



Double the Numbers: A Jobs for the Future Initiative

By the Numbers:
***State Goals for Increasing
Postsecondary Attainment***

By Michael Collins

February 2006

About Double the Numbers

By the Numbers is one of a series of *Double the Numbers* publications from Jobs for the Future. *Double the Numbers*, a JFF initiative, is designed to deepen support for state and federal policies that can dramatically increase the number of low-income young people who enter and complete postsecondary education. The initiative identifies, assesses, and promotes new and promising approaches to increasing efficiencies and reducing inequities in secondary and postsecondary education attainment. *Double the Numbers* publications address controversial policy debates. They propose creative ways to break through existing barriers to improved educational and economic outcomes, particularly for students from groups traditionally underrepresented in higher education. *Double the Numbers* is supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Ford Foundation.



By the Numbers:

State Goals for Increasing Postsecondary Attainment

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
I. Setting State Goals: Which States Have Numerical Goals? What Are the Most Common Goals?	2
II. Rationales for State Goals: What Drives State Goals for Postsecondary Access and Success?	4
III. Measuring Progress: How Do States Track and Report Progress?	6
IV. Public Outreach Campaigns: How Are States Publicizing their Goals and Plans?	8
V. Two Comprehensive Approaches: Texas and Kentucky	9
VI. Recommendations	12
Appendix: Setting Numerical Goals for High Education: A 50-State Review of Plans and Initiatives	15

Tables

Table 1. Statewide Numerical Goals for Higher Education	3
Table 2. Examples of Rationales for Participation Goals for States with Numerical Goals	5
Table 3. Examples of Rationales for Graduation Goals for States with Numerical Goals	6
Table 4. How Oregon Measures Progress	8
Table 5. Texas's Progress Toward 2005 Participation Targets	10

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Elizabeth Dubinsky for lending a skillful hand with the research in its earliest stages while juggling weighty obligations of finishing her Master's degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Education, planning a wedding, and moving out of state. I would like to thank my colleagues at JFF for their support and patience throughout the process. I owe a special thanks to Richard Kazis, who continually cleared the "brush," which allowed me to see the bricks in the road, and to Nancy Hoffman and Michael Webb for their thoughtful advice and encouragement, which accompanied me through the journey. I can't thank Eliot Yaffa enough for his "just in time" offers to help with research and fact checking. Finally, I'd like to acknowledge Don W. Brown, former Texas Commissioner of Higher Education, for his vision and unwavering commitment to closing achievement gaps. His thoughtful approach to higher education, particularly his ability to galvanize a state as large and diverse as Texas around a grand vision of equity, deeply affects my thinking about education policy. While I appreciate the help and support of all of the above, any lapses and errors in "getting it right" are my own.

By the Numbers:

State Goals for Increasing Postsecondary Attainment

Executive Summary

Many states have begun to seek ways to drive improvements in higher education outcomes and productivity as a result of both budgetary constraints and the pressures of global competition. State policymakers—and the public—want to know what benefits their educational investment is yielding: Are more students earning postsecondary credentials that allow them to support themselves and their families and contribute to economic growth?

By the Numbers addresses one important state-level approach to assessing—and increasing—the value of public higher education: the setting and publicizing of clear, numerical goals for expanding student access and success. In 2005, Jobs for the Future conducted a 50-state survey of state higher education plans to determine how many states have set numerical targets for enrollment and completion and how these goals are set, measured, and publicized to institutions, the public, and policymakers. This study asks: When it comes to improving the outcomes of their public higher education systems, do states know where they are trying to go and have they a plan for how and when they will get there?

By the Numbers assesses whether and how fully each state's higher education strategy documents and plans embrace goal-setting as an approach to improving college access and success. It also highlights efforts in two states, Texas and Kentucky, whose comprehensive strategies provide valuable lessons for other states.

During our research, which presents a snapshot of state goals and plans at a particular moment, we were impressed by how quickly the policy landscape is changing. Some of the data reported on here may already be out-of-date; however, we believe that the general picture, in terms of the extent to which states use goals, have rationales to justify their targets, measure progress, and publicize results is accurate and instructive. The goal is to help state policymakers think about how to proceed as they navigate this new terrain and try to set goals and develop accountability plans that drive significant change.

JFF's research assessed how states array themselves in relation to four distinct components of comprehensive state strategies for setting and monitoring progress toward higher education enrollment and completion goals.

1. Setting Goals: What States Have Numerical Goals? What Are the Most Common Goals?

Of the 50 state higher education plans JFF scanned, fewer than half specified measurable goals for increasing the proportion of their population with a postsecondary education, including specific benchmarks and a specific timeframe for achieving the goals. Fewer than half contain any numerical goals to increase higher education enrollment or success, whether for increasing enrollment in postsecondary education, improving the retention of postsecondary students, or increasing the number of postsecondary students who earn degrees.

Twenty states have set at least one goal for increasing total enrollments statewide, while ten have set a retention goal, and nineteen a graduation goal. Nine states have set goals for all three areas. Only a handful of states have established goals or targets that are disaggregated by race, income, or gender. Texas is perhaps the most impressive and elaborate of these.

2. Rationales: What Drives State Goals for Postsecondary Access and Success?

While some states have set explicit numerical goals to improve higher education outcomes, few provide explicit rationales in publicly available documents for how they arrived at these targets. While many states cite the general importance of strengthening economic competitiveness, the links between particular enrollment or graduation goals and economic development or other outcomes are typically left unexplained.

Eleven states provide a clear rationale for their numerical goal around enrollment increases, some of which benchmark against

other states and some against the performance of different population subgroups within the state. The most common rationale for statewide goals is meeting or exceeding the national average for the number of students enrolled and graduating from higher education.

3. Measuring Progress: How Do States Track and Report Progress?

If a state sets measurable goals for improved outcomes, it should also create a quick, easy way for the public to judge how well the state as a whole—and individual institutions—are progressing toward meeting those targets. JFF found 15 states with some form of performance monitoring mechanisms, including report cards, annual reports, and accountability systems. There is significant room for improving the alignment of data and reporting systems that are part of state higher education accountability systems and for making it easier to access and understand reporting on statewide enrollment, retention and/or completion goals as specified in higher education plans.

4. Public Outreach: How Are States Publicizing their Goals and Plans?

In an environment where many different priorities compete for public and policymaker attention, strategies that use measurable goals as a way to drive improvement in particular directions typically require some form of campaign to publicize the goals as a priority and to build public demand for success.

A number of states are creatively positioning and publicizing their targets and improvement plans. State public campaigns appear to cluster in two groupings: campaigns that frame the need for increasing the population’s college skills and credentials

as a “*public agenda*” for higher education; and consumer-focused campaigns that stimulate the demand for higher education through motivational *public awareness and media campaigns*.

Six of the states that have set numerical goals for student enrollment or success have launched explicit public campaigns to build support and momentum for their efforts. Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Texas have developed the most comprehensive public awareness strategies, each designed to assist the state in reaching the goals specified in their higher education plans.

Recommendations

By the Numbers concludes with recommendations to states on how to design and implement goal-setting efforts so they have a greater chance of success.

- Set a small number of realistic, but ambitious, goals—and then create a concise action plan delineating roles, responsibilities, and a timeline.
- Disaggregate goals by population subgroups to emphasize the importance of progress that is equitable.
- Relate goals logically and clearly to the problems the state wants to address.
- Inform the public of the status of statewide higher education goals, instead of reporting solely on goals set for individual institutions.
- Use public agenda and awareness campaigns to build and sustain both public and political will and to reach out to populations that are traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

Summary Table: Statewide Numerical Goals for Higher Education		
Statewide Numerical Goals	Number of States	States
ENROLLMENT States with at least one participation goal	20	AK, CO, FL, GA, IN, KY, LA, ME, MI, MO, NJ, NV, OR, PA, TN, TX, UT, VA, WV, WY
RETENTION States with at least one retention goal	10	AK, LA, MO, NJ, OR, PA, TX, TN, VA, WY
GRADUATION States with at least one graduation goal	19	AK, FL, GA, KY, LA, MI, MO, NC, NJ, NV, OK, OR, PA, TX, TN, VA, WA, WY, WV
ALL THREE GOALS States with enrollment, retention, and graduation goals	9	AK, MO, NJ, OR, PA, TX, TN, VA, WY

By the Numbers:

State Goals for Increasing Postsecondary Attainment

States play a significant role in public higher education, providing operating funds and student financial aid and exercising varying degrees of oversight and governance. In recent years, as the relationships between governments and institutions have changed in complex ways, the nature of state involvement in higher education has become an increasingly volatile focus of public policy.

At the same time, the combination of fiscal challenges at home and the growing demands of global competition in a knowledge-based economy is pushing many states to seek ways to improve higher education outcomes and productivity. State policymakers—and the public—want to know about results: Are more students earning postsecondary credentials that allow them to support themselves and their families and contribute to economic growth? Is the taxpayer investment in colleges and universities worth it compared to states' myriad other financial obligations?

In this environment, states seek policy strategies that can drive improvement in institutions that have traditionally championed their autonomy: community colleges, flagship research institutes, and entire postsecondary systems. Recalling reforms in K-12 public education, many state governments are moving toward more robust accountability systems that enable policymakers and the public to make informed decisions—based on transparent data on how well students learn—about higher education institutions and investments.

