



**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Cascades Conference Rooms, 4th Floor
1300 Quince Street SE • Olympia, WA**

Study Session: Wednesday, January 31, 2007
2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting: Thursday, February 1, 2007
8:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

Jan. 31 Study Session Agenda

- 1:00 p.m. Reception and Tour of New SBCTC Office**
Chris Reykdal

- 2:00 p.m. Call to Order**
Jim Garrison

- 2:05 p.m. Task Force Reports** **Discuss Tab 1**
 - Student Achievement Incentives
 - Technology Transformation
 - Student Listening

(SSD Principles)
Jan Yoshiwara/Chris Reykdal

- 2:35 p.m. Fall Enrollment Report** **Discuss Tab 2**
(SSD Economic Demand/Student Success)
Mary Alice Grobins/Jan Yoshiwara

- 3:30 p.m. Operating Funds Overview** **Discuss Tab 3**
(SSD Principles)
Mary Alice Grobins/Deb Frazier

- 5:00 p.m. Adjourn Study Session**

- 6:00 p.m. Dinner**
Mercato Ristorante

Feb. 1 Regular Meeting Agenda

- 8:30 a.m. Call to Order and Welcome**
Jim Garrison, Chair

- 8:35 a.m. Remarks by Representative Deb Wallace** **Discuss**
Chair, House Higher Education Committee

- 9:05 a.m. Adoption of Consent Agenda** **Action Tab 4**
 - a. State Board Regular Meeting Minutes – November 30, 2006
 - b. State Board Special Meeting Minutes – December 19, 2006
 - c. Lower Columbia College Property Acquisition – Maple Park Apts.
Resolution 07-02-01
 - d. Tacoma Community College – 19th Street Entry Project
Resolution 07-02-02
 - e. Contract with Agile Mind for Transition Math Project
Resolution 07-02-03

- 9:10 a.m. Director's Report** **Discuss**
Charles Earl
- 9:30 a.m. Chair's Report** **Discuss**
Jim Garrison
- Trustees' Association Report
Jim Robinson, TACTC President
- 9:45 a.m. Board Member Notes** **Discuss**
- 10:00 a.m. Legislative Update** **Discuss** **Tab 5**
(SSD Principles)
Chris Reykdal
- 11:15 a.m. 2009-11 Capital Budget Development** **Action** **Tab 6**
Resolution 07-02-04
(SSD Principles)
Tom Henderson/Mary Alice Grobins
- 12:15 p.m. Adjournment**
Next Meeting: March 14-15, 2007 at SBCTC Office in Olympia

1/23/07

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Under RCW 42.30.110, an Executive Session may be held. Action from the Executive Session may be taken, if necessary, as a result of items discussed in the Executive Session.

PLEASE NOTE: Times above are estimates only. The Board reserves the right to alter the order of the agenda. Reasonable accommodations will be made for persons with disabilities if requests are made at least seven days in advance. Efforts will be made to accommodate late requests. Please contact the Executive Director's Office at (360) 704-4309.

SSD refers to the SBCTC System Direction adopted by the Board in September 2006 (Resolution 06-09-27).



STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

TAB 1

January 31, 2007

Topic

Task Force Reports

- Student Achievement Incentives
- Technology Transformation
- Student Listening

Description

Consistent with the State Board's System Direction, the Board created three new system task forces. The Student Achievement Incentives Task Force will recommend a system of measures and financial incentives for colleges to improve student achievement. The Technology Transformation Task Force will recommend a technology strategic plan that outlines future directions for delivering college instruction and services and guides future system investments. The Student Listening Task Force is developing mechanisms for direct student feedback on their programmatic, technology, and financial needs to improve achievement of their educational goals. All three task forces have held initial meetings and outlined goals and work plans.

Key Questions

- Are the goals and principles proposed by the Student Achievement Incentives Task Force consistent with the Board's goal of improving student success?
- Will the goals and principles proposed by the Technology Transformation Task Force support the Board's goal for innovation?
- For what issues should the Student Listening Task Force collect student input?

Analysis

SSD: Student Success, Innovation

The Student Achievement Task Force consists of State Board members (Sharon Fairchild, Lyle Quasim, Jim Bricker), college presidents, trustees, faculty union representatives, and State Board staff. A large advisory committee of college instruction and student services administrators, business officers, researchers and faculty has been convened to support the Task Force's deliberations. Data and national research analysis is underway with active participation by committee and task force members.

The Technology Transformation Task Force consists of State Board members (Reuven Carlyle, Jim Garrison, Erin Munding), college presidents, trustees, college staff including information technology and distance learning administrators, State Board staff, and technology experts from universities and industry. College system resource mapping and a national scan of technology plans are underway. Task Force members are being organized into task groups to work on parts of the technology plan.



The Student Listening Task Force includes State Board members (Jim Garrison, Sharon Fairchild, Tom Koenninger) and State Board staff. An initial work plan has been developed. Existing student feedback results from colleges are being inventoried and planning is underway for a web-based student survey.

Background Information

Goals and principles for the Student Achievement Incentives Task Force (Appendix A) and the concept paper for the Technology Transformation Task Force (Appendix B) are attached. These documents represent proposed policy frameworks for the work of these two task forces and are provided for Board review and discussion.

Recommendation/Outcomes

Board members will have an opportunity to discuss the directions of the three System Direction Task Forces and provide feedback.

Prepared by: Jan Yoshiwara, 360 704-4353, jyoshiwara@sbctc.ctc.edu

D R A F T
Student Achievement Task Force

Principles and Goals
December 2006

Principles for Student Achievement Initiative

- Improves educational attainment for students
- Colleges' results are measured relative to the needs of the communities they serve, the college focus on workforce education, academic transfer and adult basic education, and the results of their students
- Measures recognize all students in all mission areas
- Measures focus on student outcomes and key momentum points as determined by system data analysis
- Measures focus on student achievement that can be influenced by colleges
- Measures are tied to the demographics of the state's future population, including improved access for underserved populations

Goals for Task Force

- Review national research on student retention and progress and on higher education performance funding systems
- Identify potential momentum points based on findings from national research and on analysis of Washington community and technical college system student data
- Consider momentum points for student progress and achievement as well as exits for employment and transfer to colleges and universities
- Propose financial incentives that recognize student progress across mission areas
- Recommend student achievement incentive system to State Board
- Use results of task force work to inform Washington Learns and other state accountability efforts

Process

- Create system task force with membership including presidents, trustees, faculty, State Board members, State Board staff
- Create advisory group of college vice presidents, deans, faculty and institutional researchers to support staff data analysis and to develop findings and conclusions for consideration by the system task force. This group will also advise the retention research project funded by the Education Assistance Foundation.
- Include representatives of colleges that regularly use data to measure and evaluate progress towards policy goals, especially for student retention and progress
- Include individuals committed to using data to improve student achievement

Timeline

June-July 2006	Concept paper discussed with State Board, WACTC
Fall 2006	Board, task force, advisory committee and WACTC work on principles and goals, and common understanding of student progress data
Winter 2007	Board, task force, advisory committee and WACTC work on momentum points and measures
Spring 2007	Board, task force, advisory committee and WACTC work on funding incentives
June 2007	Recommendation on student achievement system to State Board

Technology and the Power of Transformation in Education

CONCEPT PAPER for a Strategic Action Plan for the Future of Technology For the Washington State Community and Technical College System

Introduction

Technology is an essential aspect of the state community and technical college system at all levels. It is central to how and what students learn and their educational outcomes; it is core to faculty's ability to collaborate, instruct and evolve; it is a major tool for administration efficiency, effectiveness and operations. Technology impacts all college stakeholders on all levels.

Technology is directly linked with all stakeholders' quality of educational experience. And yet technology is still a means to an end. Instructors need technology as a tool not as a distraction or mandate; students need equitable access to compelling educational applications without obstacles; administrators need technology to improve each college's efficiency and effectiveness.

The marketplace of ideas has exploded with new content and new approaches. Wikipedia, Youtube.com, Skype, Craig's List, del.icio.us, MySpace, flickr, ebay, RSS feeds, blogs, WiFi/WiMax, open source, etc. represent the new generation of user generated internet. Today's technology allows users to unleash their own content, applications, services, products, purchasing and learning without the rigid structures controlled by top down organizations.

