2794 - Lessons Learned: Interstate Passport after Five Years of Implementation
Leadership and Strategic Planning, Partnerships and Collaboration

Every year innovative programs are implemented at institutions, demanding enthusiasm, staff labor, and dedicated budgets, but what happens as a program ages? This presentation will reflect on the first five years of the Interstate Passport program and will discuss stakeholder turnover and the challenges of measuring and tracking impact. This presentation will encourage participants to reflect on assessing the success of ongoing programs and revising established programs in new cultural and policy landscapes.

Olivia Tufo, Member Services Coordinator
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
WHAT IS INTERSTATE PASSPORT?

► Interstate Passport® is a national program that enables seamless block transfer of lower-division general education.

► Interstate Passport® based on an agreed upon set of learning outcomes rather than on specific courses and credits.
THE HISTORY OF INTERSTATE PASSPORT

Phase 1:
23 institutions, 5 states

National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) partnership
First in the World Grant (U.S. Department of Education)

Phase 2:
Passport Learning Outcomes (PLOs) Grants:
Gates Foundation Lumina Foundation

First non-founding members
28,000 Passports reported to the NSC

Initial evaluation for the First in the World grant

The final evaluation report for the First in the World Grant

20,823 reported Passports in a single academic year
ECMC Foundation Catalyzing Transfer Initiative (CTI) Grant

ECMC CTI gathering in Denver, CO
Building a theory of change
STUDENT TRANSFER PATTERNS IN THE WICHE STATES: A LOOK AT THE FALL 2006 COHORT

At the outset of the Interstate Passport initiative, a report was produced to examine the student transfer picture of the fall 2006 cohort in the 15 WICHE states.*

The transfer rate for full-time students was 35.9 percent, and 31.6 percent for part time students or 33.6 percent of the entire cohort.

Of the students who began at a public two-year institution, 15.4 percent transferred out of state; 25.3 percent of students who began at a public four-year institution did so. Neighboring states gained the highest number of interstate transfer students.

*The WICHE region has grown to 16 states and freely associated territories

---

**Table 2. Transfer within State and out of State 2006 - 2010 by Sector and Control of Origin Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Institution</th>
<th>Within-State Transfer</th>
<th>Out-of-State Transfer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Count (%)</td>
<td>Weighted Count (%)</td>
<td>Weighted Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>108,246 (84.6%)</td>
<td>19,647 (15.4%)</td>
<td>127,893 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Nonprofit</td>
<td>97.5 (75.1%)</td>
<td>90 (24.9%)</td>
<td>360 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private for-Profit</td>
<td>23,667 (95.5%)</td>
<td>1,111 (4.5%)</td>
<td>24,778 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>52,125 (74.7%)</td>
<td>17,647 (25.3%)</td>
<td>69,773 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Nonprofit</td>
<td>5,752 (58.6%)</td>
<td>5,481 (41.4%)</td>
<td>13,234 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private for-Profit</td>
<td>317 (58.5%)</td>
<td>225 (41.6%)</td>
<td>542 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Share of students over entire cohort of transfer students, by institution type

Source: National Student Clearinghouse Research Center

---

**Table 3. Interstate Transfers among WICHE States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Institution</th>
<th>Student Transfers into the State from Other WICHE States</th>
<th>Student Transfers Out of the State to Other WICHE States Only</th>
<th>Student Transfers Out of the State to Non-WICHE States Only</th>
<th>Total Student Transfers Out of the State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>2,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>7,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>2,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>2,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13,214</td>
<td>13,214</td>
<td>11,503</td>
<td>28,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Student Clearinghouse Research Center
CURRENT STATUS OF INTERSTATE PASSPORT

• 70 Member Institutions
• 22 states
• All public two-and four-year institutions in four states: HI, AK, UT, SD
• 42% institutions reported Passports in AY 2021-2022,
• Total number of reported Passport awards over the life of the program is 88,569
EVALUATING A PROGRAM

- Identify stakeholders and decision-makers
- Define the challenges with the program
- Compare the initial goals and context of the program to current goals and context
- Consider the growth or degrowth over the life of the program
- Map activities that could lead to the short- and long-term results
- Write a proposal for change for stakeholders
THINK-PAIR-SHARE

► Consider a program at your institution.
► What mechanisms for evaluation does your institution utilize?
► What are the roadblocks to evaluation?
► What are the signs that a program needs evaluation?
► Was the program revised or retired?
SUMMER 2022 MARKETING FOCUS GROUPS

Member Perspective

► They implemented the program, but they do not know if Interstate Passport is working.

► Three key questions
  • Are our students using it to transfer?
  • Are transfer student success outcomes improved?
  • Does participating in the Interstate Passport Network gain us students?

Prospective Member Perspective

► No urgency

► Positive feelings but no passion

► Not a unique solution that they feel their institution must pursue
  • Legislative mandates are seen as a “competitor” to the program

► No connection to Interstate Passport as solving a real problem for their students
CREDIT MOBILITY IN 2023

► NISTS

► COVID-19 Transfer, Mobility, and Progress report from National Student Clearinghouse (NSC)

► Issue brief from Ithaka S+R

► National Transfer Landscape scan from Education Commission of the States (ECS)

► State-wide transfer initiatives and mandates

► Feedback from ECMC Foundation Catalyzing Transfer Initiative
THANK YOU!

Olivia Tufo
Member Services Coordinator

etufo@wiche.edu

www.wiche.edu

www.interstatepassport.wiche.edu