This brief addresses a relatively narrow but critical question for these nascent state efforts to determine the value of public higher education and find ways to increase that value: *Have states set numerical goals for higher education improvement—in terms of both enrollment and completion? In other words, in the drive to improve results from higher education, do states know where they are trying to go and when they might get there?*

As the saying goes, “What gets measured is what gets done.” Generic commitments to improve outcomes do not provide either a detailed enough road map or sufficient pressure for institutions to change their routines. If states are indeed serious about increasing the number of their citizens who make it to and through college, they would benefit from charting a clear course toward that future. As business gurus would suggest, states should set a small number of critical goals for their higher education institutions, determine whether progress is being made, and use the evidence to decide about resource allocations, rule changes, and other policies.

By the Numbers was prepared for *Double the Numbers*, JFF's national initiative to advance public policies that can significantly increase the number of young people who make it to and through college. This report takes a comprehensive look at whether and how fully each state is embracing goal-setting for improving college access and success as part of higher education accountability systems. Based on a 50-state review conducted in mid-2005, it analyzes the extent to which states are identifying and publicly embracing access and success goals for higher education. It also highlights efforts in two states, Texas and Kentucky, whose comprehensive strategies that provide valuable lessons for other states.

Our research assessed how states are arrayed in relation to four aspects of a comprehensive strategy for setting and monitoring progress toward higher education enrollment and completion goals:

- *Numerical goals with specific timeframes for improving access to and success in higher education.* Plans should focus on high-priority, measurable goals for increasing student enrollment, retention, and graduation. Goals should be disaggregated by population subgroups (e.g., first-gener-

By the Numbers takes a comprehensive look at whether and how fully each state is embracing goal-setting for improving college access and success as part of higher education accountability systems.

ation college goers, race, gender, income), some of which historically have had lower rates of academic achievement in postsecondary institutions.

- *A clear rationale underpinning the goals.* There should be a readily understandable rationale for each numerical goal. For example, the rationale for some states is to increase the percentage of adults with Bachelor's degrees, with the national average as the goal. These states might want to set goals not just for improving degree-completion rates but also for increasing enrollment and retention rates, two logical first steps.
- *A simple method for measuring and reporting progress toward the goals.* Plans should track progress toward each numerical goal and provide a quick, easy way for the public to judge how well individual institutions—and the state as a whole—are meeting overall goals.
- *A public awareness component that forcefully communicates a state's commitment to achieving the goals.* Plans should send a strong message to civic, business, and policy leaders, as well as to postsecondary institutions, that the improvement of higher education outcomes is a state priority. States that want to go further can take the case straight to the people, using a media-based public awareness campaign to motivate those who have not finished college to consider doing so.

As more states tackle the challenges of setting and pursuing concrete goals to increase the number of their citizens with college credentials, the policy field is changing rapidly. In the course of JFF's research, several states noted that they were about to issue new goals or that new data-collection systems were in the works. *By the Numbers* provides a snapshot of states at a particular moment. It is a

guide, not a definitive, comparative document. Its primary goal is to aid state policymakers at all stages of the goal-setting process as they navigate this new terrain. It lays out the landscape, showing how other states have tackled the same challenge.¹

I. Setting State Goals: Which States Have Numerical Goals? What Are the Most Common Goals?

A growing number of states has taken the first important step toward developing higher education plans that are designed to spur improvement. They have set measurable goals for increasing the proportion of their population with a postsecondary education, including specific benchmarks and specific timeframes for achieving the goals. Of the 50 state higher education plans we scanned (see *Appendix*), fewer than half contain any numerical goals to increase higher education enrollment or success, whether for:

- Increasing enrollment in postsecondary education;
- Improving the retention of postsecondary students; or
- Increasing the number of postsecondary students who graduate and earn degrees.

Most of the states that have set numerical goals target access: increasing the number of people who enroll in postsecondary education, which is a logical first step to improving subsequent outcomes. Almost as many states have set goals for how well students perform once they get there. Twenty state plans contain numerical goals to increase participation; ten have goals for retention; and nineteen to increase graduation or degree completion (see Table 1).

Ten of the states with numerical goals take a comprehensive approach, designing specific targets for getting students “in and through” higher education. Alaska, Louisiana, Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wyoming have statewide numerical goals for improving outcomes in all three key areas: enrollment, retention, and graduation.

States have taken a variety of approaches to the goal of increasing postsecondary participation (see “Enrollment” in Table 1). A number of states focus



Table 1: Statewide Numerical Goals for Higher Education

Statewide Numerical Goals	Number of States	States
ENROLLMENT States with at least one participation goal	20	AK, CO, FL, GA, IN, KY, LA, ME, MI, MO, NJ, NV, OR, PA, TN, TX, UT, VA, WV, WY
Increase minority participation	8	FL, LA, NV, OR, PA, TN, TX, UT
Close the gap in enrollment rates for different population groups	2	MO, TX
Increase the number of high school graduates who enroll in higher education right after graduation (or within a certain amount of time shortly thereafter)	7	AK, CO, FL, GA, KY, NV, OR
Increase the number of students in dual enrollment	4	KY, MI, OR, VA
Increase adult enrollment	3	MO, TN, WV
RETENTION States with at least one retention goal	10	AK, LA, MO, NJ, OR, PA, TX, TN, VA, WY
Increase minority retention rate	4	NJ, PA, TN, TX
GRADUATION States with at least one graduation goal	19	AK, FL, GA, KY, LA, MI, MO, NC, NJ, NV, OK, OR, PA, TX, TN, VA, WA, WY, WV
Increase graduation rate	11	AK, LA, MO, NV, NJ, OR, PA, TN, WA, WV, WY
Increase three-year graduation rate at community colleges	2	LA, NV
Increase four-year graduation rate for full-time undergraduates	2	NJ, PA
Increase the six-year Bachelor's graduation rate	6	AK, LA, NV, NJ, OR, PA
Increase minority graduation rate	4	NV, NJ, PA, TN
Increase the number or percentage of AA/vocational degrees	5	FL, GA, OK, TX, WA
Increase the number or percentage of students completing Bachelor's degrees	7	FL, KY, MI, OK, OR, TX, WA
Close gaps in degree attainment rates for different population groups	3	NC, NV, TX
Increase graduates in critical needs areas	5	AK, FL, LA, TX, WV
Increase the percentage of residents that earn postsecondary degrees	2	KY, MI
ALL THREE GOALS States with enrollment, retention, and graduation goals	10	AK, LA, MO, NJ, OR, PA, TX, TN, VA, WY

on increasing the number of people in the overall population attending postsecondary institutions, while others take a more targeted approach, looking at the participation of particular racial groups or students from different age groups.

While many states pursue multiple goals, others do not. Colorado, for example, has set a single goal to increase the number of recent high school graduates who enroll in higher education right after graduation or shortly thereafter. Utah has set one explicit goal: increasing minority participation.²

States taking a targeted approach set goals for specific population subgroups, and some look at the data based on student ages, ranging from recent

high school graduates to older adults. Eight states have goals to increase the number of students entering higher education right after high school graduation (or soon after): Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Nevada, Oregon, and Tennessee. Four states have goals to increase the number of dually enrolled students—those taking college courses while still in high school: Kentucky, Michigan, Oregon, and Virginia. Three states have set goals related to increasing adult participation in higher education: Missouri, Tennessee, and West Virginia.

Other states focus on specific underrepresented populations, hoping to increase, for example, the



JFF analyzed the rationales behind each state's goals to shed light on how seriously states approach goal-setting and how powerful the resulting goals are likely to be as a tool for educational—and, ultimately, economic—improvement.

participation of African-American and Latino students. Seven states have explicit goals to increase minority participation: Florida, Louisiana, Nevada, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah. Texas and Missouri have taken this a step further, setting as their ultimate goal not just an increase in minority participation but also the elimination of the participation gaps between students of color and students of the majority population.

While about two-fifths of the 50 states have set enrollment goals, just over one-fifth have set numerical goals for improving retention of students in postsecondary education (see “Retention” in Table 1). Retention goals typically target first-time, full-time freshman and the number who continue into their sophomore year. Some states continue the focus on keeping students in the system, setting goals for continuing to be enrolled into their junior years or persisting to graduation.

New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas have set specific numerical goals for increasing the retention rate of students of color. Missouri targets community college performance, with a specific goal to increase the percentage of students retained in two-year higher education institutions.

Nineteen states have set explicit numerical goals for degree completion or graduation (see “Graduation” in Table 1). These goals typically are expressed as seeking an increase in the number of degrees awarded or an increase in the percent of entering students who eventually graduate. Most states set goals targeting degree completion within a certain amount of time, usually 150 percent of the minimum time it takes to earn a degree (i.e., three years for an Associate's degree; six years for a Bachelor's degree). However, New Jersey and Pennsylvania

have set numerical goals to increase the percentage of full-time college students graduating in four years.

Few states disaggregate their graduation goals for particular populations. However, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee target specific increases in minority graduation rates. Three other states—North Carolina, Nevada, and Texas—have set numerical goals to close the gaps in degree attainment between students of color and white students. In addition, several states have set goals for increasing the number of students earning degrees related to critical employment needs, such as degrees in teaching, engineering, and technology.

II. Rationales for State Goals: What Drives State Goals for Postsecondary Access and Success?

While many states have set explicit numerical goals to improve higher education outcomes, it is not always clear what lies behind their targets. It is often difficult to understand from published documents whether there is a clear logic, or rationale, underpinning each specific goal. For example, does a state's plan specify the problem it hopes to solve if it meets its goals? Would meeting the goals move the state toward addressing the identified challenge? JFF analyzed the rationales behind each state's goals to shed light on how seriously states approach goal-setting and how powerful the resulting goals are likely to be as a tool for educational—and, ultimately, economic—improvement.