How does this technological revolution in the marketplace of ideas impact the college system and its stakeholders? How should it? How are these broader market changes impacting users directly and indirectly? What possibilities exist to embrace technology and our learning systems in a more profound way that is less tied to back end infrastructure and more to front-end applications?

Vision and Scope

The purpose of this project is to understand and boldly plan for the transformative power of technology in our state's community and technical colleges and our users. We want to create a seamless online student process for all aspects of the college student experience by reexamining our common technology architecture and processes to determine where colleges will benefit from the collective power, knowledge, and processes of the colleges.

We will examine:

Vision - To design and build a strategic technology action plan with and for the stakeholders and the full federated system.

Decision Making - Dramatically improve how stakeholders and the college system utilizes, views, examines, purchases and incorporates technology into its strategic objectives.

Funding - To truly view technology as integral to running today's colleges and to respond to the question of how we can take better advantage of the resources that we already have in a manner where all colleges may benefit in planning for the future.

Process

Create a system task force. Participants will include visionary thinkers and practitioners who use new technology to solve problems related to college operations, system efficiencies and student access to learning and educational achievement. The Task Force will include State Board

members, presidents, and college and CIS staff, stakeholder and user representatives and private sector technology entrepreneurs with expertise in public issues. All strategic planning work that has already been accomplished by system commissions and councils as well as other states and/or national agencies will be actively used and incorporated.

End Products

1. To be able to use this document as the research, foundation and justification for substantive legislative budget request. Document will show the future technology direction for WACTC system (roadmap) and what is needed to get there.
2. A technology visioning plan that has national impact.

Goals

Specifically, some central goals include:

- To design and build a strategic technology action plan with and for stakeholders and the full federated system that allows the colleges to operate competitively within the higher education arena.
- Dramatically improve how stakeholders and the state system utilizes, views, examines, purchases and incorporates technology into its strategic objectives.
- Determine the best future use of technology given the evolving needs of users.
- Identify methods and implications for transforming the design and delivery of education itself.
- Transform and improve the overall educational experience for students by making the full range of 'student experience' components easier to manage such as: admissions, financial aid, housing, child care, transportation, courses, programs, study and out-of-classroom time research, distance learning, university transfer, job search and hiring.
- Improve the efficiency, effectiveness, cost savings and simplicity of educational operations for stakeholders while establishing a systematic approach that allows equity among the colleges.

This project will strive to position the college system for current and future challenges and transitions required to serve all students using technology, collaboration and innovation to meet the demands of the economy, increase student access to college services, and improve student success.

Guiding Principles of this Initiative

1. Technology permeates the Community and Technology College mission at all levels.
2. Technology is central to the future design and delivery of education.
3. Technology is central to learning resources for research and study.
4. Technology is crucial as a subject of instruction.
5. Technology provides the means to gather data to assess success and make decisions for improvement.
6. Technology supports the administrative functions of the colleges.
7. Technology must be accompanied by faculty and staff training and professional development.
8. All stakeholders of our system must be involved in designing, building and delivering technological solutions for their own needs.
9. This effort will be user-centric to understand real user needs, wants, opportunities and possibilities that can be applied by all stakeholders.
10. This effort is a strategic directive not a tactical implementation, but it must remain operationally viable and logistically compelling for all stakeholders.
11. By using a mapping process we will gain an objective understanding and analysis of existing capabilities and processes. These maps will act as a baseline for future decision-making and the creation of a long-term sustainable strategy.
12. Numerous national institutions have explored the implications of technology at some level. This initiative will strive to learn from many of these existing efforts in Washington and nationally. We will be open to a solution with a number of solutions.
13. We will actively reach out to learn from entrepreneurs, advocates, private sector vendors and others who have unique perspectives and who may be able to assist us in this endeavor.
14. We will recognize the legal frameworks that we are mandated to respond to and respond to them appropriately as well as creatively.
15. Expand the technology capacity for all colleges and that all colleges will benefit and be moved forward from this technology transformation project.

Possible Outcomes

1. Directly link technology with our educational, strategic and system objectives in specific and tangible ways.
2. Base all decisions on user needs analysis, system budget efficiencies, and best practices for stakeholders.
3. Use technology to better target our instruction and student services delivery to match students' different life circumstances, technical abilities, locations, backgrounds, languages, experience and expectations.
4. Keep our technology course content and other learning resources up-to-date so that students' experiences will prepare them for the modern work place or continuing their education.
5. Provide suites of collaborative tools, an enhanced technology environment and training for faculty to better achieve their educational objectives.
6. Provide a continuously renewed technology infrastructure that will provide the ability to gather and process information to be able to respond with well-informed, timely decisions.
7. With this continuously renewed technology infrastructure we will be able to adjust our approach and response to rapidly changing needs of students and communities.
8. Embrace the use of technology as an essential utility from a funding standpoint.

Timeline

October 2006	Concept paper discussion with SBCTC team and Task Force Chair
November 2006	Task Force selected and invited
December 2006	Concept paper discussed at WACTC
December 2006	Task Force convened; principles, goals and timeframe developed December 13 th , 2006, 1:30 pm – 5:00 pm
January 2006	Study design, assignments and deadlines outlined and delegated for SBCTC staff
February 2006	Vendor selection process initiated for consulting support
Winter/Spring 2007	Board and System review literature and data, and consult experts in technology trends
Summer 2007	Board and System develops strategic directions
Fall 2007	Strategic directions reviewed by system and adopted by Board

Possible Elements of the Study (in no particular order):

- Productivity and Adaptation
- Competitive Advantage
- Distribution of Technology
- Business Expansion
- Population Diversity
- World Competition
- Defining Educational Attainment
- Supply-Demand
- Operational Costs Models
- Pathway from where we are to where we need to be
- Purchasing priorities, systems, vendors, processes and roadmaps



STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

TAB 2

January 31, 2007

Topic

Fall Enrollment Report

Description

Fall quarter enrollments are a good predictor of student enrollments for the entire academic year. They form an important touchstone for discussion during the legislative session, informing decisions around how many growth enrollments the system might receive in the budget, gauging system success in achieving objectives such as high demand enrollments, and in updating program trends of policy importance.

Key Questions

- What is the short and longer-term outlook for CTC enrollments? How will the Board's Strategic Direction affect future enrollments?
- Who is being served by the community and technical colleges, and how does the student and program profile relate to the system direction to broaden access across underserved populations?

Analysis

SSD: Economic Demand, Student Success

After reaching an all-time high in 2003, community and technical college state enrollments fell for the following three years. Most of the drop in enrollments was associated with a drastically improving economy, which resulted in reductions of the number of persons seeking re-training services and programs. In addition, higher education enrollments – particularly in two-year colleges – tend to be “counter-cyclical”, with potential students often opting to go to work vs. college. Now, state enrollments are trending up again even though the economy continues to be strong. Basic skills and workforce programs are leading the growth. Based upon fall enrollments, we project that the system will exceed its legislative target by over 1,000 FTES, and will be approximately 3,000 FTES higher than last year.

Access by young adults and people of color continues to be strong. Increased enrollments in workforce education and basic skills mean the college system is improving its contribution to a skilled labor force. Nine months into statewide implementation, IBEST (integrated basic skills and workforce education) programs are beginning to show enrollments across the system which will translate into improved transition and college achievement rates for basic skills students.

Outcomes

The Board will be updated on the most recent system enrollment level and profile and will understand the basis on which the Legislature will make 2007-09 growth enrollment funding decisions.

Prepared by: Mary Alice Grobins, 360-704-4381, mgrobins@sbctc.ctc.edu
Jan Yoshiwara, 360 704-4353, jyoshiwara@sbctc.ctc.edu



STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

TAB 3

January 31, 2007

Topic

Operating Funds Overview

Description

The State Board oversees the distribution of funds provided by the Legislature, federal sources and grantors to the 30 college districts. Biennially, the amount of funding exceeds \$1.2 billion. The college districts, overseen by local boards of trustees, combine this funding with over \$850 million in locally generated funds, including tuition and contracts, to operate the colleges. This agenda item will provide data and information to the State Board about the sources and uses of college funding.

Key Questions

- Where does college funding come from?
- Is there disparity in the resources available to colleges?
- Why is this significant?
- What do college spending patterns reveal about local service priorities?

