority groups to 20% and 40% respectively. o Increase the graduation rates of returning adult degree-seeking students to 48% and 58% respectively. o Increase the graduation rates of degree-seeking transfer students to 48% and 58% respectively.	**Initially:** Set campus target on each metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. This strategy must include activities that address at least one of the target populations (low-income, underrepresented minority, returning adult, and transfer students). **Annually:** Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategies including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
5. As an extension of academic program review, systemwide **assurance that academic programs prepare students to be knowledgeable and competent** in their chosen disciplines and also to be proficient in quantitative literacy, critical thinking, problem-solving, and communications skills.	NA	**Initially:** Develop a comprehensive plan (as described in section IV of this document) to assure that all graduates are knowledgeable and competent in their content discipline and also proficient in quantitative literacy, critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication skills. **Annually:** Report on the progress of the components of plan including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on the assessment.
6. Systemwide implementation of **efforts to improve the outcomes of students enrolled in graduate programs** and assessment to monitor these efforts	NA	**Initially:** Institutions with graduate programs will develop and provide a strategy to improve the outcomes of students enrolled in these programs along with how the success of these activities will be assessed. **Annually:** Institutions will report on the progress of the strategy including implementation, outcomes of assessment, and actions to be taken based on that assessment. Initiatives may include efforts to improve licensure pass rates, strategies for supporting students in the timely completion of their degrees, initiatives to decrease student debt loads, or other institutional efforts to improve student success.
7. Enhance the contribution of **faculty scholarship**	NA	**Initially:** Develop and provide 1 strategy, consistent with institution mission, to promote and support faculty scholarship. The strategy must incorporate collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. **Annually:** Report on the progress of the strategy including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.

IMPACT

In the focal area of impact, the five objectives contribute to the goal of increasing the impact that public colleges and universities have on West Virginia through production of qualified graduates ready to contribute to the workforce and the community, provision of needed services, and research and development that promote knowledge production and economic growth. Three objectives have system metrics for which campuses will develop institutional targets and strategies and two objectives involve comprehensive plans. The area of research and development is required of Marshall University and West Virginia University is an optional reporting element for other institutions.

Table 3. Impact Goal, Objectives, Metrics, and Institutional Compact Responsibility
Goal: Increase the impact that public colleges and universities have on West Virginia through production of qualified graduates ready to contribute to the workforce and the community, provision of needed services, and research and development that promote knowledge production and economic growth.

System Objectives	System Metrics	Institution Compact Responsibility
1. Increase the number of **degrees awarded annually at the undergraduate and graduate levels** overall and in needed areas.	○ Increase the number of degrees awarded to 15,500. ○ Increase the number of degrees awarded in STEM fields to 3,750. ○ Track the production of degrees awarded in STEM education and increase the number of these degrees over the master plan cycle. ○ Increase the number of degrees awarded in Health to 2,000.	**Initially:** Set campus target on each metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. The strategy must include an activity that addresses one of the target degree areas of STEM, STEM Education, or Health. **Annually:** Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategy including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
2. Systemwide address of regional economic needs through developing and **promoting pathways to careers in West Virginia** for students and recent graduates.	NA	**Initially:** Develop and submit a comprehensive plan developing and promoting pathways to careers in West Virginia as described in Section IV of this document. **Annually:** Report on the progress of the plan including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
3. Systemwide engagement with external organizations (government, business, non-profit) to **solve critical regional civic and/or social issues.**	NA	**Initially:** Develop and submit the comprehensive plan to solve critical regional civic and social issues as described in Section IV of this document. **Annually:** Report on the progress of the plan including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.
4. Reduce the number and percent of students excessively burdened by **student loan debt.**	Decrease the system average **federal student loan cohort default rate** to 9.0 percent.	**Initially:** Set campus target on each metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment. **Annually:**Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategy including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.

Table 3. Impact Goal, Objectives, Metrics, and Institutional Compact Responsibility (Continued).