Of the states identified as having set numerical goals, few provide explicit rationales in publicly available documents for how they arrived at these targets. While many states cite the general importance of strengthening economic competitiveness, often the links between particular enrollment or graduation goals to economic development or other outcomes is simply assumed but not explained.

A few rationales dominate among states that do explain their reasons for choosing specific targets. Many states with participation goals, for example, cite the need to reach or exceed the national average for higher education participation (see Table

Table 2: Examples of Rationales for Participation Goals for States with Numerical Goals

Participation Goals	States	Goal/Rationale
College enrollment directly after high school	AK	National average rate
	FL	Meet projected labor force needs
	KY	Narrow gaps with top states
	NV	Median for the 15 states in the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
	OR	Capture the increases in the proportional representation among Oregon's high school graduate population and college-age population
	TN	Enhanced position in the knowledge economy
	WV	Raise state's per capita income to, or above, the national rate by 2020
Increase adult participation rate	MO	Comparable to state with highest participation rates
	TN	Enhanced position in the knowledge economy; reduce higher education gaps between Tennessee and Southern states
	WV	Improve education within each county; national average
Increase overall participation rate	IN	Exceed national participation rate
	MO	Comparable to state with highest participation rates
	OR	Capture the increases in the proportional representation among Oregon's high school graduate population and college-age population
	NV	National average for educational attainment
	TX	Close gaps between minority and majority populations within the state and gaps between Texas and other states
	WV	National average
Increase overall enrollment	VA	Top 10 percent nationally
Increase minority participation rate	NV	Parity with majority of Nevada population
	TN	Representative of proportion in total population; reduce gaps between state and other Southern states
	TX	Close gaps with majority population
	UT	Proportional representation

2). Some states reach higher: they set goals that would allow them to measure up to the highest-performing states. Others peg their goals to reducing gaps with other states within their geographic region. States that specify goals for different population subgroups often identify the ultimate target as closing gaps between students of color and the majority population.

Two states offer explicit rationales for their goals to improve retention. Tennessee cites the need to reduce gaps with other states, while Texas also cites the need to reduce gaps among subgroups within the state itself.

State rationales for improving graduation rates parallel those for participation goals. The most commonly cited rationales are meeting or exceeding national or regional averages or achieving the

performance levels of the leading states in the nation (see Table 3). Closing gaps between minority and majority populations are also cited.

Kentucky and Texas are two states that provide clear rationales for their targets, in part because their numerical goal-setting is embedded in broad strategic planning initiatives, especially in Kentucky.

Kentucky's *Public Agenda for Postsecondary Education*, for example, has set a goal of doubling the numbers of its residents who hold at least a Bachelor's degree. Planners based this figure on a calculation of how great an increase in degrees the state would need to bring Kentucky up to the national average by 2020. Using U.S. Census projections, analysts estimated that an additional 400,000 working-age Kentuckians would need to

Table 3: Examples of Rationales for Graduation Goals for States with Numerical Goals

Graduation Rate	States	Goal/Rationale
Increase six-year graduation rate for a Bachelor's degree	NV	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education median
Increase three-year graduation rate for an Associate's degree	NV	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education median
Increase minority graduation rate	NV	Meet or exceed majority population graduation rate
Increase overall graduation	VA	Top 10 percent in the nation
Degree Completion		
Associate's degree	FL	National average
	TX	Close gaps between minority and majority populations and between Texas and other states
Bachelor's degree	FL	National average
	KY	National average
	TX	Close gaps between minority and majority populations and between Texas and other states
	WA	Enrollments to reach degree goals based on current FTE/degree earned ratio multiplied by degree goals
Close gaps between minority and majority populations in Bachelor's degree attainment	NC	National average
	TX	Close gaps between minority and majority populations and between Texas and other states
Critical needs areas	AK	Meet high-demand labor needs
	TX	Meet high-demand labor needs

have a Bachelor's degree, or twice the then-current number. By attaching a timeframe to the goal of reaching the national average target, Kentucky provides a clear signal about the level of effort that will be required. Kentucky also links increased educational attainment to increased economic success, estimating that reaching the national average by 2020 will result in a cumulative increase in state revenue of \$5.3 billion. Texas, Oklahoma, and West Virginia advance similar rationales.

Texas's state higher education goals are part of a comprehensive plan to stem long-term economic and social losses. As the state grapples with rapid population growth and shifting demographics, it has set clear numerical goals for higher education access and success among different populations subgroups, particularly Hispanics and African Americans. Texas based the specific goals on projection's of demographic change and the projected impact of these shifts on state income and standard of living, absent an aggressive plan to increase higher education participation and success for all population groups.

In 2000, Texas determined that an additional 300,000 students over the 200,000 already expected to enroll would be needed to close attainment gaps and increase the state's probability of

future social and economic well-being. If participation and graduation rates were to remain low, the state demographer projected, the poverty rate would increase by 3 percent and average Texas household income would decline by \$3,000 in constant dollars by 2030, a multi-billion-dollar impact on the state as a whole. In an update, the state demographer revised the per-household decrease in income upward to \$6,558.

III. Measuring Progress: How Do States Track and Report Progress?

Just as important as a clear rationale for access and success targets is a transparent and easy way to determine progress toward those targets—and to assess whether states will be able to reach their overall goals by their self-imposed deadlines. Such information is crucial to decision-making about higher education budgets and other key policies. For a data-based system to operate smoothly, policymakers—and the public—must be able to assess progress toward publicly announced statewide higher education goals quickly and efficiently.

Of the states JFF identified that have set numerical targets for improving higher education outcomes, many have developed accompanying sys-

tems for measuring state and institutional progress. We found 15 states with varying monitoring mechanisms, ranging from report cards and accountability systems to performance measures, annual reports, and other methods.

While many states have developed monitoring systems to measure progress toward postsecondary access and success goals, few of these systems align effectively with specific enrollment, retention, or graduation goals as presented in state higher education plans. That is, a state may have a data-collection and accountability system that makes it possible to assess progress toward specified goals, but the specific state goals are not tracked explicitly or reported upon publicly. In some states, the goal-setting process and the system to measure progress were developed separately and later aligned as well as possible—but not always successfully. In others, comprehensive performance measuring systems monitor progress on a range of higher education goals, but these systems are not set up to report on progress toward the specific access or success targets in the state’s strategic plan for higher education.

Systems that states use to measure and monitor progress are rarely user-friendly. Most have not been established for public use or interface. Rather, they are designed as feedback and accountability mechanisms for higher education institutions themselves, many pages long, and without any direct reference to states’ higher education plans. Frequently, statewide numerical goals for enrollment and completion are buried within more comprehensive reports on all aspects of higher education. In these instances, determining the status of a particular statewide goal can be difficult and confusing, requiring considerable time and effort. In some cases, finding a state’s performance report is itself a challenge, requiring a search through multiple Web links on the Internet. (See “Measuring Progress Toward Goals” at right for the approaches to performance measurement in three states.)

A few states have created simple systems to measure and report on progress toward statewide higher education enrollment or graduation goals.

Oregon’s is perhaps the most user-friendly, reporting progress toward statewide postsecondary benchmarks in a way that an interested layperson

Measuring Progress Toward Goals in State Higher Education Plans

State goals and success indicators differ from state to state, and the methods of monitoring progress vary. Nevada, Tennessee, and West Virginia, among other states, have at least one statewide numerical goal that they track in some way.

Nevada

Nevada uses an annual accountability report to measure and report on its progress in achieving the statewide goals specified in its higher education master plan, *Building Nevada’s Future*. The annual report was established through a public accountability process by the University and Community College System, with input from the state’s colleges and universities.

The accountability system is designed to measure progress of the system as a whole, as opposed to individual institutions. Twelve performance measures frame the process of monitoring progress in relation to the master plan goals. Each performance measure specifies sub-indicators that are designed to accommodate the different types of institutions in the system.

Progress is reported through graphs, tables, and a concise summary. The document is easy to read and very accessible to the legislature, the higher education institutions themselves, and the public.

The accountability report is located on the system’s Web site (www.nevada.edu) under the Resources link to Nevada System of Higher Education Publications: <http://system.nevada.edu/News/Publicatio/index.htm>

Tennessee

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission publishes two annual reports for the General Assembly at the beginning of each legislative session: *The Condition of Higher Education in Tennessee* and the *Joint Report on Pre-Kindergarten through Higher Education in Tennessee* (with the state board of education). The reports provide an update on progress toward the state’s higher education goals. The *Joint Report* is an effort for the K-12 and higher education systems to work with each other. It doesn’t reflect the goals as they appear in the state’s higher education plan. There is an effort to combine the two reports and align them with the goals of the master plan.

Tennessee’s numerical goals for higher education improvement are categorized into a few broad program and policy areas: access and attainment; student performance and academic quality; seamless education; and strengthening P-16. Multiple goals are reported under each category. Included is information on how the goal is assessed, interim targets, baseline information, and progress status.

The reports are direct and use non-technical language, which may increase their accessibility to the public, while satisfying the level of detail that policymakers need. The reports are located under the Policy, Planning, and Research link on the commission’s Web site: www.state.tn.us/thec/index3.html.

West Virginia

West Virginia reports progress on its statewide goals through an annual higher education report card. The West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission is required to submit the report card to the Legislative Oversight Committee by January 1 of each year.

The report card contains simple tables and graphs and plain-language commentary on each of 53 educational outcomes. It measures progress toward the state’s higher education goals largely in the order they appear in the state’s compact, *It All Adds Up* (e.g., preparation, participation, affordability, competitive workforce, economic development). Multiple charts per measure may be appropriate for institutional and policy evaluators, but they can be a bit daunting for lay readers.