Analysis

The State Board makes decisions that directly affect the availability of college funding, and the system direction guides and influences uses of these funds. Community and technical college funding is fundamental to decision making about serving the needs of students and communities. Availability and flexibility of funding determines the ability to initiate new programs, revamp existing programs, recruit and retain faculty and other staff, and to sustain campus infrastructure.

Often, the State Board hears about college funding concerns, but usually sees information that looks at the system as a whole, or at system-wide averages. This presentation will provide an overview of the history of college funding and expenditures, including the role and variability of tuition and tuition waivers, and will provide an understanding of the ranges of experience at the college districts.

An example of the type of information we'll discuss is that 2006 system expenditures were nearly 56% state general fund supported. However, this funding source ranged from 45% at one district to over 68% at another. Why is this significant? State general funds must be used in the fiscal year in which they are appropriated, unlike tuition collections, which can cross fiscal years. Dependence on state general funds provides less flexibility for local decision making.

Outcomes

The Board will achieve a new level of understanding about the sources and uses of college funding, and about variability in budgets and spending patterns of the colleges.

Prepared by: Deborah Frazier, 360-704-4350, dfrazier@sbctc.ctc.edu



**REGULAR MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD FOR
COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES**

MEETING MINUTES

November 30, 2006

State Board Members

**Jim Garrison (Chair), Mt. Vernon
Jim Bricker, Coupeville
Reuven Carlyle, Seattle
Sharon Fairchild, Spokane
Jeff Johnson, Olympia
Tom Koeninger, Vancouver
Erin Munding, Omak
Lyle Quasim, Puyallup
Beth Willis, Tacoma**

State of Washington
STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Olympia

ACTION INDEX
November 30, 2006

<u>Resolution Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page in Minutes</u>
----	Approval of Minutes for October 19, 2006	1
06-11-33	Adoption of Consent Agenda: - 2007-09 Capital Budget Alternatively Financed Project Request	2
06-11-34	- Everett CC Property Acquisition	2
----	Adoption of SBCTC Work Agenda for December 2006 – June 2008	3
06-11-35	Approval of State Board Retirement Plan Investment Options	3
06-11-36	Approval of 2006-07 Legislative Policy Principles	3-4

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Olympia**

**Regular Meeting Minutes
November 30, 2006
Bates Technical College**

The State Board held a study session at Bates Technical College - Downtown Campus on November 29, 2006, from 1:30 to 5:15 p.m. to discuss the following topics: 1) 2006-07 SBCTC Tuition Policy Study and Presentation by Don Heller, 2) State Board Work Agenda for December 2006-June 2008, 3) Washington Learns Presentation by Ann Daley, and 4) High School to College Transition. The Board also met in executive session that evening from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. at C.I. Shenanigans Restaurant in Tacoma to discuss the performance of a public employee. No action was taken at the study session or executive session.

State Board Members Present: Jim Garrison (Chair), Jim Bricker, Reuven Carlyle, Jeff Johnson, Tom Koeninger, Erin Munding, Lyle Quasim, Beth Willis

State Board Member Absent: Sharon Fairchild

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Garrison called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and welcomed those present. He thanked Bates Technical College President David Borofsky for hosting the meeting. Jim noted a change to the agenda to add two additional items: 1) a discussion of System Direction data and task forces, which was deferred from the previous day's study session, and 2) an executive session to discuss the performance of a public employee.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A correction was noted to the list of Board members who were absent from the October 19, 2006 State Board meeting. State Board members Jeff Johnson and Lyle Quasim were absent from that meeting.

MOTION: Moved by Erin Munding and seconded by Beth Willis that the State Board approve the minutes of the October 19, 2006, regular meeting with a correction noted to the list of Board members absent from the meeting to include Jeff Johnson and Lyle Quasim.

MOTION CARRIED.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Moved by Tom Koenninger and seconded by Erin Munding that the State Board adopt the consent agenda for its November 30, 2006 regular meeting as follows:

- a) Resolution 06-11-33 (ATTACHMENT #1) – 2007-09 Capital Budget Alternatively Financed Project Request***
- b) Resolution 06-11-34 (ATTACHMENT #2) – Everett CC Property Acquisition***

MOTION CARRIED.

SYSTEM DIRECTION DATA AND TASK FORCES

Jan Yoshiwara of the State Board staff distributed a mock-up of the System Direction publication which will be available in mid-December for broader dissemination. The System Direction statement and ten-year goals related to economic demand, student success, and innovation were adopted by the Board in September 2006. Jan gave a PowerPoint presentation on trend data and actions related to each of the System Direction goals.

The Board and staff discussed ways of measuring progress towards the system goals, baseline data for those indicators, and strategies being implemented in pursuit of the System Direction, including the establishment of three new task force groups: Student Achievement Incentives Task Force, Technology Transformation Task Force, and Student Listening Task Force. A progress report of activities to date related to each task force was provided in the agenda packet.

HOST COLLEGE PRESENTATION

President David Borofsky welcomed the Board and staff to Bates Technical College and provided some general information about the college and program offerings. He also discussed funding formula issues and challenges specific to the technical colleges and expressed serious concern about their future funding. Dr. Borofsky introduced Diana Taylor, Associated Student Government President, and several students who shared their personal stories and educational experiences at Bates. Following the student panel presentation, Sunny Burns, Vice President for Instruction, talked about common course numbering; Ivan Gorne, Vice President of Student Services reported on high school student integration; and Cheri Loeland provided information about the international education program at Bates.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Executive Director Charlie Earl reported on the following topics: 2007 legislative session, December 1 GMAP presentations, WorkFirst policy changes, worker retraining policy change for participation by the employed in declining industries, a request from the technical colleges to offer Associate in Technology degrees, performance audits scheduled for the community and technical college system, status of the Snohomish, Island & Skagit Counties Higher Education Needs Assessment, and awards presented to the State Board by the Seattle Jobs Initiative for the Bridges to Opportunity initiative and by the National Council for Marketing and Public Relations for the Creating Opportunities television advertisements.

CHAIR'S REPORT

- **Trustees' Association Report.** TACTC President Jim Robinson reported on a recent joint meeting of the TACTC Legislative Steering Committee and Board of Directors and thanked Jim Garrison for his participation. Jim also discussed his involvement on two system task force groups, an electronic survey of trustees on the issue of common course numbering, and the creation of an ad hoc committee to study tuition policy. He encouraged Board members to attend the TACTC winter conference scheduled for January 22-23 in Olympia. This year's conference theme is "Higher Education for All."
- **State Board Work Agenda.** At the Board's September meeting, Chair Garrison discussed the development of a Board member work plan for the next 18 months. Following that meeting, a preliminary list of topics was sent to Board members, and Chair Garrison had subsequent conversations with individual Board members to further refine the work plan. Additional revisions were made to the work plan at the October Board meeting. Chair Garrison presented the final draft for approval with the understanding that the Board may choose to enrich and update the document periodically.

MOTION: Moved by Tom Koenninger and seconded by Beth Willis that the State Board adopt the SBCTC Work Agenda for December 2006 – June 2008 as presented (ATTACHMENT #3).

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD RETIREMENT PLAN INVESTMENT OPTIONS (Resolution 06-11-35)

John Boesenberg of the State Board staff reported that the State Board sponsors a 401(a) retirement plan for approximately 6,500 faculty and exempt administrative staff. In December 2005, revisions were adopted that increased the investment options for participants from 10 to 24 annuity and mutual funds. John presented a recommendation to add five investment options to the State Board retirement plan for a total of 29.

John summarized the major provisions of the State Board retirement plan, as well as recent activities and issues related to the plan.

MOTION: Moved by Lyle Quasim and seconded by Erin Munding that the State Board adopt Resolution 06-11-35 (ATTACHMENT #4) approving increased State Board Retirement Plan investment options by allowing access to five additional mutual funds.

MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF 2006-07 SBCTC LEGISLATIVE POLICY PRINCIPLES (Resolution 06-11-36)

State Board member and Joint Legislative Committee (JLC) Chair Jim Bricker introduced the topic and provided background information. The community and technical college system's

legislative priorities are developed collaboratively by the trustees, presidents, college staff, faculty unions, and State Board members and staff.