System Objectives	System Metrics	Institution Compact Responsibility
5. **Increase research and development activities** which contribute to West Virginia's economic growth (Required for Marshall University and West Virginia University, optional for all other institutions).	o Increase annual external research and development funds to $200 million. o Increase annual licensure income to $170,000. o From 2013 to 2018, a total of 30 patents issued. o From 2013 to 2018, a total of 20 start-up companies based on university technology. o Track the number of articles that faculty members publish in peer-reviewed journals and increase the number of these publications over the master planning cycle.	**Initially:** Set campus target on each metric and explain the rationale for the target. Prepare 1 campus strategy to foster improvement in the objective, incorporating collaboration, fiscal responsibility and assessment. **Annually:** Submit quantitative data on metric progress and an explanation for that progress. Report on the progress of the strategies including implementation and outcomes of assessment and actions to be taken based on that assessment.

II. QUANTITATIVE OBJECTIVES: SETTING TARGETS AND REPORTING DATA

Each focal area of the master plan has objectives for which numerical metrics have already been selected for the system because they apply to all institutions. System targets on these metrics for the master planning period were developed from preliminary institutional targets set in the fall of 2012 with some adjusting upward due to system needs and the belief that Commission efforts will enhance institution efforts. Now institutions will be asked to work with Commission staff to formally set their targets for the five-year master planning cycle in the fall of 2013. It is expected that campuses will engage in a thoughtful and inclusive process to examine historical data supplied by the Commission to set challenging but reasonable targets on each metric. Almost all elements will be provided from Commission data derived from institution submissions. The exceptions are: enrollment of low-income students, degrees awarded in STEM education, the research and development metrics (for campuses reporting on research and development), and the student loan cohort default rate, which will be collected from the federal government. Institutions will also provide rationales for each target. Once approved by the Commission, these targets may only be revised or altered up until the fall 2015 Compact update. In years 2014-15 to 2018-19, campuses will report in their Compact on their progress toward the established targets and provide brief narratives for each metric on the reasons for the year's progress. In the late summer of each year, the Commission will send institutions spreadsheets of their most recent data for validation and to utilize in the drafting of their Compact update. In the Compact update submissions, the quantitative data will be reported in the focal area under which it falls. The table below provides the quantitative data categories and the year or cohort of data that institutions will report on in the first data submission in fall of 2014.

Table 4. Quantitative Metrics: Reporting Year and Data Year Alignment

Focal Area	Metric Category	Example Reporting Year	Actual Data Year*
ACCESS			
	Enrollment	Fall 2014	Academic Year 2013-2014
SUCCESS			
	Developmental Education Outcomes	Fall 2014	Fall 2012 Cohort
	Retention	Fall 2014	Fall 2012 Cohort
	Progress Toward Degree	Fall 2014	Fall 2012 Cohort
	Four-Year Graduation Rate	Fall 2014	Fall 2010 Cohort
	Six-Year Graduation Rate	Fall 2014	Fall 2008 Cohort
IMPACT			
	Degrees Awarded	Fall 2014	Academic Year 2013-2014
	Research and Development	Fall 2014	Fiscal Year 2014
	Federal Student Loan Cohort Default Rate	Fall 2014	2010 Repayment Cohort

*Actual data year varies by availability and the nature of the measure.

Metric Definitions

Unless noted, all data are from Commission data submitted by institutions. All enrollment refers to students enrolled in courses for credit.

ACCESS

Headcount enrollment: Fall end-of-term credit headcount enrollment.

Annualized FTE enrollment: Sum of Summer, Fall, and Spring end-of-term FTE divided by 2. FTE for each term is derived by dividing the total amount of instructional activity by 15 for undergraduates and 12 for graduates.

First-time freshman headcount enrollment: Fall end-of-term credit headcount enrollment of students designated as first-time freshmen in registration type on the student file.

Low-income student headcount enrollment: Fall end-of-term credit headcount enrollment designated as having received a Pell Grant during that academic year at that institution. *This data element will be provided directly from institutions due to the timing of the financial aid file submission.*

Underrepresented minority student headcount enrollment: Fall end-of-term credit headcount enrollment designated in the student file as being from one of the following racial/ethnic minority groups: Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or multi-racial. Nonresident aliens are to be excluded. For years prior to the new IPEDS race/ethnicity categories, the Asian and Pacific Islander category is not included.