The report is on the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission’s Web site: www.hepc.wvnet.edu.

Table 4: How Oregon Measures Progress

Benchmark Number	Title	Is Oregon making progress?
23	High School Completion	Yes. About 90% have a high school education, but this has not improved since 1994.
24	Some College Completion	Yes. About 63% of Oregonians had completed some college in 2002, up from 53% in 1992.
25	Postsecondary Credentials	Unknown. (insufficient data) About 30% of Oregonians have professional-technical credentials.
26	College Completion	Yes. Oregonians with a college degree has increased since 1992.
26a.	Bachelor's	Yes. Oregonians with a Bachelor's degree climbed steadily from 25% in 1992 to 31% in 2002.
26b.	Advanced Degree	Yes. Oregonians with advance degrees increased from 7% in 1990 to nearly 12% in 2002.

Source: Oregon Progress Board 2003 Benchmark Performance Report

can understand. The Oregon Progress Board, an independent planning agency charged with monitoring the state's 20-year strategic vision *Oregon Shines*, reports on progress toward statewide benchmarks in a report, *Is Oregon Making Progress?* The 2003 report, for instance, clearly marks the section on postsecondary education. It succinctly lists six postsecondary benchmarks, alongside specific data points and a “yes” or “no” answer to the question “Is Oregon making progress?” (see Table 4). Thus, to find out whether the percentage of Oregonians who had completed some college education has risen in the past 10 years, look in the “Some College Completion” category: the answer is “yes.” Moreover, the specifics are listed right there: about 63 percent of Oregonians had completed some college in 2002, up from 53 percent in 1992.

IV. Public Outreach Campaigns: How Are States Publicizing their Goals and Plans?

As state fiscal challenges persist and the financial needs of higher education institutions and systems grow, it is becoming increasingly important for states to reach beyond traditional audiences to publicize and promote their postsecondary plans, priorities, and results. Annual progress reports and other ways to report results are critical, but galvanizing public support and political will at budget time requires more proactive strategies. In many states that set and monitor higher education improvement goals, the public and even policymakers may not know that goals have been set or that meeting them is a high priority. The message is more likely to get across if the state initiates a

public communications and marketing campaign to publicize the commitment to improvement and to stimulate demand for access to higher education in communities where participation is relatively low.

Convinced that business as usual will not be enough to meet ambitious statewide goals, a number of states are creatively positioning their plans as a top state priority. Our research identified two different emphases in state public campaigns:

- Framing the need for increasing the population's college skills and credentials as a “public agenda” for higher education—and bringing together diverse sectors of the community to shape that agenda; and
- Stimulating the demand for higher education by taking the case straight to the citizenry through public awareness and motivational campaigns using the media and advertising.

Public Agenda Campaigns

Higher education institutions and systems cannot mount these efforts on their own. States designing successful public agendas around higher education typically bring together legislators, the business community, K-12 educators, community-based organizations, and ordinary citizens, along with postsecondary leaders, to define needs, set goals, and monitor progress toward them.

Six of the states that have set numerical goals for student enrollment or success have launched explicit public campaigns to build support and momentum for their efforts. Public agendas in

Kentucky, Oregon, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia focus on the broad social benefits of reaching the educational goals.

Public Awareness Campaigns

Public awareness campaigns focus on the individual benefits that higher levels of education can bring to residents. Using marketing strategies, they take the form of TV, radio, and newspaper ads and urge people to go to college. The information is practical and geared toward potential students and those who influence them, such as parents, teachers, and mentors. These campaigns encourage students and parents to take specific steps: contact a guidance counselor, fill out financial aid forms, formally enroll in higher education, and so on. Georgia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas, all of which have set numerical targets for higher education access, have entered into this realm of communications.³

Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Texas have developed the most comprehensive public awareness strategies, each designed to assist the state in reaching the goals specified in their higher education plans. Oklahoma launched its public awareness campaign in support of its *Brain Gain 2010* plan in 1999. In 2000, Texas launched its public awareness campaign, *Education. Go Get It.*, and Kentucky launched *Go Higher*.⁴ A common theme across these efforts has been the danger of negative social and economic impacts if statewide goals are not met. Although access and success campaigns ultimately depend on the policies and support of states and higher education institutions, these public efforts send a strong signal about state priorities to both the public and key policymakers.

Creating a public agenda or public awareness campaign around higher education goals and outcomes accomplishes several objectives. First, states make themselves more accountable to the public for results. Second, these campaigns underscore the fact that the public has responsibilities, too. Third, ambitious campaigns help the public understand the level of private and public commitment and resources that will be needed to turn goals into plans that can achieve the desired results.



V. Two Comprehensive Approaches: Texas and Kentucky

There is no shortage of public statements about the importance of higher education to the economy. It is far less common, though, for states to develop comprehensive strategies for identifying where they think they should be in terms of postsecondary enrollment and completion, how they can get there, and how the public and policymakers will know if institutions and systems are making the kinds of improvements that are needed—and, increasingly, expected.

Among the states attempting to design and implement a clear strategy for improving higher education outcomes, Texas and Kentucky stand out for the comprehensiveness and creativity of their approaches. Both states are committed to a comprehensive, public policy approach to the challenge of increasing higher education attainment and outcomes.

Texas: Setting and Reporting Goals

Closing the Gaps by 2015, the Texas higher education plan, was created by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board as a comprehensive approach to setting and reporting goals to increase postsecondary attainment. *Closing the Gaps* includes the linked components of an effective strategy: it sets a few clear and easily measurable goals, which are disaggregated by race, and it specifies a timeline to meet the goals and interim targets. The rationale underpinning the goals is the state's population projections: the state must better educate its black and Hispanic population in order to preserve the state's standard of living

Public awareness campaigns encourage students and parents to take specific steps: contact a guidance counselor, fill out financial aid forms, formally enroll in higher education, and so on.

into the next decade. The plan includes a simple performance measurement system that reports progress toward the goals in a way that is easy to understand and is tied to the state's overall public higher education accountability system. Finally, the plan includes a higher education public awareness and motivational campaign to encourage Texans to consider college and to focus attention on reaching *Closing the Gaps* goals.

Goals

In 1999, Texas policymakers began the goal-setting process by commissioning a statewide higher education needs assessment and considering projected demographic changes. They decided that the state should strive to close higher education attainment gaps not only between Texas and other states but also within Texas itself—across regions, income levels, and racial and ethnic groups. Developed by a broad group of stakeholders, including community, business, and education leaders, the plan focuses on four goals deemed central to long-term economic competitiveness and social cohesion, with a target date of 2015 and interim targets set for 2005 and 2010. The first two goals relate directly to increasing higher education access and success:

Close the gaps in participation: By 2015, close the gaps in participation to add 500,000 more students.⁵ Toward that goal, Texas has set several interim targets, such as:

- By 2005, increase the overall Texas participation rate from 5 percent to 5.2 percent, an increase of 150,000 students.

- By 2010, increase the overall Texas higher education participation rate to 5.5 percent, an additional increase of 175,000 students.
- By 2015, increase the overall Texas higher education participation rate to 5.7 percent, an additional increase of 180,000 students.

These interim targets are further disaggregated by race.

Close the gaps in success: By 2015, increase by 50 percent the number of degrees, certificates, and other identifiable student successes from high-quality programs. Interim targets include:

- By 2005, increase the number of students receiving Bachelor's degrees, Associate's degrees, and certificates from 95,000 to 120,000.
- By 2010, increase the number of students receiving Bachelor's degrees, Associate's degrees, and certificates to 140,000.
- By 2015, increase the number of students receiving Bachelor's degrees, Associate's degrees, and certificates to 163,000.

These interim targets are further disaggregated by race.

Measuring Progress

Texas uses two methods to measure and report progress toward its higher education goals. One is notably user-friendly: simple charts in an annual report highlight how far the state has come toward meeting each interim target for increasing participation and success for each demographic group (see Table 5). The progress reports include straightforward analyses interpreting the charts.

Table 5: Texas's Progress Toward 2005 Participation Targets

Annual Enrollment (Public and Independent Institutions)	Fall 2000	Fall 2003	Increase from 2000-2003	Increase from 2000 to Reach 2005 Targets	Fall 2005 Target	Percent of Targeted Increase for 2005 Achieved
Total	1,019,879	1,176,937	157,058	149,121	1,169,000	105.3%
Black	108,463	132,211	23,748	23,537	132,000	100.9%
Hispanic	237,394	291,959	54,565	102,606	340,000	53.2%
White	570,042	626,201	56,159	20,958	591,000	268%

Source: *Closing the Gaps by 2015: 2004 Progress Report*

Progress toward the goals of *Closing the Gaps* is also reported in the state's higher education accountability system, which is organized around the plan's four goals. The data are illustrated in simple tables and bar charts that report progress in relation to 2005 targets.

Public Awareness Campaign

Texas created and funded a public awareness and motivational campaign to publicize the importance of higher education in the lives of its citizens.

Called *Education: Go Get It*, the campaign encourages Texans to go to college, trying to address not just the supply of higher education but also the demand for it, particularly among traditionally underrepresented population groups. The campaign provides practical information on the academic and financial requirements needed to do so. The campaign targets high school students and those who influence their decisions, and it seeks to persuade young people not just to consider college but to apply. The legislature provided \$5 million in seed money to launch the campaign. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board then spun off a non-profit foundation, College for Texans, to raise private funding to continue the effort. The campaign also focuses attention on the state's progress toward meeting the goals of *Closing the Gaps*.