This year, the JLC was asked to consider a series of policy principles or values held by the system with input from stakeholders. This represents a departure from the previous practice of promoting specific legislation or issues prior to the beginning of session.

The advantages to this new approach are: 1) It has the purpose of convening stakeholders about the interests of a particular policy issue, instead of a particular policy position, prior to knowing legislative preferences on the details of a bill. 2) It has the potential to unite the system's stakeholders around a common set of principles, allowing Board members, trustees, presidents, faculty, and staff to clearly articulate the interests and values of the system on a policy topic as legislation is being developed. 3) It allows for adjustments when new information or data is presented.

Chris Reykdal of the State Board staff presented a recommendation from the JLC to approve a set of policy principles on nine topics: high school completion, dual enrollment programs, tuition, financial aid, compensation and staffing, student access, accountability, innovation, and Washington Learns.

MOTION: Moved by Jim Bricker and seconded by Jeff Johnson that the State Board adopt Resolution 06-11-36 (ATTACHMENT #5) approving the 2006-07 Legislative Policy Principles.

MOTION CARRIED.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board convened in executive session from 11:45 a.m. to 12:23 p.m. to discuss the performance of a public employee. No action resulted from the executive session.

ADJOURNMENT/NEXT MEETING

Following the executive session, the Board reconvened in open meeting for the purpose of adjournment. There being no further business, the State Board adjourned its regular meeting of November 30, 2006, at 12:20 p.m. The next regular meeting of the State Board is scheduled for January 31-February 1, 2007, at the State Board office in Olympia.

Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:

Charles N. Earl, Secretary

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 06-11-33

WHEREAS the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges has submitted its 2007-09 Capital Budget Request; and

WHEREAS subsequent to Board action an additional alternatively financed project has been identified; and

WHEREAS the Green River Community College Board of Trustees has approved expanding the college satellite operation at Kent Station; and

WHEREAS this project requires legislative approval under RCW 39.94 to secure approximately \$20 million in Certificates of Participation through the Washington State Treasurer;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves submittal of this project as part of the 2007-09 Capital Budget Request to the Office of Financial Management.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED November 30, 2006.



Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:



Charles N. Earl, Secretary

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 06-11-34

WHEREAS the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges is required to approve acquisition of property that exceeds \$400,000; and

WHEREAS Everett Community College has identified a significant opportunity to meet current and future needs through the swap and acquisition of land with Providence Everett Medical Center; and


WHEREAS the Everett Board of Trustees has approved moving forward with the agreement subject to approval by the State Board; and

WHEREAS the current capital budget appropriation includes sufficient funds to acquire parking as an initial action under this agreement; and

WHEREAS the agreement provides funding to assist the college in replacement of the gym and fields;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves the land swap and acquisition of property with Providence Everett Medical Center.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED November 30, 2006.



Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:



Charles N. Earl, Secretary

**FINAL DRAFT OF THE SBCTC WORK AGENDA
December 2006 – June 2008**

1. Individual member and program based advocacy – Build a broader understanding of the mission, capabilities, and achievements of the CTC system within:
 - the Washington Learns initiatives/considerations
 - the Legislature
 - the underserved constituencies
2. Assure the development of accountability programs, reflecting student achievement, and educational productivity, all capable of influencing the direction of resources to colleges.
3. Review and determine new technology initiatives to support the System Direction:
 - Student access to educational and service programs
 - Cost effective use of resources
 - Clear outcomes, and return on investment
 - Best industry/sector practices
4. Monitor/assess how our federated system is doing as measured against the System Direction statement. Review and update this statement, at least once during this period, based on new environmental conditions, achieved alignments, and system performance.
5. Develop and recommend a long-term tuition/fees policy reflecting our mission, System Direction and long-term resource needs. Present to the 2008 Legislature for approval.
 - As part of this work, develop an understanding of the total revenue resources in play within the system, and preliminary proposals on how to more fully develop such incremental resources for the colleges in the future.
6. Evaluate the performance of the Executive Director: Move this assessment into an appropriate, annual calendar by July 2007.
7. Develop a student listening initiative; systematic communication with these stakeholders about their challenges, opportunities, our programs, and their development needs. Gain comfort that we have a data-based understanding of the perceptions of our learner communities.
8. Be a better Board, a strategic asset for the system. Use an evaluation tool focused on Board effectiveness, linked to a more explicit development of the roles of the Board and its members. Perform at least one assessment of Board effectiveness during this period.
9. Perform all of the other routine/every-year requirements such as budgets, other statutory specified behaviors. The Direction statement will be the explicit context.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 06-11-35

A resolution to approve an increase in the number of investment options available to Participants of the State Board Retirement Plan.

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges desires to provide an array of investments that allow Eligible Employees to diversify their Retirement Plan portfolios to meet individual retirement goals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that, effective January 8, 2007, the State Board authorizes the following set of TIAA-CREF mutual fund investment options be provided in addition to the annuity and mutual fund options currently available:

Small-Cap Equity
Large-Cap Value
International Equity
Social Choice Equity
Real Estate Securities

APPROVED AND ADOPTED November 30, 2006


Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:


Charles N. Earl, Secretary

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 06-11-36

A resolution relating to the 2006-07 Legislative Policy Principles.

WHEREAS the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges has adopted the System Direction in September 2006 and has submitted operating and capital budget requests for the 2007-09 biennium that reflect the system's highest priorities; and


WHEREAS the 2007-09 operating and capital budget requests remain the system's highest priorities; and

WHEREAS the Board has also identified a series of policy issues that may generate legislative interest that would effect the community and technical colleges; and

WHEREAS the Board would like to express a set of policy principles related to the identified issues;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board adopt Resolution 06-11-36, approving the 2006-07 Legislative Policy Principles contained in the attachment that were considered by the system's Joint Legislative Committee.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on November 30, 2006.


Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:


Charles N. Earl, Secretary

State Board for Community and Technical Colleges 2006-07 Policy Principles

The SBCTC adopted the System Direction in September 2006, and subsequently adopted Operating and Capital Budget requests for the 2007-09 biennium wherein the elements reflect the highest priorities for the Community and Technical College System for the 2007 legislative session. Consistent with those budget requests are a series of policy principles aimed at providing the Board, staff, and college officials with a clear understanding of the interests of the CTC system in policy deliberations that may occur.

High School Completion

- **CTCs as Providers** – The community and technical colleges should continue to play a significant role in high school completion and/or GED preparation for those that leave K-12 without diplomas.
- **Flexibility** – Colleges should retain local flexibility in their program offerings for high school completion and/or GED pathways.
- **Preventive Role** – The CTCs can play a significant role through partnerships to create success for students before they become high school dropouts.
- **Adequate Funding** – Colleges will need adequate resources to provide high school completion pathways.
- **Alignment of Pathways** – High school completion or GED pathways should position the learner to seamlessly enter college.

Dual Enrollment Programs

- **Variety of Pathways** – Students learn at different paces and in different ways and a variety of dual enrollment options should be available such as Running Start, College in the High School, Tech Prep, etc.
- **Efficient** – Dual enrollment programs reduce time to completion for students and should be utilized in the context of increasing certificates and degrees.
- **Adequate Funding** – Dual enrollment programs are a tremendous benefit to students, parents, and tax payers and should be encouraged with adequate resources.

Tuition

- **Public Good** – Tuition policies should be developed under the context that higher education is a public good and a student benefit. “We” all have a vested interest in keeping higher education affordable.
- **Predictability** – Students, parents, and college administrators need a tuition model that is predictable, stable and is placed in the larger context of the full cost of attendance.
- **Sector Differences** – Different tuition policies may be needed to reflect the diverse student populations that are served by each higher education sector.

- **Affordability** – Even when tuition is matched with financial aid, the “sticker” price, whether real or perceived, discourages many populations from beginning their pursuit of higher education.
- **Linked to Aid** – Tuition increases should be matched with appropriate financial aid, including innovative ways to respond to part-time students and other non-traditional students.