Adult undergraduate headcount enrollment: Fall end-of-term credit headcount enrollment with birth year on the student file indicating the student is 25 years of age or older. Year of birth is subtracted from year of enrollment.

SUCCESS

First-time freshmen passing developmental education courses: Out of the number of fall end-of-term first-time freshmen who enroll in developmental education courses at any public institution in math (CIP=320104) or English/writing (CIP= 320108, 320191, or 320192) in their first two years of school, the proportion who within those two years eventually pass each of the courses taken in that developmental subject area. The end of the two year period is in spring of the second year.

First-time freshmen students passing college-level course in subject requiring developmental coursework: Out of the number of fall end-of-term first-time freshmen who enroll in developmental education courses at any public institution in their first two years, the proportion who pass a college-level course in that same subject area (math CIP= 270000 thru 279999 and English/writing CIP = 230000 thru 239999) within two years. The end of the two year period occurs in spring of the second year.

First-year retention rate of full-time first-time, degree-seeking freshmen: Out of the number of first-time, degree-seeking students enrolled for 12 or more credit hours according to fall end-of-term data, the proportion who are enrolled the following fall at any public institution according to fall, end-of-term data.

First-year retention rate of part-time first-time, degree-seeking freshmen: Out of the number of first-time, degree-seeking students enrolled for 11 or fewer credit hours according to fall end-of-term data, the proportion who are enrolled the following fall at any public institution according to fall, end-of-term data.

First-year retention rate of first-time, degree-seeking low-income freshmen: Out of the number of first-time, degree-seeking students according to fall end-of-term data who received a Pell Grant at that institution that year, the proportion who are enrolled the following fall at any public institution according to fall, end-of-term data.

First-year retention rate of first-time, degree-seeking freshmen from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups: Out of the number of first-time, degree-seeking students classified as being of Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or multi-racial background (but not nonresident alien) according to fall end-of-term data, the proportion who are enrolled the following fall at any public institution according to fall, end-of-term data.

Retention of returning adult students: Out of the number of degree-seeking students age 25 and older who are coded as registration types readmitted or transfer in fall end-of-term data, the proportion who are enrolled the following fall at any public institution according to fall, end-of-term data. Students who complete any credential prior to the next fall, but are not enrolled the next fall, are counted as a success.

Retention of transfer students: Out of the number of degree-seeking students coded as registration type transfer in fall end-of-term data, the proportion who are enrolled the following fall at any public institution according to fall, end-of-term data. Students who complete any credential prior to the next fall, but are not enrolled the next fall, are counted as a success.

Freshmen earning 30 or more credit hours: Out of the number of first-time, degree-seeking freshmen according to fall end-of-term data, the proportion who earn 30 or more credit hours by the end of the following summer at any public institution. Developmental education hours are included.

Four- and six-year bachelor's degree graduation rates of first-time freshmen: Out of the number of first-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen according to fall end-of-term data, the proportion who complete a bachelor's degree at any public institution by the spring of the fourth and sixth years since matriculation.

Four- and six-year bachelor's degree graduation rates of low-income first-time freshmen: Out of the number of first-time, bachelor's degree-seeking freshmen according to fall end-of-term data who received a Pell Grant at that institution their first year, the proportion who complete a bachelor's degree at any public institution by the spring of the fourth and sixth years since matriculation.

Four- and six-year bachelor's degree graduation rates of first-time freshmen from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups: Out of the number of first-time, bachelor's degree-seeking students classified as being of Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or multi-racial background (but not nonresident alien) according to fall end-of-term data, the proportion who complete a bachelor's degree at any public institution by the spring of the fourth and sixth years since matriculation.

Four- and six-year bachelor's degree graduation rates of returning adult students: Out of the number of bachelor's degree-seeking students age 25 and older that are coded as registration types readmitted or transfer in fall end-of-term data, the proportion who complete a bachelor's degree at any public institution by the spring of the fourth and sixth years since enrollment as a returning adult student.