Kentucky: A Bold and Creative Strategy

Kentucky has developed a collaborative, creative approach to setting goals for the state's public higher education system. Coming to grips with the need for a better-educated citizenry in a time of intensifying economic competition, the state's Council on Postsecondary Education invited education, business, community, and policy leaders to help devise a plan to raise the state's standard of living to the national average by 2020. Kentucky's approach is unique in that the state has intentionally reframed the higher education agenda from traditional competition between institutions to a shared agenda directed at meeting statewide needs. It is also unique in its focus on adults.

The council studied the strategies of other states and held a series of regional forums attended by a broad group of Kentuckians. The resulting public agenda was developed to spur a dramatic increase

in the number of citizens earning postsecondary degrees. It is simple and driven by state, rather than institutional, interests or logic. Five questions frame the public agenda and guide the efforts of all sectors of the higher education system:

- Are more Kentuckians ready for postsecondary education?
- Is Kentucky postsecondary education affordable for its citizens?
- Do more Kentuckians have certificates and degrees?
- Are college graduates prepared for life and work in Kentucky?
- Are Kentucky's people, communities, and economy benefiting?

In addition to focusing higher education on broad public goals, Kentucky has set specific, challenging, and measurable targets for its higher education system, developed a clear way to track progress, and designed a public awareness campaign to attract people to college.

Goals

To raise the state's standard of living to the national average by 2020, Kentucky's overall goal for public higher education is high: to double the number of citizens with at least a Bachelor's degree. This goal is explained this way in the state's "2020 Imperative," a long-range plan in the *Public Agenda for Postsecondary Education in Kentucky*: "According to an analysis of U.S. Census projections, Kentucky will need nearly 800,000 working-age adults with bachelor's degrees or higher to match the projected national average in 2020; in 2000 we had only 402,000. Over the next 15 years, we need to nearly double the number of Kentuckians ages 25-64 with at least a four-year degree."

Measuring Progress

Kentucky uses the five key questions framing its higher education plan to also frame how it measures progress toward its goals. Progress toward the 2020 national average for degree completion is reported in the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education's *Key Indicators of Progress toward Postsecondary Reform*. For example,

Kentucky's approach is unique in that the state has intentionally reframed the higher education agenda from traditional competition between institutions to a shared agenda directed at meeting statewide needs.



progress toward doubling the number of Bachelor's degrees is reported under question 3: "Do more Kentuckians have certificates and degrees?"

Public Awareness Campaign

In 2000, to help the state reach its ambitious goals, Kentucky launched an aggressive public awareness campaign, *Go Higher*. Using broadcast and print media, the statewide campaign seeks to attract under-educated adults between the ages of 18 and 49 into the education system. The campaign received \$4.25 million in funding from multiple sources for 2001 and 2002, but budget cuts eliminated funding for 2003 and 2004. The Council on Postsecondary Education has been trying to secure private funding to revive the campaign.

VI. Recommendations

JFF set out to assess how many states have moved beyond paying lip-service to the challenges of fiscal responsibility and global competitiveness to setting statewide goals for improved outcomes and productivity from the public higher education system. The glass is half full or half empty, depending upon your point of view. On the one hand, at least 20 states have established public targets for improved access or success. At the same time, far fewer states have built comprehensive campaigns that demonstrate a seriousness of purpose and commitment to these goals. Some states have established goals without specifying ways of measuring progress. Others have goals and measurement systems but do little to inform either the public or policymakers of progress—or of the implications of progress, or the lack thereof, for public investment and state policy.

We caution readers that there is little empirical evidence on the best approaches to setting and using numerical enrollment and completion targets or to integrating them effectively into state policy efforts to improve higher education outcomes. We simply do not know from experience what strategies consistently yield the outcomes that states want. However, we believe that common sense, analogies from business, and other change strategies provide useful guidance on how to design and implement these efforts so they have a greater chance of success.

Set a small number of realistic, but ambitious, goals—and then create a concise action plan delineating roles, responsibilities, and a timeline.

The most elegant and well-designed numerical goal or set of goals is like one hand clapping in the absence of several other components described above, particularly a system for measuring progress toward the goal, making that information public, and mounting a campaign that puts higher education access and success high on the public and policy agenda—and keeps it there so that institutions begin to take it seriously and change their practices.

Improvement goals that are carefully crafted expect change from institutions. In a time of naturally expanding population and demand for college, some numerical growth targets may be set too low. They may be achievable without any significant effort and change. At the same time, goals that are clearly unattainable can be hard to use motivationally: they are seen as cynical public relations, not serious policy. Always, the targets should be set as either increases in number or in proportion and must be measurable. Proportions or percentages tend to be a better approach: they are more immune to year-to-year demographic shifts.

Setting too many goals is a way to avoid emphasizing any. Compelling plans, like those in Texas and Kentucky, have a limited number of powerful goals toward which the state and its many departments, agencies, institutions, and systems are driving.

Disaggregate goals by population subgroups to emphasize the importance of progress that is equitable.

Many states set overall state goals for improvement. Yet the enrollment and attainment outcomes for different groups—racial, ethnic, gender, immigrant status, first-generation college-going status—may be quite different. State goals should, as in Texas, specify goals for different population groups, designed so that reaching goals would narrow attainment gaps across the state. While aggregate goals may be less politically contentious, they also do less to reveal where improvement in state and institutional efforts is most critical.

Relate goals logically and clearly to the problems the state wants to address.

Goals specify the direction to move in: where the state leaders want to get by when. If the state wants to shrink the attainment gap between different populations, then the goals should specify how much gap reduction, for which groups, and by what year. If the goal is to raise performance vis à vis states of comparable size and composition in the region or nationally, then the goals should be set accordingly. This implies that the rationale behind the goal-setting process is indeed important, more important than many states make it. Goals are likely to be more effective in promoting change if the rationale that drives goal-setting is clearly articulated, well-researched, and publicly declared.

Inform the public of the status of statewide higher education goals, instead of reporting solely on goals set for individual institutions.

Many state performance tracking reports are designed for institutional rather than public use. Consequently, the emphasis is on institutional performance. This is important: institutional leadership needs detailed data and information on outcomes to improve performance. However, long tables of slightly different numbers are not user-friendly to policymakers or members of the public who want to know: “Is the state headed in the right direction?” Policymakers and the public at large need tools for quickly assessing progress of the state as a whole, so they will be adequately informed when the time comes to make important decisions,

such as whether to fund additional student scholarships or vote for education-related borrowing.

Tie monitoring systems to state higher education plans, so that goals and measurements are closely aligned. Ideally, the two would be developed together. If that’s not possible, monitoring systems should be adapted to meet the public need for clear, transparent reporting systems.

Reports on progress should be easy to find and easy to use. Policymakers and private citizens should not have to call multiple agencies or search multiple Web sites to locate data. Nor should they have to pore over hundred-page documents to determine progress toward a particular goal. Put information on student outcomes front and center in reports. Any reader should be able to quickly assess whether the state is making adequate progress. Post results prominently on the state’s Web site and those of higher education institutions and systems. Cite these references frequently in state literature.

Use public agenda and awareness campaigns to build and sustain both public and political will and to reach out to populations that are traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

A public campaign to publicize the state’s goals and demonstrate its seriousness of purpose in trying to drive improved higher education outcomes is good government—and good politics. These efforts mobilize key sectors of the public, including opinion leaders and stakeholders in higher education from business, advocacy, and other groups. The investment in such efforts can pay off when progress is slower than hoped and when political changes in the state threaten continuity and long-term commitment.

If a state is serious about increasing access to higher education, its outreach campaign should target those groups whose enrollment rates are lower than the state average.

What Gets Measured Is What Gets Done

It would be overreaching to claim that embracing the four components of a goal-setting initiative—setting measurable goals for improvement, basing those goals on a clear strategic rationale, tracking

We believe that common sense, analogies from business, and other change strategies provide useful guidance on how to design and implement these efforts so they have a greater chance of success.

and reporting progress in transparent ways, and giving the effort public visibility—will necessarily lead to expanded access and greater success in higher education for a state’s residents. In the end, success depends upon a complex mix of changes in institutional practice, state supports for institutional change, improvements in the quality of K-12 as well as higher education systems, and the choices and decisions of individual consumers of higher education.

Some would argue that efforts like those described here need to be backed up with a system of performance bonuses or sanctions. This question deserves careful debate: the history of performance funding for higher education is not very encouraging. Rarely have states stayed with performance funding systems long enough for the incentives to drive significant behavioral change. As Kevin Dougherty and Esther Hong have noted, per-

formance accountability showed the potential to realize important public goals but had not yet had a significant impact, in part because relatively little funding was at stake.⁶ In a time of tight state budgets, the best way to go may be transparency, clear goals, and public competition among institutions.

There is little doubt, though, that states are unlikely to get where they want to go without a clear destination and a good map telling a state’s leaders and institutions where they are headed and letting them know when they are off course.

“What gets measured is what gets done”: an increasing number of states have recognized this and are finding their way toward strategies that can help them define the improvement in higher education enrollment, completion, and productivity they want to see for their investments of public resources.