Financial Aid

- **Need Based** – Financial aid programs should be focused on assisting financially needy students.
- **Adequacy** – Financial aid policies should be responsive to the particular needs presented by diverse populations of learners in order for them to achieve their educational goals.
- **Underserved** – Changes in financial aid policies should target low income students; first generation learners; and strive for substantial simplification for all students.
- **Working Adults** – Financial aid systems should be structurally modified to address the real financial barriers experienced by low-income working adults.
- **Fairness** – Financial aid policies linked to tuition should provide proportional amounts of aid based on credit loads taken and be available for all programs of study.
- **Leveraging** – Changes in state financial aid programs should retain an emphasis on leveraging federal, local, and private resources.
- **Comprehensive Support** – Financial aid is a subset of comprehensive support and should be paired with adequate funding for counseling, advising, and other engagement resources.

Compensation and Staffing

- **Quality** – Compensation systems should contribute to the recruitment and retention of high quality employees.
- **Collective Bargaining** – Compensation changes aimed at faculty should respect local collective bargaining processes.
- **Adequacy** – Faculty and staff should be compensated adequately and within the context of a competitive environment.
- **Data Driven** – Long-term changes to compensation practices and staffing should be based on comparative information and other measurable data.
- **Flexibility** – Compensation practices should ensure appropriate flexibility so that colleges can make staffing adjustments necessary to meet the changing demands of their local communities.
- **Comprehensive Duties** – Compensation systems should recognize the full spectrum of duties/responsibilities performed by employees.

Student Access

- **Economic Demands** – Funding for new enrollments should include consideration of the economic needs of the state, as well as population increases:
 - Growth in baccalaureate production should recognize the large contribution made by the CTCs.

- The fastest growing segment of our adult population over the next ten years will be those 25-35 years old and need to be a focus of access and student success.
- The fiscal health of our private and public sectors will require us to achieve greater success with traditionally low skilled populations such as ABE and ESL learners; former Foster Care youth; and WorkFirst clients.
- Many of the high-demand fields are high-cost and will require resources in excess of the average funding rate for existing college enrollments.
- **Baccalaureate Production** – The CTCs play a critical role in the preparation of baccalaureate degree students:
 - Any expansion of applied baccalaureate programs for the CTCs should be placed under the authority of the SBCTC.
 - Increasing baccalaureate degree participation in the state should first consider solutions that utilize existing higher education infrastructure such as university centers on CTC campuses.

Accountability

- **Responsibility** – The SBCTC is responsible for ensuring meaningful accountability in response to policy initiatives.
- **Data** – The SBCTC will measure results using high-quality systemic data.

Innovation

- **Instructional Method** – Innovative, proven ways of teaching such as IBEST should be recognized and encouraged with the appropriate resources.
- **Modes of Delivery** – Delivering the benefits of higher education to broad segments of our population should recognize the immense power of technology.
- **Systems Infrastructure** – Increasing accountability and effectiveness stems in large part from robust and relevant data systems that need be supported at the statewide and local level.
- **Shared Resources** – Where possible, the legislature should develop policy solutions that create equal opportunities for all students through cost-effective shared resources such as digital libraries and on-line advising tools.

WA Learns

- **Comprehensive** – The SBCTC supports the comprehensive vision of Washington Learns, and will work to increase education attainment considered by a P-20 council.
- **Seamlessness** – Investments stemming from the Washington Learns effort should be student-centric and should focus on providing a smooth continuum for students as they progress through the P-20 system.
- **Investments** – Investments stemming from Washington Learns should be focused strategically on student success and outcomes. Long-term funding goals should reflect the resources necessary to support those strategic investments.
- **Early Learning** – Increased investments in early learning should recognize the substantial role that CTCs play in training and developing early learning educators, parent education, and curriculum development as well as the utilization of our child development centers.

- **Math/Science** – An emphasis on math and science should include a comprehensive approach that:
 - Infuses more math and science at every level of the educational pathway (from P-20).
 - Recognizes the substantial role that the CTCs play in providing the first two years of college coursework for over half of the math teachers in our state.
 - Provides appropriate support to faculty to upgrade their knowledge and skills in math and science so that it is infused across the curriculum.



**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD FOR
COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES**

MEETING MINUTES

December 19, 2006

State Board Members

**Jim Garrison (Chair), Mt. Vernon
Jim Bricker, Coupeville
Reuven Carlyle, Seattle
Sharon Fairchild, Spokane
Jeff Johnson, Olympia
Tom Koenninger, Vancouver
Erin Munding, Omak
Lyle Quasim, Puyallup
Beth Willis, Tacoma**

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
Olympia**

**Special Meeting Minutes
December 19, 2006**

State Board Members Present: Erin Mundinger (Vice-chair), Reuven Carlyle, Tom Koeninger, Lyle Quasim, Beth Willis

State Board Members Absent: Jim Bricker, Sharon Fairchild, Jim Garrison, Jeff Johnson

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chairman Erin Mundinger called the teleconference special meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

GOVERNOR'S BUDGET PROPOSAL (Info)

State Board staff Mary Alice Grobins, Debra Frazier, and Tom Henderson reviewed the Governor's budget proposal and answered questions regarding the implications of the proposal for the community and technical college system.

ADJOURNMENT/NEXT MEETING

There being no further business, the State Board adjourned its special meeting of December 19, 2006, at 4:10 p.m. The next regular meeting of the State Board will be held January 31-February 1, 2007, at the office of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges.

Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:

Charles N. Earl, Executive Director



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA ITEM

February 1, 2007

TAB 4(c)

Discussion Action (Resolution 07-02-01)

Topic

Consent Agenda: Purchase Maple Terrace Apartments – Lower Columbia College

Description

Lower Columbia College (LCC) is seeking authority to enter into an option to purchase the Maple Terrace Apartment Complex in advance of receiving their 2007-09 capital appropriation for replacing their health sciences building. The 2007-09 appropriation will include acquisition funds for the property necessary for construction of the health sciences facility. While the college has been authorized by the Board to purchase the property in the 2007-09 Capital Request, LCC needs specific authority to enter into an option to purchase in advance of receiving the appropriation.

Major Considerations

- Acquisition is with a willing seller.
- The college is working through General Administration to purchase the property.
- The college will have an appropriation to cover acquisition cost in the 2007-09 capital budget.

Analysis

LCC has brought this proposal before the State Board on several occasions. Initially, the site was sought for placement of the Performing Arts Center. Acquisition was held up by an unwilling seller, and “eminent domain” action was proposed by the college and its board of trustees. The action was set aside when the college was able to procure the McDonalds property for placement of the Performing Arts Building.

Presently, LCC has a \$2.5 million 2007-09 capital appropriation request to purchase a site for development of the new Health Sciences Building. LCC’s intent is to purchase the Maple Terrace Apartments, which are adjacent to and within the master plan boundary of the Longview Campus. The Maple Terrace owner has proposed a purchase sale agreement that is under AG review in advance of negotiating a deal and entering into a purchase option.

Lower Columbia College is working with General Administration Real Estate Services to secure appraisals and to negotiate the purchase upon approval of this resolution.

Background Information

- State Board Agenda Item (Action): March 1, 2001 – Lower Columbia College Acquisition of Maple Terrace Apartments (Resolution 01-03-04)
- State Board Agenda Item (Info): February 15, 2002 – Lower Columbia College Maple Terrace Apartment Condemnation



Recommendation

State Board staff recommends that the State Board approve resolution 07-02-01 allowing Lower Columbia College to enter into an Option to Purchase the Maple Terrace Apartments in advance of the 2007-09 Capital Budget.

Prepared by: Tom Henderson, 360-704-4382, thenderson@sbctc.ctc.edu

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 07-02-01

WHEREAS Lower Columbia College has identified the acquisition of Maple Terrace Apartments as critical to the replacement of its Health Sciences Building; and

WHEREAS Lower Columbia College has an approved capital budget replacement request that includes property acquisition funds; and

WHEREAS the owner of the Maple Terrace Apartment is willing to move forward with the sale of their property at this time;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves Lower Columbia College to negotiate a purchase and sale agreement and enter into an option to purchase the Maple Terrace Apartments in advance of receiving the 2007-09 capital appropriation.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED February 1, 2007.

Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:

Charles N. Earl, Secretary



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA ITEM

February 1, 2007

TAB 4(d)

Discussion Action (Resolution 07-02-02)

Topic

Consent Agenda: Enhance Campus Landscaping and 19th Street Entry at Tacoma Community College.