Four- and six-year bachelor's degree graduation rates of transfer students: Out of the number of bachelor's degree-seeking students coded as registration type transfer in fall end-of-term data, the proportion who complete a bachelor's degree at any public institution by the spring of the fourth and sixth years since enrollment as a transfer student.

IMPACT

Degree production: The number of degrees produced during the academic year at the associate's, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels.

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) degree production: The number of degrees produced during the academic year at the associate's, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels in National Science Foundation designated STEM fields (those categorized as STEM categories 1, 2, and 4 in the HEPC degree inventory: **https://www.wvhepc.org/resources/degree%20inventory%20update/deginvframe.html**).

Health field degree production: The number of degrees produced during the academic year at the associate's, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels in programs with CIP code beginning with 51.

STEM education degree production: The number of education degrees produced during the academic year with specializations in science, technology, or mathematics education *according to institution data*. A graduate specializing in multiple STEM areas is to be counted once.

Federal student loan cohort default rates: The percentage of a school's borrowers who enter repayment on certain Federal Family Education Loans (FFELs) and/or William D. Ford Federal Direct Loans (Direct Loans) during a fiscal year and default (or meet the other specified condition) within the three-year period. *This data will be pulled from the federal Office of Student Financial Aid Programs website*: **http://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/cdr.html**.

External research and development funds: The total amount of externally sponsored academic research grants and contracts underway during an academic year *according to institution data*. This figure includes both direct and indirect costs as indicated on the grant contract or budget.
Patents issued: The number of US patents issued during the fiscal year *according to institution data*.
Licensure income: The total amount of money derived from licensed royalty and associated income for intellectual property developed by faculty at the institution licensed to publicly or privately traded businesses or industry during the fiscal year *according to institution data*.
Start-up companies based on university technology: The number of start up companies established during the fiscal year based on intellectual property developed at the institution *according to institution data*.
Articles published by faculty in peer-reviewed journals: The number of articles published in any peer-reviewed journal during the year measured from July 1 to June 30 *according to institution data*.

III. IDENTIFYING STRATEGIES AND UPDATING PROGRESS

During the initial year of the Compact reporting process (2013-14), institutions will develop strategies to support progress on each of the quantitative metrics within the master plan:

- Enrollment,
- Developmental Education,
- First-Year Retention Rate,
- Progress toward Degree,
- Graduation Rate,
- Degrees Awarded,
- Federal Student Loan Default Rate, and
- Research and Development (for institutions reporting in this area).

Institutions will also develop additional strategies in the following two areas:
- Graduate Student Success (for institutions with graduate programs), and
- Faculty Scholarship.

A strategy is an organized campus approach to an objective that includes multiple activities to coherently address the challenge and engages numerous units on campus in development and implementation. An example of such a strategy for graduation might be a focus on improved advising related to selection of a major and progress toward program completion. The importance of such a strategy lies with the benefits that the student receives through content area related support, assistance toward completion, and guidance into a career. Activities within that strategy might include early major advising, a distinct college for undeclared majors, and focused training for academic advisors.

Strategies will be identified for the duration of the master plan cycle. While it is expected that adjustments will be made in response to assessment activities, the overall approach is to be consistent for the five-year period. Strategies do not have to be entirely new efforts; considerable efforts are already underway on campuses in many of these areas. What is new is institutions deliberately tying their efforts to a system master plan objective, articulating to the Commission what outcomes the strategy will achieve and through what activities, and developing a means of assessment to guide refinement.

These strategies must address the issues of collaboration, fiscal responsibility, and assessment and should be strategies that incorporate a campuswide approach as they are being implemented.

Institutions will submit their identified strategies to the Commission in the fall of 2014 and must address the following questions in relation to each strategy developed:
- What internal and external entities will collaborate to implement the strategy?
- How are resources (human, physical, time) being deployed in a targeted and responsible way to achieve the intended means?
- What are the intended outcomes of the strategy and how will the implementation and the outcomes of the strategy be assessed to shape future efforts in the strategy?