Endnotes

¹ The data in this paper is based on a review of public documents and on phone calls with state officials at a single point in time: mid-2005. Several caveats are in order. First, undoubtedly, some of the information here quickly became dated. Second, any scan of this type oversimplifies: if a state higher education system has an accountability plan that includes numerical goals for improved student attainment in an appendix, is this evidence of a state plan driven by specific numerical goals? In addition, from the level of our scan, it is difficult to know if the goals are widely known or taken seriously as a guide to priority-setting. If a blue ribbon panel announces goals for a state, do the systems that govern postsecondary institutions take those goals to heart? Finally, system goals may not be statewide, and a strategic plan may not have the same effect as an accountability plan.

² States express specific participation goals in two different ways, with terms that are used interchangeably at times and can be confusing. A goal to increase “enrollment” usually refers to increasing the number of people enrolled at higher education institutions in a particular state. A goal to increase a state’s “participation rate” usually refers to increasing the percentage of a state’s population enrolled at higher education institutions; this would be calculated as the enrollment divided by the population. Regardless of the specific terminology or mathematical methodology, the broad goal remains the same: to increase the number of people entering and succeeding in postsecondary education.

³ Georgia’s goals are limited to technical and adult education.

⁴ The Southern Regional Education Board later created the *Go Alliance* modeled after the Texas campaign to assist other Southern states in launching their own public awareness campaigns.

⁵ This number has been adjusted upward by the state due to revised demographic projections.

⁶ In *State Systems of Performance Accountability for Community Colleges: Impacts and Lessons for Policymakers*, an issue brief prepared by JFF for Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count, Dougherty and Hong found that community colleges with performance accountability systems have changed their structure and operations in attempts to increase retention, graduation, and job placement rates. There was some evidence that these changes helped to improve student outcomes, but the extent of improvement was unclear. At the same time, they documented troubling unintended consequences, including a decline in academic standards and a tendency to limit enrollment to students with a high likelihood of success.

Appendix

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives*

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
ALABAMA						
State Plan for Alabama Higher Education 2003-04 to 2008-09	Alabama Commission on Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
ALASKA						
The University of Alaska System Strategic Plan 2009: Building Higher Education for Alaskans Golden Anniversary	Board of Regents University of Alaska	Enroll college-bound Alaskans at the national average rate	National average	none found	Performance Measure System	none found
University of Alaska Performance Measures 2005		<p>Within 3 years from fall 2003, capture 26 percent of Alaska's high school graduates who enroll in the University of Alaska and enroll 40 percent within 6 years (fall 2007)</p> <p>Over 3 years (from 2000), increase retention rate for Bachelor's degree-seeking first-time freshman to 71 percent</p> <p>Starting with the first-time freshman class beginning in 1999-2000, increase the 6-year graduation rates (by 2006) for Bachelor's degree-seeking first-time freshman to 30 percent</p> <p>Using FY00 as the base year, increase graduates by 5 percent over the next 2 years and 10 percent over the next 4 years in specified job areas (teacher education, health careers, process technology, transportation and logistics, information technology, and other high-demand job areas)</p>				
ARIZONA						
Changing Directions	Arizona Board of Regents	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	State Board of Directors for Community Colleges	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
ARKANSAS						
Arkansas State University System Administration Strategic Plan for 2003-2005	Arkansas State University System Administration	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	Arkansas Department of Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	University of Arkansas System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
CALIFORNIA						
Master Plan for Higher Education in California	Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Forthcoming January 2006	California Community Colleges	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
The Cornerstone Report	California State University System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Cites Master Plan for Higher Education	University of California System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
COLORADO						
Colorado Commission on Higher Education: Access to High-Quality, Affordable Education for All Coloradans	Colorado Commission on Higher Education	<p>Improved Access to Higher Education: "Colorado will have the nation's highest rate of Colorado's high school graduates enrolled in two-year or a four-year degree program regardless of income level or geographic location."</p> <p>(The new Department of Higher Education Performance Contracts may have goals, though these are not required. It would depend on agreements made with between an the institution and the Department of Higher Education.)</p>	none found	none found	Department of Higher Education Performance Contracts	none found

* This table only includes goals related to enrollment, retention, and graduation.

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
CONNECTICUT						
none found	Connecticut Department of Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Strategic Plan of the Connecticut State University System	Connecticut State University System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
University Strategic Plan	University of Connecticut	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
DELAWARE						
none found	Delaware Higher Education Commission	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	Delaware State University	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	Delaware Technical and Community College	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	University of Delaware	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
FLORIDA						
The Florida Community College System: A Strategic Plan for the Millennium 1998-2003 (A new strategic plan is pending approval of the state board of education.)	Florida State Board for Community Colleges	By 2010, increase h.s. graduates who enter postsecondary directly after high school to 75%	Meet projected labor force education requirements	Yes (State University System)	K-16 Accountability System	none found
		By 2010, 25% completion of AA/vocational degree within 10 years (2000-01 high school cohort)	none found			
		By 2010, 25% completion of B.A. or higher (2000-2001 high school cohort)	none found			
		Increase number of B.A. degrees granted per 100,000 18- to 44-year-old population	Meet 90% of average of top ten economically strong states			
State University System of Florida Strategic Plan June 9, 2005 (Draft)	Board of Governors	Access to and production of degrees 2012-2013 goals: Bachelor's: 57,638 Master's: 17,514 Professional: 2,167 Doctoral degrees in emerging technologies: 941-1317	The Commissioner's Higher Education Funding Advisory Council recommended that Florida seek the national averages for Bachelor's, Master's, and professional degrees are also based on national projections for 2012-2013. The emerging technologies doctoral targets are based on the ratio of research expenditures to emerging technology doctoral degrees awarded using 2001-2002 NSF research expenditures and NSF doctoral degrees for all disciplines except psychology, social sciences, and interdisciplinary.			
		Access/diversity: Minority representation in State University System graduates as percentage of expected representation: 100 percent	Ratio of the representation of minority state university system graduates to their representation in the state's 18- to 44-year old population. If minority graduates were as well represented as they are in the total population, it would be 100%, which is the 2012-13 target.			
		Meeting statewide professional and workforce needs 2012-2013 goals: 1. Education: 2,729 2. Health professions: 5,375 3. Mechanical science and manufacturing: 5,235 4. Natural science and technology: 5,544 6. Medical science and health care: 1,774 7. Computer science and information technology: 6,432 8. Design and construction: 1,136 9. Electronic and media simulation: 410	The goals are based on targeting Baccalaureate degree programs for Florida workforce enhancements, submitted to the Workforce Estimating Conference in 2001.			

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
GEORGIA						
University System of Georgia Reformulated Strategic Plan 2002-2007	Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia	none found	none found	none found	none found	Georgia Go
Department of Technical and Adult Education Strategic Plan FY 2002-FY2006 (FY2000 Update)	State Board of Technical and Adult Education	<p>Technical colleges will increase the number of students who enroll in, graduate from, and obtain employment related to technical college Technical Certificate of Credit, diploma, and Associate's degree programs annually from FY2002 through FY 2006.</p> <p>Technical colleges will increase the number of students who enroll in technical education programs during or immediately after completing their high school education or GED annually from FY 2002 to FY 2006</p> <p>Adult literacy service providers will reduce illiteracy and increase educational attainment in Georgia by increasing the number of students who achieve higher literacy skill levels or achieve GED annually from FY 2002 through FY 2006. Technical colleges will increase the number of developmental studies students who successfully transition into technical education by FY 2006.</p>	none found	none found	Agency level - program evaluation; federal project compliance; annual report; agency report card	The plan has an "Educational Awareness for Community Development" goal, which is being used to increase the market penetration of agency programs and services.
HAWAII						
University of Hawaii System Strategic Plan: Entering the University's Second Century 2002-2010	Hawaii Board of Regents	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
IDAHO						
Strategic Plan 2000-2005	State Board of Education/Board of Regents University of Idaho	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
University of Idaho: A Strategic Plan for the New Millennium		none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Idaho State University Strategic Plan 2002-2005		none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
ILLINOIS						
The Illinois Commitment: A Policy Framework for Illinois Higher Education	Illinois Board of Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	Annual performance report	none found
INDIANA						
Indiana's Framework for Policy and Planning Development in Higher Education	Indiana Commission on Higher Education	Increase participation to exceed national levels	Goals measured and evaluated against national measures of performance	none found	Review performance on Measuring Up indicators and post-secondary education indicators identified in the report.	Learning More www.learnmoreindiana.org
IOWA						
2004-2009 Strategic Plan of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa	Board of Regents, State of Iowa	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Shaping the Future: A Five-Year Plan for Iowa's System of Community Colleges	State Board of Education's Bureau of Community Colleges and Workforce Preparation	none found	none found	none found	Annual progress report	none found
KANSAS						
None found	State Board of Regents State Board of Education Legislative Planning Committee	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
KENTUCKY						
Five Questions—One Mission, Better Lives for Kentucky People, A Public Agenda for Postsecondary and Adult Education 2005-2010 (2005-2010 Strategic Plan) Accountability Plan: Key Indicators of Progress	Council on Postsecondary Education	“Nearly double” Bachelor’s degree and higher by 2020	Match U.S. Census national projected average for 2020	none found	Accountability system: The accountability system has been realigned to reflect the goals of the public agenda. Each institution is required to report outcomes organized around the 5 policy questions. HB 1 requires review of the strategic plan every 2 years.	Gear Up Kentucky Go Higher Kentucky
		Percentage of adults with at least a high school diploma or GED (goal: 82 percent by 2006)	National average by 2020			
		Number of college-level courses per 1,000 high school juniors and seniors (goal: 600 by 2006)	none found			
		Increase the percentage of 9th graders enrolling in college within 4 years (goal: 41 percent by 2006)	Narrow gap with top states			
		Enroll 209,348 undergraduates by 2006	none found			
		Enroll 24,652 graduate and first-time professional by 2006	none found			
		Percentage of adults with a Bachelor’s degree or higher (goal: 22.6 percent by 2006)	National average by 2020			
LOUISIANA						
Master Plan for Public Postsecondary Education: 2001	Board of Regents State of Louisiana	Increase participation by 2% by 2005	none found	Yes	Accountability reports (required from Act 1465 of 1997)	none found
		Increase minority participation by 5%				
		Increase % of first time, full-time entering freshman retained to 2nd year 5% by 2005				
		Increase 3-year graduation rate at community colleges 5% by 2005				
		Increase 6-year graduation rate at 4-year institutions 5% by 2005				
		75% of first-time, full-time entering freshman at 4-year institutions academically prepared (do not require remediation) by 2005				
		Increase number of students earning B.A. in education by 7%				
MAINE						
The Maine Idea: Strategies for Ensuring Maine’s Future 2000-2005	Board of Trustees University of Maine System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
A New Era: A Renewed Commitment	Maine Community College System’s Board of Trustees	Increase degree enrollment to 11,000 (from 7,500 in 2002) by 2010	none found	none found	none found	none found
MARYLAND						
2004 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education	Maryland Higher Education Commission	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
MASSACHUSETTS						
None found	Massachusetts Board of Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
MICHIGAN						
Final Report on Lt. Governor’s Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth	Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth	Increase participation rates by 5% each year for the next 10 years	none found	none found	none found	none found
		Public school districts must expand dual enrollment programs so that 50% of high school students are earning college credit by 2015				
		Double the % of residents who attain post-secondary degrees or other credentials that link them to success in Michigan’s new economy				