Description

Part of the Tacoma Community College's strategic initiative is to enhance the campus' physical appearance. Key to this goal is constructing a well-defined and visible entrance from 19th Street – the main entry to the campus. The college will spend additional local funds to assist with installation of a Japanese Garden in collaboration with Tacoma's sister city of Kitakyshu.

Major Considerations

- The college has sufficient local funds dedicated to the project.
- Proposed work is consistent with the master plan.

Analysis

The college has set aside reserve funding since 1999-2000 to fund campus enhancements. Currently \$1,667,000 in local funds is available to support these enhancements. The college has completed design drawings and estimate that the 19th Street improvements will be \$1,250,000.

The college has committed a maximum of \$250,000 to the Japanese Garden. The College Foundation will continue to seek gifts and will commit additional funds to see the Japanese Garden through completion.

The college contribution of local funds is well covered by local reserves.

Recommendation

The staff recommends approval of resolution 07-02-02 allowing Tacoma Community College to expand up to \$1.5 million in fund reserves to enhance the 19th Street entry and establish a Japanese Garden on the college campus.

Prepared by: Tom Henderson, 360-704-4382, thenderson@sbctc.ctc.edu

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 07-02-02

WHEREAS Tacoma Community College has identified upgrades to enhance the physical appearance of its campus; and

WHEREAS the Tacoma Community College Board of Trustees has recognized the need to make these improvements; and

WHEREAS the college has a reserve balance of sufficient funds dedicated to this purpose; and

WHEREAS the planning and design are sufficiently along to complete the projects within the estimated cost;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves Tacoma Community College to use up to \$1,250,000 for the 19th Street entry improvements and up to \$250,000 for installation of the Japanese Garden.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED February 1, 2007.

Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:

Charles N. Earl, Secretary



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA ITEM

TAB 4(e)

February 1, 2007

Discussion Action (Resolution 07-02-03)

Topic

Consent Agenda: Contract with Agile Mind for Transition Math Project

Description

The Transition Math Project is seeking approval for a \$150,000 contract with Agile Mind to work with a limited number of Phase II regional partnerships to provide research-based curricular, instructional, and assessment materials, with integrated professional development. With Agile Mind course support services, students have access, 24 hours a day, to high caliber curricular support, assessment, and test preparation presented in a way that keeps them motivated and ensures their success. Agile Mind will train teachers in these partnerships in a math coaching model built around these materials and offer an Internet-delivered content presentation, learning management and assessment system designed to collect information necessary for systematic improvement of our curriculum content, student support, and teacher professional development services.

Major Considerations

- The design of the Agile Mind support system builds on the work of Philip Uri Treisman, professor of mathematics and director of the Charles A. Dana Center, who has been a core consultant to Washington's Transition Math Project and the College Readiness Standards initiative since its inception in 2004.
- The Transition Math Project has at least three, and perhaps more, partnerships ready and eager to work with Agile Mind in these efforts.
- The funding for the contract is included in the Gates Foundation grant for Phase II of the Transition Math Project.

Analysis

This contract supports the Board's focus on student success by helping to align mathematics between high schools and two-year colleges and support smooth transitions of students from K12 to colleges to universities. Key college and high school math faculty and instructional leaders will be involved in the work defined in this contract.

Background Information

- State Board Agenda Item (Action): June 22, 2006—approval of the Gates Foundation grant for Phase II of the Transition Math Project
- The contract resolution is attached



Recommendation/Outcomes

State Board staff recommends that the State Board approve Resolution 07-02-03 allowing the Transition Math Project to contract with Agile Mind for services to selected Phase II regional partnerships.

Prepared by: Bill Moore, 360-704-4346, bmoore@sbctc.ctc.edu

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 07-02-03

A resolution to execute a contract with *Agile Mind* for Transition Math Project, Phase II work with selected regional partnerships.

WHEREAS the two-year college system is working to more strategically align math entrance expectations, standards, and curriculum with high schools and universities through this project; and

WHEREAS Phase I of the project developed College Readiness Standards in mathematics; and

WHEREAS regional partnerships around the state are seeking support to implement these standards in Phase II of the project through local efforts aimed at providing standards-based instructional resources to teachers and students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves the \$150,000 contract with *Agile Mind* to support the Phase II work of the Transition Math Project.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on February 1, 2007.

Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:

Charles N. Earl, Secretary



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA ITEM

February 1, 2007

TAB 5

Discussion Action

Topic

Legislative Update

Description

There are several policy bills of significance that have been introduced in the Legislature already. All of these bills were anticipated, and the Board's adoption of policy principles at the November meeting has positioned the staff to respond quickly to these bills with appropriate messaging. It is important that the Board get an update on these bills and contemplate amendments (if necessary) in light of the Board's principles. The Board will also get an update on early talk about the budget and the comprehensive Washington Learns Bill.

Key Questions

- For each of the policy bills described below, the Board should ask:
 - Does this align with our principles?
 - Does this advance one or more of our three goals?
 - Under the provisions of each bill, are there adequate resources to execute the intent of the bill?
 - Does each bill provide for effective accountability?
 - Are amendments needed to in order to strengthen the bill with respect to the questions above?

Analysis

As you review the following bills, please see the attached version of the Board's Policy Principles that were adopted in November, 2006 (Attachment A).

SB-5098 Creating the Guaranteed Opportunities Scholarship (Sen. Rockefeller)

- Creates an early outreach/incentive scholarship program for low and middle income students and first generation college students.
- To meet income eligibility requirements, students must qualify for free or deduced-price lunch. Students establish their eligibility in the 7th grade and must maintain a 2.0 GPA or better and have no felony conviction record through high school.
- Students have a window of five years to use the funding.
- The class of 2012 will be the first to receive funding.

SB-5104 Expanding Applied Baccalaureate Degrees (Sen. McAuliffe)

- Amends HB 1794 that would identify the current four pilots as the work of 2006 and requires the State Board to award up to two technical college pilots by February 2008 for instruction to start in fall 2009.

SB-5155/HB-1131 Creating the Passport to College Promise Program (Sen. Kilmer/Rep. Dunshee)

- Provides campuses with incentive funding of \$3,500 for foster care youth student who successfully complete 45 quarter credits, and every 45 credits thereafter until the student has earned 90 quarter credits or met other certification or training requirements.
- Creates a financial aid program for foster care youth that leverages traditional aid resources but allows for significantly enriched student budget allowances.
 - Students receive scholarships that bridge the gap between currently available aid resources and the cost of attendance.
 - Requires institutions to leverage all available aid resources, while limiting the amount of work-study a participant may have to 20% of the cost of attendance and removes student loans from the resources package.
- Students are eligible to receive funding for up to five consecutive years after their initial enrollment.
- The State Board is responsible for performing annual analysis for the system to ensure that colleges are in compliance with the requirements and regulations.
- The State Board is responsible for developing and maintaining an internet website and outreach program to serve as a comprehensive portal for foster care youth in Washington State for information related to negotiating the college preparation and completing processes.
- Provides an appropriation of \$25K per year to be awarded to one or more institutions that are most successful in recruiting, retaining and graduating foster care youth students.
 - The State Board is to monitor the academic progress of CTC students who receive scholarships, and the HECB is to monitor the progress of baccalaureate students.
 - The total appropriation is \$3 million for the fiscal year ending June 2008 and \$3 million for the following year.

HB-1051 Expanding High School Completion Programs (Rep. Upthegrove)

- Requires colleges to offer a high school completion program, resulting in a diploma, for students who have earned all graduation requirements except passing the WASL.

HB-1096 Creating Postsecondary Opportunity Programs (Rep. Kenney)

- State Board must create a workforce education program know as the Opportunity Grant Program to enroll students in opportunity-grant eligible programs of study.
- CTC tuition and fees rate is paid directly to the higher education institution and an additional \$1,000 for supplies, books, etc. is paid directly to the student.
- Funding is limited to a maximum of 45 credits or three years, whichever comes first.
- Student Eligibility for the Opportunity Grant Program:
 - Washington resident enrolled in an Opportunity Grant eligible program and have a family income of:
 - Up to 200% of poverty for 2007-09.
 - Up to median family income for 2009-11.
 - No income limit for 2011-13 and beyond.
 - Shown commitment to the program
 - Must make satisfactory progress and maintain a 2.0 GPA.