In subsequent years (2015 through 2018), institutions will report on the implementation of activities in support of each strategy, how collaboration was incorporated, what resources were employed, and the success of the activities based on assessment. Institutions will also report how future activities will be adjusted moving forward.

IV COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

In addition to the quantitative data and strategies discussed in the previous two sections, institutions are required to develop five comprehensive plans, two in the area of access, one in the area of success, and two in the area of impact. Comprehensive plans are utilized for objectives in which the Commission has identified system wide need, but is providing institutions latitude to approach the challenge in a manner befitting their unique context and mission. Consistent with the Compact reporting model, institutions through their plans will define specific objectives, develop strategies to meet those objectives, and assess the effectiveness of their efforts.

Value of Comprehensive Plans

Comprehensive plans provide institutions an opportunity to identify how they want to address a broad system objective and to develop a cogent, sustained effort in this area. Comprehensive plans are broad initiatives that are comprised of several interrelated strategies designed to meet the identified objectives in the focal area. Successful implementation will require coordination and marshalling of institution and community resources. The focus of the comprehensive plan extends throughout the duration of the master planning five-year cycle. Although assessment may lead to plan adjustments and improvements, the overall objective and approach will be maintained and hopefully contribute to the institution's success. Comprehensive plans do not have to be completely new campus initiatives; they may grow out of and further develop existing efforts.

Given the multifaceted and complex nature of the planning areas, these efforts should involve collaboration among multiple offices and departments within the institution and beyond, not just those directly associated with the area in question, for example, the financial aid comprehensive plan should include other stakeholders such as academic advisors, student services, faculty, and secondary school personnel. Also, in keeping with the mutually reinforcing nature of access, success, and impact, it is expected that the comprehensive plans and efforts developed in each of these areas will inform and support one another.

Individual Planning Areas

The following comprehensive plan parameters provide focus and guidance for institutional leadership as to the purpose of each plan. It is strongly encouraged that institutions not only focus on the significance of each individual comprehensive plan, but also their value as a collective whole. The Commission will provide additional assistance and resources to support the planning and implementation process.

- **Collaborative Access Effort Comprehensive Plan.** This plan should incorporate best practices such as: early intervention, family involvement, education in the benefits of attending college, provision of information about college going, financial aid assistance and literacy, academic preparation and promotion of college readiness, and application assistance. The plan should articulate goals aligned with the institution's mission, the institution's strategies to meet those goals, and how the institution will assess the success of those strategies to progress toward its goals.

- **Financial Aid Comprehensive Plan.** This plan should guide institution level financial aid allocation, administration, and outreach and report on the success and outcomes of this plan. The plan should articulate goals which align with the institution's mission and this master plan; the institution's strategies in aid allocation, administration and outreach to reach those goals; and how the institution will assess the success of those strategies to progress toward the goals.

- **Academic Quality Comprehensive Plan.** This plan will provide how the institution will assure that all graduates are knowledgeable and competent in their content discipline and proficient in the use of quantitative literacy, critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication skills. The plan should articulate goals which align with the institution's mission and this master plan, the institutions strategies to meet those goals, and how the institution will assess the success of those strategies to progress toward its goals.
- **Career Pathways Comprehensive Plan.** This plan will direct how institutions will address regional economic needs through developing and promoting pathways to careers in West Virginia. It will include both:
  (1) developing formal partnerships with businesses, non-profit organizations, and other employers; and
  (2) enhancing institutional career readiness programs for students (internships, co-operative arrangements, career counseling, job placement programs, etc.). The plan should articulate goals aligned with the institution's mission, the institution's strategies to meet those goals, and how the institution will assess the success of those strategies.
- **Critical Regional Issues Comprehensive Plan.** This plan will focus on how the institution and its students are engaging with external organizations (government, business, non-profit) to identify and solve critical regional civic and/or social issues. The plan should articulate goals aligned with the institution's mission, the institution's strategies to meet those goals, and how the institution will assess the success of those strategies.

Comprehensive Plan Process

In order to take advantage of this opportunity, institutions are strongly encouraged to engage in an in-depth process of review and planning. Institutions should engage a range of internal and external stakeholders, who can provide valuable insight and resources, to contribute to the comprehensive plans' creation and implementation. Such a process requires institutional leaders to develop a holistic vision for student success that extends beyond the individual focal areas of the master plan and the organizational structure of their institution.