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
MINNESOTA						
University of Minnesota: Advancing the Public Good	Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Designing the Future 2002-2005 Strategic Plan	Minnesota State College and Universities Board of Trustees	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
MISSISSIPPI						
Plan of Excellence: IHL Strategic Plan	Board of Trustees of State Institution for Higher Learning	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
None found	State Board for Community and Junior Colleges	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
MISSOURI						
Missouri Department of Higher Education's Strategic FY 2005 Coordinated Strategic Plan	Coordinating Board for Higher Education	<p>By FY 2005, increase the number the % of low- and middle-income students completing the Free Application for Student Financial Aid by deadline by 5 points</p> <p>By FY 2005, increase the % of students from low- and middle-income receiving financial aid through federal Pell Grants, the Missouri College Guarantee, and the Charles Gallagher Grants programs by 5 points</p> <p>By FY 2005, increase number and proportion of students aged 18 to 24 enrolling in postsecondary programs by 5%</p> <p>By FY 2005, increase the number and proportion of students aged 25 and older enrolling in postsecondary programs by 5%</p> <p>By FY 2005, reduce the overall participation gap by 5%</p> <p>By FY 2005, increase the retention rates in certificate and 2-year programs by 5%</p> <p>By FY 2005, increase completion rates in certificate and two-and four-year programs by 5%</p>	Participation rates comparable to states with highest participation rate	Yes	Annual Report of the Missouri Department of Education to the Presidential Advisory Committee and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education	none found
MONTANA						
Strategic Plan: Mission, Vision, Goals and Objectives of Montana University System	Board of Regents of Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
NEBRASKA						
Comprehensive Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education	Coordinating Committee for Postsecondary Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
NEVADA (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)						
Building Nevada's Future: A Master Plan for Higher Education	Board of Regents University and Community College System of Nevada	<p>Raise percentage of high school graduates who continue into postsecondary</p> <p>Increase participation</p> <p>Increase minority participation</p> <p>Increase % of students who complete Bachelor's in 6 years and Associate's in 3 years</p>	<p>2001 WICHE median</p> <p>National average for educational attainment based on 2000 Census data</p> <p>Parity with majority Nevada population</p> <p>2001 WICHE median</p>	none found	Performance indicator report and accountability report	none found

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
NEVADA (CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE)						
Performance Indicator Report 2003-2004: UCCSN Master Plan Accountability Report	Board of Regents University and Community College System of Nevada	Raise % of Nevada h.s. graduates who continue into postsecondary education	2001 WICHE median	Yes	none found	none found
		Minority student enrollments within the UCCSN will meet or exceed the minority population distributions within Nevada (progress measured against the Nevada Census data and UCCSN enrollment statistics)	Meet or exceed minority population distribution in the state			
		Increase % of Nevadans who participate in some form of higher education	Continuous improvement toward national averages for education attainment based on 2000 Census data			
		Minority graduation rates will meet or exceed those of white, non-Hispanic students	Progress measured against Nevada Census data and UCCSN enrollment statistics			
		Increase % of students who complete Bachelor's degrees in 6-years and community college students who complete Associate's degrees in 3 years	2001 WICHE median			
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Board of Trustees Strategic Goals (adopted 02/05)	Board of Trustees of the Community and Technical College System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	Board of Trustees of the University of New Hampshire System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
none found	Postsecondary Education Commission	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
NEW JERSEY						
A Blueprint for Excellence: New Jersey's Long Range Plan for Higher Education	New Jersey Commission on Higher Education	Provide access to high-quality higher education opportunities for 406,000 to 411,000 students, an increase of 45,000 to 50,000 students	Supporting data and explanations provided in an appendix to higher education plan	none found	Accountability system being developed in phase 2 of planning process Annual Updates	None found
		Increase 4-year (and less) and 6-year graduation rate by 10% for full-time undergrads	Enrollment incomes for traditional students were based on projected growth in high school graduates and the goal of increasing the percentage of recent high school graduates who attend college in N.J.			
		The retention and graduation rates of a steadily increasing number of low-income and minority students will increase by at least 20 percent through defined annual progress	National data on non-traditional students points to relatively steady enrollment growth			
		The level of satisfaction with employers with student preparedness for the workforce will increase by a minimum of 25% from baseline established in 2004				
NEW MEXICO						
Strategic Plan 1999-2009	New Mexico Higher Education Department	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
NEW YORK						
The Tentative Plan for Higher Education in New York State 2004-2012	University of the State of New York Board of Regents/State Education Department	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
State University of New York Master Plan 2004-2008	SUNY Board of Regents	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
The City University of New York Master Plan 2004-2008	CUNY Board of Regents	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign	
NORTH CAROLINA							
Long Range Plan	System level: North Carolina University System	Assist state in closing gap between state and national average in B.A. degrees or higher with no significant differences between educational attainment of majority and minority populations	Reach national average Monitor participation and the size of the freshman class in relation to the number of high school graduates in the state	Yes	none found	none found	
none found	State Board for Community Colleges	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found	
NORTH DAKOTA							
Creating a University System for the 21st Century	North Dakota State Board of Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found	
OHIO							
None found	Ohio Board of Regents	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found	
OKLAHOMA							
Brain Gain 2010: Building Oklahoma Through Intellectual Power	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Double growth of college degree holders 25 and older by adding 203,000 Bachelor's degree holders and 140,000 Associate's degree by 2010	Meet or exceed national average for the proportion of population age 25 and older holding an Associate's degree or higher by 2010	none found	Consumer-oriented report that publicizes the performance of state colleges and universities	Gear Up Oklahoma Public awareness and motivational campaign to inform different audiences of the benefits of higher education	
OREGON (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)							
Oregon University System 2003-2005 Performance Measures	Oregon University System	Number and % of students of color: 14,606 by 2007 from 11,350 in 2004.	Capture increases in number and proportional representation among Oregon's h.s. graduate population and college-going age population	none found	none found	none found	
		Number of entering first-time freshman: 10,765 by 2007 from 9,730 in 2004	none found				
		Number of students who are new Oregon community college transfers: 4,330 by 2007 from 3,761 in 2004	none found				
		Number of undergraduates enrolled: 69,762 by 2007 from 65,234 in 2004	Increased undergraduate enrollment reflects importance of a Bachelor's degree in a knowledge economy				
		Percent of full-time freshman who demonstrate progress by returning for the second year: 82 percent by 2007 from 80.3 percent in 2003	Comparable to national averages for public universities in all states				
		Percent of full-time freshman starting and completing a Bachelor's degree at any Oregon University System university (6-year graduation rate: 58 percent by 2007 from 55.8 percent in 2003)	none found				
		Percent of Oregon community college transfers completing a bachelor's degree at an OUS university (6-year graduation rate: 78 percent BY 2007 from 76.1 percent in 2003)					
		Total number of Bachelor's degrees granted: 13,234 by 2007 from 11,063 in 2003					
Total number of advanced degrees granted: by 2007 4,674 from 4,049 in 2003							