- Institutions would get \$1,500 per FTES for students who are at or below 200% of family income. Funds may be used for individualized support or for emergency childcare or transportation needs.
- The State Board is accountable for student retention and completion and must set annual performance measures and targets and monitor performance.
- The State Board and HECB will work together to ensure that:
 - All other state and federal aid is available to Opportunity Grant students.
 - Opportunity Grant student receive priority order for state and federal aid when pursuing a subsequent related credential, certificate or degree at a two- or four-year institution.
 - Aid amounts are documented and reported to the legislature.
- The WTECB would administer the Opportunity Partnership Program.
 - The program will provide mentoring to Opportunity Grant students who would benefit from the program
 - Each participant will be matched with a mentor.

HB-1385/SB-5495 Faculty Salary Increments for Community and Technical Colleges (Rep. Kenney/Sen. Kohl-Welles)

- The Legislature shall fund faculty salary increments for full and part-time faculty.
- The amount appropriated shall equal 0.8% of the annual faculty salary base.
- The awarding of increments remains a function of local collective bargaining.

Background Information

- 2006-07 Board Policy Principles (Attachment A)

Recommendation/Outcomes

The Board is expected to discuss these bills and provide staff with clarifying direction as we proceed to navigate committee hearings and private meetings. Board members will also be asked to take on communication assignments for one or more of the policy bills and possibly some of the major budget items in the Board's 2007-09 Operating Budget Request.

Prepared by: Chris Reykdal, 360-704-4390, creykdal@sbctc.ctc.edu

State Board for Community and Technical Colleges 2006-07 Policy Principles

The SBCTC adopted the System Direction in September 2006, and subsequently adopted Operating and Capital Budget requests for the 2007-09 biennium wherein the elements reflect the highest priorities for the Community and Technical College System for the 2007 legislative session. Consistent with those budget requests are a series of policy principles aimed at providing the Board, staff, and college officials with a clear understanding of the interests of the CTC system in policy deliberations that may occur.

High School Completion

- **CTCs as Providers** – The community and technical colleges should continue to play a significant role in high school completion and/or GED preparation for those that leave K-12 without diplomas.
- **Flexibility** – Colleges should retain local flexibility in their program offerings for high school completion and/or GED pathways.
- **Preventive Role** – The CTCs can play a significant role through partnerships to create success for students before they become high school dropouts.
- **Adequate Funding** – Colleges will need adequate resources to provide high school completion pathways.
- **Alignment of Pathways** – High school completion or GED pathways should position the learner to seamlessly enter college.

Dual Enrollment Programs

- **Variety of Pathways** – Students learn at different paces and in different ways and a variety of dual enrollment options should be available such as Running Start, College in the High School, Tech Prep, etc.
- **Efficient** – Dual enrollment programs reduce time to completion for students and should be utilized in the context of increasing certificates and degrees.
- **Adequate Funding** – Dual enrollment programs are a tremendous benefit to students, parents, and tax payers and should be encouraged with adequate resources.

Tuition

- **Public Good** – Tuition policies should be developed under the context that higher education is a public good and a student benefit. “We” all have a vested interest in keeping higher education affordable.
- **Predictability** – Students, parents, and college administrators need a tuition model that is predictable, stable and is placed in the larger context of the full cost of attendance.
- **Sector Differences** – Different tuition policies may be needed to reflect the diverse student populations that are served by each higher education sector.

- **Affordability** – Even when tuition is matched with financial aid, the “sticker” price, whether real or perceived, discourages many populations from beginning their pursuit of higher education.
- **Linked to Aid** – Tuition increases should be matched with appropriate financial aid, including innovative ways to respond to part-time students and other non-traditional students.

Financial Aid

- **Need Based** – Financial aid programs should be focused on assisting financially needy students.
- **Adequacy** – Financial aid policies should be responsive to the particular needs presented by diverse populations of learners in order for them to achieve their educational goals.
- **Underserved** – Changes in financial aid policies should target low income students; first generation learners; and strive for substantial simplification for all students.
- **Working Adults** – Financial aid systems should be structurally modified to address the real financial barriers experienced by low-income working adults.
- **Fairness** – Financial aid policies linked to tuition should provide proportional amounts of aid based on credit loads taken and be available for all programs of study.
- **Leveraging** – Changes in state financial aid programs should retain an emphasis on leveraging federal, local, and private resources.
- **Comprehensive Support** – Financial aid is a subset of comprehensive support and should be paired with adequate funding for counseling, advising, and other engagement resources.

Compensation and Staffing

- **Quality** – Compensation systems should contribute to the recruitment and retention of high quality employees.
- **Collective Bargaining** – Compensation changes aimed at faculty should respect local collective bargaining processes.
- **Adequacy** – Faculty and staff should be compensated adequately and within the context of a competitive environment.
- **Data Driven** – Long-term changes to compensation practices and staffing should be based on comparative information and other measurable data.
- **Flexibility** – Compensation practices should ensure appropriate flexibility so that colleges can make staffing adjustments necessary to meet the changing demands of their local communities.
- **Comprehensive Duties** – Compensation systems should recognize the full spectrum of duties/responsibilities performed by employees.

Student Access

- **Economic Demands** – Funding for new enrollments should include consideration of the economic needs of the state, as well as population increases:
 - Growth in baccalaureate production should recognize the large contribution made by the CTCs.
 - The fastest growing segment of our adult population over the next ten years will be those 25-35 years old and need to be a focus of access and student success.
 - The fiscal health of our private and public sectors will require us to achieve greater success with traditionally low skilled populations such as ABE and ESL learners; former Foster Care youth; and WorkFirst clients.
 - Many of the high-demand fields are high-cost and will require resources in excess of the average funding rate for existing college enrollments.
- **Baccalaureate Production** – The CTCs play a critical role in the preparation of baccalaureate degree students:
 - Any expansion of applied baccalaureate programs for the CTCs should be placed under the authority of the SBCTC.
 - Increasing baccalaureate degree participation in the state should first consider solutions that utilize existing higher education infrastructure such as university centers on CTC campuses.

Accountability

- **Responsibility** – The SBCTC is responsible for ensuring meaningful accountability in response to policy initiatives.
- **Data** – The SBCTC will measure results using high-quality systemic data.

Innovation

- **Instructional Method** – Innovative, proven ways of teaching such as IBEST should be recognized and encouraged with the appropriate resources.
- **Modes of Delivery** – Delivering the benefits of higher education to broad segments of our population should recognize the immense power of technology.
- **Systems Infrastructure** – Increasing accountability and effectiveness stems in large part from robust and relevant data systems that need be supported at the statewide and local level.
- **Shared Resources** – Where possible, the legislature should develop policy solutions that create equal opportunities for all students through cost-effective shared resources such as digital libraries and on-line advising tools.

WA Learns

- **Comprehensive** – The SBCTC supports the comprehensive vision of Washington Learns, and will work to increase education attainment considered by a P-20 council.
- **Seamlessness** – Investments stemming from the Washington Learns effort should be student-centric and should focus on providing a smooth continuum for students as they progress through the P-20 system.

- **Investments** – Investments stemming from Washington Learns should be focused strategically on student success and outcomes. Long-term funding goals should reflect the resources necessary to support those strategic investments.
- **Early Learning** – Increased investments in early learning should recognize the substantial role that CTCs play in training and developing early learning educators, parent education, and curriculum development as well as the utilization of our child development centers.
- **Math/Science** – An emphasis on math and science should include a comprehensive approach that:
 - Infuses more math and science at every level of the educational pathway (from P-20).
 - Recognizes the substantial role that the CTCs play in providing the first two years of college coursework for over half of the math teachers in our state.
 - Provides appropriate support to faculty to upgrade their knowledge and skills in math and science so that it is infused across the curriculum.

Revised 11/17/06



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA ITEM

TAB 6

February 1, 2007

Discussion Action (07-02-04)

Topic

Prioritization of 2009-2011 Capital Budget Requests

Description

The SBCTC capital budget request consists of a prioritized project list of well-planned projects that are clearly linked to colleges' instructional and facilities plans for the future. Our capital planning process and its results are held up by the Governor and the Washington Legislature as a "best practice" model. The State Board figures prominently in budget development through its work on the Capital Task Force, sizing the request and integrating the major project categories into the overall budget request. This agenda item provides another opportunity for Board involvement in the front end of the process for the 2009-11 capital budget process.