1. Identifying Objectives
   a. **Research and Input.** Assemble all related campus and community stakeholders to review information regarding institution successes and challenges in the plan area.
   b. **Focus.** Identify the focus of the comprehensive plan that fits within the master plan parameters and the mission and goals of the institution.
   c. **Outcomes.** Outline desired comprehensive plan outcomes for the campus.

2. Developing Strategies
   a. **Identify strategies.** Develop a coordinated set of mutually reinforcing strategies to achieve the objective. It is expected that some strategies will be unique but some may also be incorporated into other areas of the master plan.
   b. **Longitudinal Vision.** Create a timeline for implementation of all strategies.
   c. **Support**. Identify institutional resources (fiscal, human, facilities, etc.) which will be needed to implement each strategy.
   d. **Connect.** Collaborate across different comprehensive planning areas to ensure a synthesis of efforts and resources.

3. Assessing Progress
   a. **Develop Measures**. Assessment questions should be developed in parallel with strategies that monitor the implementation of the plan as well as its outcomes.
   b. **Resources.** Guide assessment efforts with resources such as the master plan and Compact documents, internal institutional research, and focal area best practices.
   c. **Feedback.** Seek critique from multiple stakeholders, including those working on comprehensive plans in other focal areas.
   d. **Adapt.** Utilize findings to strengthen or alter plan areas of concern.
   e. **Report.** Progress will be reported as part of the Compact process to the Commission, but should also be disseminated to stakeholders.

Comprehensive Plan Compact Reporting

Initial Compact reporting will consist of the plan itself and information about how it was developed. Institutions will be responsible for the following in year one (2014) of the Compact process:

1. Objectives
   a. Explanation of plan focus
   b. Discussion of planning process
      i. Participants, evidence the process was inclusive and collaborative
      ii. Summary of research and information utilized in identifying the focus
   c. Outcomes associated with plan

2. Strategies
   a. Explanation of each strategy
   b. Timeline
   c. Identification of resources to support the plan
   d. Articulation of how strategies will be implemented in a collaborative fashion and that the strategies in different comprehensive planning areas inform one another

3. Assessment
   a. Explanation of the means of assessment to be employed for each strategy
   b. Explanation of the plan to utilize assessment results to guide future efforts

In later years of the Compact, reporting will shift to focus on plan progress. Institutions will be responsible for reporting the following during years two through five (2015-2018) of the Compact process:

1. Strategies
   a. Progress on implementation of strategies
   b. Update on resource management
   c. Collaboration with stakeholders
   d. Connections with other master plan focal areas

2. Assessment
   a. Strategy outcomes
   b. Informing stakeholders of progress

3. Future Direction
   a. Any future alterations to comprehensive plan strategies
   b. Any future alterations to comprehensive plan process

CONCLUSION

The new master plan, Leading the Way, and its attendant Compact process, represent an evolution in both strategy and method. They have been thoughtfully designed to address the system's challenges, while building on the strengths of our diverse family of institutions. The new master plan is the result of institutional and public postsecondary stakeholder feedback and seeks to balance reporting consistent with Commission-based metrics on some objectives with opportunities for institutions to exercise autonomy and individuality in the development of unique plans to address others. The Compact also responds to concerns over academic quality by asking institutions to provide evidence that all graduates have achieved learning outcomes. Beyond annual reports, Leading the Way represents a renewed commitment on behalf of the Commission to coordinate, develop, and promote research and best practices that will inform the creation and implementation of institutional strategies and plans. Just as the master plan seeks to foster a reinforcing cycle of improvements in access, success, and impact, the Compact sets forth a consistent model of objectives, strategies, and assessment to drive those improvements. The Compact charges institutions with planning, acting, and evaluating to meet the state's goals. Through earnest attention and inclusive efforts, the Commission is confident that institutions will find both value and success throughout the Compact process.

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission
1018 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Suite 700
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

www.hepc.wvnet.edu