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
OREGON (CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE)						
The Community College Pledge to Oregon	Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development	<p>Providing educational access for ethnic minority Oregonians: Maintain equal or greater statewide student proportion compared to state population</p> <hr/> <p>Removing barriers to transitions between community colleges and the Oregon University System: Increase subsequent enrollment in OUS by 5 percent.</p> <hr/> <p>Helping high school students get a jump on college careers: Increase number of h.s. students in college credit courses by 5 percent</p> <hr/> <p>Continuing to be primary college choice of Oregon h.s. students: Maintain % of Oregon h.s graduates directly entering community colleges</p>	none found	none found	none found	none found
PENNSYLVANIA						
Leading the Way: The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education: A Plan for Strategic Directions 2004-2009	Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education	<p>Second-year persistence rate (overall, black, and Hispanic): 79%</p> <hr/> <p>Diversity of entering class: black, 8.5%; Hispanic, 2.5%</p> <hr/> <p>Enrollment diversity: black, 7.0%; Hispanic, 2.5%</p> <hr/> <p>4-year graduation rate: overall, black, and Hispanic 30%</p> <hr/> <p>6-year graduation rate: overall, black, and Hispanic 55%</p>	none found	Yes	Measures, performance targets, and related plans and initiatives (appendix in strategic plan)	none found
RHODE ISLAND						
Rhode Island Board of Governors for Higher Education: 2002-2005 Goals and Priorities	Rhode Island Board of Governors	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
SOUTH CAROLINA						
2002 Strategic Plan for Higher Education	South Carolina Commission on Higher Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
SOUTH DAKOTA						
Opportunities for South Dakota	South Dakota Board of Regents	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
TENNESSEE (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)						
Creating Partnerships for a Better Tennessee: The 2005-2010 Master Plan for Tennessee Higher Education	Tennessee Higher Education Commission	<p>Increase % of African-American and Hispanic students enrolled in higher education</p> <hr/> <p>Increase number of recent h.s. graduates in higher education</p> <hr/> <p>Increase number of non-traditional students participating in higher education, especially in community colleges</p> <hr/> <p>Increase both persistence and graduation rates for all students across public and private higher education to regional averages</p>	The rationale for Tennessee's goals derive from a planning process around state needs. The goals were chosen to better situate Tennessee in the knowledge economy. The state received policy expertise from the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, SREB, NCHEMS, SHEEO, and WICHE and funding from Lumina Foundation for Education's, Changing Directions initiative.	none found	Two annual reports to the legislature: The Condition of Higher Education in Tennessee and (see rows below) The Annual Joint Report on Pre-Kindergarten Through Higher Education in Tennessee. These two reports are being adapted to align with the master plan (as is the funding formula).	The state is explicit about the master plan being a part of a public agenda for higher education. College for Tennesseans: College Pays...We Can Get You There Campaign.

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
TENNESSEE (CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE)						
Accountability Plan: Tennessee Higher Education Commission: The Condition of Higher Education in Tennessee (2003)	Tennessee Higher Education Commission	By 2010, combined headcount undergraduate enrollment of public and private higher education institutions in the state will exceed 220,000	none found	none found		
		By 2010, college participation rates of 18- to 24-year-old African-Americans will be representative of their current proportion in the population of the state as a whole	none found			
		By 2010, enrollment of students 25 and older will increase toward the Southern regional average	none found			
		By 2010, retention rates at public colleges and universities will increase toward the SREB average. (By 2010, retention rates will equal the current SREB average of 80.5 percent.)	none found			
		By 2010, persistence rates will increase toward the SREB average. (By 2010, graduation rates will equal the SREB average by 54.8 percent.)	none found			
		By 2010, persistence to graduation rates for African-American will be within 2 percentage points of other racial groups in Tennessee higher education. (By 2010, graduation rate for African-Americans will equal.)	By 2010, higher education will reduce the gap between Tennessee and SREB states in providing higher education access to it's citizens.			
TEXAS						
Closing the Gaps by 2015	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board	By 2015, close gaps in participation rates across Texas	Raise participation rate to 5.7% by 2015	Yes	Annual progress report (statutory) and statewide accountability system that is aligned with the Closing the Gaps higher education plan	Education. Go Get It. public awareness and motivational campaign
		By 2015, increase by 50% the number of degrees, certificates, and other identifiable student successes	Increase to above national average			
		Increase student persistence and degree completion to exceed national levels	none found			
UTAH						
Master Plan 2000: A Commitment to the People of Utah	Utah State Board of Regents	Increase number of racial and ethnic minorities enrolled in USHE to reflect proportion of minorities in the state.	Proportional representation	none found	none found	none found
VERMONT						
University of Vermont Strategic Plan: Objectives and Action Steps for 2003-2008	University of Vermont	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Vermont State Colleges Strategic Planning Documents	Vermont State Colleges	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
VIRGINIA (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)						
Virginia 2020: Agenda for the Third Century	University of Virginia	none found	none found	None found	none found	none found
Advancing Virginia Through Higher Education: The Systemwide Strategic Plan for Higher Education	State Council on Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV)	By 2010, accommodate at least 38,000 additional students	Public college and university enrollment will outstrip capacity by 2010 (2001 SCHEV needs assessment)	none found	Each institution develops a strategic plan and together with SCHEV's agency plan constitutes implementation of the strategic plan. SCHEV monitors overall progress in meeting systemic goals on an annual basis.	none found

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives continued

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
VIRGINIA (CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE)						
Dateline 2009	Virginia Community College System	By 2009, serve at least 16,000 new students	no rationale provided	none found	Each institution develops a strategic plan and together with SCHEV's agency plan constitutes implementation of the strategic plan. SCHEV monitors overall progress in meeting systemic goals on an annual basis.	none found
		By 2009, rank in top 10% of nation in graduation, retention, and job placement rates	Reach top 10% of national average			
		Triple number of graduates who transfer to 4-year institutions	none found			
		Triple number of h.s. students who receive college credits (from 14,000 to 45,000)	none found			
		Provide 80% annual increase in training individuals who choose non-credit training	none found			
WASHINGTON						
Strategic Master Plan for 2004	Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board	By 2010: 1. 11,500 graduate degrees 2. 30,000 Bachelor's degrees 3. 27,000 Associate's degrees 4. 25,000 complete job training programs (per year) 5. 20,525 students in ABE/ESL who demonstrate improved literacy skills	Numbers reflect the board's call for a 12% increase. The board cites increased income, higher quality of life, increased tax revenue, greater participation, and a stronger economy as rationales for the increases. (Assumptions: enrollment will continue at current rates; public and private historical share of enrollment will remain the same. Enrollments to reach degree goals is based on current FTE/degree earned ratio multiplied by degree goals.)	none found	Progress is measured by the state's higher education accountability plan; however, HB3103 and the Strategic Master Plan 2004 require the Coordinating Board and 2-year and 4-year institutions to work together to design a new accountability monitoring and reporting system that would better illustrate progress toward statewide goal.	none found
WEST VIRGINIA						
It All Adds Up: Compact for the Future of West Virginia	West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission	Postsecondary participation rate will increase by 70%.	West Virginia's overall goal is to align its higher education system to contribute to long-term growth and diversification of the state's economy. The target is to increase per capita income to, or above, the national average by 2020. The state went through a planning process (National Postsecondary Collaborative) to determine statewide needs, which was the result of legislative directive via SB 653 (2000) and SB 448 (2004) that required higher education efforts to be tied to economic development.	none found	Higher Education Report Card 2004: tracks progress toward the goals largely in the order they appear in the compact (plan). Progress toward each goal is not immediately obvious. There are 9 tables indicating participation progress and 11 education outcomes charts that one would need to go through to determine the status.	Public Awareness Campaign: Education. Go Get It.
		Levels in both young and working adults' participation rates in higher education will be equal to the national average Increase by 25% number of students transferring from 2-year to 4-year programs. Regional variances in graduation rate, academic preparation, and postsecondary participation will not exceed 5% Double the number of annual graduates in math, sciences, computer science, engineering and related technologies, and health-related fields By 2005, 20% of h.s. students enrolled in tech-prep will complete the Associate's degree within 1 year of graduation and by 2008, that number will increase to 40%. By 2006, 10% will receive both a degree and diploma at the end of the 12th grade. Exceed graduation rates: 60% for selective colleges and institutions; 50% for open access colleges; 35% for 2-year institutions				
none found	West Virginia Council for Community and Technical Education	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found

A 50-State Review of Numerical Goals in Higher Education Plans and Initiatives *continued*

Plan or Initiative	Author/Sponsor	Numerical Goal/Targets	Goal-Setting Rationale	Goals Disaggregated by Race or Income	System for Measuring Progress	Public Awareness Campaign
WISCONSIN						
Charting a New Course for the University of Wisconsin System	University of Wisconsin System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
Strategic Directions 2001-2004	Wisconsin Technical College System	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found
WYOMING						
University of Wyoming FY 2002 Performance Report to the Governor	University of Wyoming	Participation target for 2002-2003: 12,000 overall; 2,500 new students; 2,100 outreach students Retention rate for 2003-2004: 80 percent fall to fall Graduation rate (first-time, full-time freshman): 50 percent	none found	none found	none found	none found
Wyoming Community College Commission Strategic Plan: July 1, 2004-June 30, 2008	Community College Commission	none found	none found	none found	none found	none found

About the Author

Mike Collins is a program director at JFF, where his work focuses primarily on state policy issues for the Early College High School Initiative, Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count, and Double the Numbers, JFF's campaign to dramatically increase the number of young people from low-income and minority families who attain postsecondary credentials. Prior to coming to JFF in 2005, Mr. Collins worked in multiple capacities on education reform and higher education policy, helping improve public education at the local and state levels. Most recently, he served as Assistant Commissioner for Participation and Success at the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, where he led the agency's efforts to increase the number of students enrolling and succeeding in higher education. He also oversaw implementation in Texas of *Education. Go Get It*, the state's innovative, research-based public awareness and motivational campaign to increase student participation and success in the state's colleges and universities.



JOBS FOR THE FUTURE

CREATING STRATEGIES
for Educational and Economic Opportunity

JOBS FOR THE FUTURE seeks to accelerate the educational and economic advancement of youth and adults struggling in today's economy. JFF partners with leaders in education, business, government, and communities around the nation to: strengthen opportunities for youth to succeed in postsecondary learning and high-skill careers; increase opportunities for low-income individuals to move into family-supporting careers; and meet the growing economic demand for knowledgeable and skilled workers.