Critical to our process are the criteria used to develop and rank the major project capital requests and to select projects which will be included with the 2009-11 Capital Budget request. These criteria will be incorporated into the capital budget instructions issued this July and provide a framework for major project requests in December 2007. This agenda item is both a discussion of the development of scoring criteria and a request for State Board to weigh in on the policy leading to their implementation.

Key Questions

- Does the Board feel comfortable with the principles used to identify criteria for future capital requests?
- Are there clear linkages between the Capital Criteria and the Board's goals?

Analysis

SSD: Economic Demand, Student Success, Innovation

Economic demand is supported by renovating or replacing facilities to create better academic classrooms and vocational labs. Upgrades to existing facilities also enhance **student success** through increased use of technology and upgraded equipment better reflecting the work environment. **Student success** is also enhanced by expanding access through growth projects. **Innovation** is gained through partnerships and matching fund projects.

Every biennium, a broad de-brief is conducted to assess the project scoring process. Major issues that emerged following scoring & ranking of the 2007-09 request include:

- Should capital dollars be spread among more colleges. For example, currently colleges can receive projects in each of the request categories. Should there be a limit to how many categories a college can participate in?
- Enrollment growth has been used as a scoring criterion for all major project categories (renovation, replacement, growth). Is projected growth relevant to renovation and

replacement projects since these are instigated by poor facility condition rather than enrollment pressure?

- Should more of the capital request be dedicated to renovation and replacement projects? Smaller renovation requests are being crowded out by increasingly large renovation requests.

A committee of presidents, business officers, facility managers, vice presidents of instruction and student services, and state board staff reviewed all issues brought forward from the de-brief and recommend the following policy shifts to score and rank 2009-11 capital requests.

Spread of capital dollars among colleges:

- Colleges may continue to submit major projects in all three categories, but colleges will assign priorities if they submit multiple requests. Scoring points will be earned based on college priority.
- Colleges may not simultaneously submit projects if one project is dependent upon the completion of another. **Implication:** Avoids the conflict of out of sequence work and continues to assure the best projects can continue to compete for funding.

Enrollment growth

- Projected enrollment growth will be a major element in scoring only growth projects. Renovation and replacement projects will rely on age and building conditions as primary scoring criteria. **Implication:** This will provide a fairer competition for projects based more directly on need.

Small renovation projects

- Smaller renovation projects should be facilitated and several options are being forwarded for further development. **Implication:** A category limited to smaller projects may increase access to capital funds, speed colleges' response to changing program needs, and provide dollars to more colleges across the system.

Expansion of matching projects

- Innovation and partnerships can be enhanced by increasing the allowable request amount for matching projects from \$1 million to \$2 million. **Implication:** Increases foundation participation and expands tools available to colleges to leverage state investments addressing capital needs identified in colleges' strategic and master plans.

Background Information

- State Board Agenda Item: October, 2006 meeting: Tab 8: 2009-11 Capital Budget Priorities http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/docs/admin/20061019_agenda_oct_sbctc_mtg.pdf
- Attachment #1: Draft capital criteria
- Attachment #2: Major capital budget preparation timeline

Recommendation

Following a review and discussion of this item and any suggestions on the attached draft capital criteria, it is recommended that the State Board direct the WACTC Capital Committee and State Board staff to finalize and perfect the document for inclusion in the 2009-11 Capital Budget Instructions.

Prepared by: Tom Henderson, 360-704-4382, thenderson@sbctc.ctc.edu
Mary Alice Grobins, 360-704-4381, mgrobins@sbctc.ctc.edu

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

RESOLUTION 07-02-04

WHEREAS development of the criteria for selection and ranking of major projects is a significant element in the 2009-11 capital process, and

WHEREAS recommended improvements to the budget process will serve to enhance the quality of the process, and

WHEREAS the State Board has reviewed the policy recommendation and draft capital criteria

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board direct the WACTC Capital Committee and State Board staff to finalize the project request criteria for inclusion in the 2009-11 Capital Budget Instruction.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED February 1, 2007.

Jim Garrison, Chair

ATTEST:

Charles N. Earl, Secretary

**State Board for Community and Technical College
2009-11 Criteria Selection Review
Proposed Changes**

General changes

- General re-formatting, elimination of the Setting Priorities sections
- LEED is now a threshold requirement
- Ability to enhance institution's achievement of goals section is additive, includes master plan, strategic plan and institutional goals
- College project priority (1st, 2nd and 3rd) category has been added to the Renovation, Replacement and Growth categories
- Health, safety and code issues category changed – documentation required for seismic issues, energy and ADA separated, M&O removed, category is additive
- **Ten** (instead of 14) copies of the PRR are being requested for submittal. PRR narrative reduced from 20 pages to 10 (plus forms and attachments) and simplified to remove duplication.
- High demand section removed. Efficiency and utilization are kept as factors in growth projects.
- The scoring team will include representation from Instruction and Student Services Commissions and ITPG.
- Project submittals are due a week earlier – December 5, 2007.

Matching fund projects

- Limit raised from \$1M to \$2M
- State ownership is a requirement
- Equipment requests must be less than 40% of the matching request

Renovation projects

- Additional categories added for age of building – 41-50, over 50 (Replacement also)
- A matrix item addressing additional sf has been added (Replacement also)
- Program related improvements will be scored as a percentage of the assignable square footage of the building. (Replacement also)
- Minimum criteria element added to ensure the project is not dependent on another project in the current request

Replacement projects

- See three changes addressed in Renovation section above
- Plan for removal of building being replaced need to be addressed

Growth projects

- Projects less than 25,000 gsf will require WACTC Capital Committee approval
- Greater reliance on thoughtful planning to identify major program areas and student support spaces for the project
- Location of the project is to be identified by site

**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
2009-11 Project Development Guidelines
Project Request Report (PRR)**

When developing the Project Request Report (PRR), the following items should be addressed:

1. Executive Summary

- Problem statement/type of project request
- Proposed solution
- Programs addressed by project
- Probable cost summary and comparison to benchmark (reasonableness of cost)
- Project schedule
- Funding (state funds, local funds, COP's)

2. Scope and Project Description

- Short description of the project and its benefits
- Table showing a summary of program and related space (example attached)
- Increased FTES accommodated by this project

3. Prior Planning

- History of building and original funding source (except growth projects)
- How this project relates to:
 - Facilities master plan
 - Strategic plan
 - Institutional goals

4. Needs Analysis

- Facilities/Programs – define the capital problem – age, condition, functionality, health, safety and code issues, etc.
- What is driving the project – spell out the obvious and critical needs
 - New space for enrollment demand
 - Renovation/replacement
 - Program mix changes
 - Simplifying space relationships
 - Accreditation needs
- Alternatives considered
 - Programmatic and facility related
 - Consequences of doing nothing

5. Issues Analysis

- Utility infrastructure needs associated with the project
- Life of facility
- Discussion of sustainability – LEED Silver Standard required
- How this project will impact deferred maintenance and repair backlog

6. Site Feasibility (Identify special issues related to the project where a new site is being selected)

- Acquisition needs
- Mitigation and neighborhood related issues
- Parking expansion directly related to the project
- Permit issues, variances required

7. Space Utilization

- Capacity and utilization analysis: current capacity, density, classroom usage, efficiency of use
- New programs, changing mix of programs
- New space and what happens to vacated space – is it renovated or demolished?

8. Capital Cost Development

- Prediction of overall project cost
- Comparisons of economically reasonable and related projects (\$/FTE and \$/GSF) – preferably Washington community and technical colleges
- Anticipated funding sources

9. Operating Budget Impacts

- Anticipated annual impact on the college's operating and maintenance budget in both Program 090 FTES and M & O cost, including but not limited to:
 - Janitorial costs
 - Utility costs
 - Technology – infrastructure and technician support; voice, data and video communication
 - Capital maintenance, general repair, and furniture/equipment replacement
 - Roads, walks, landscaping and grounds maintenance
 - Security
 - Administration

10. Schedule

- Listing of major project milestones and approximation of dates: Predesign, design, bid, notice to proceed, 50 percent construction completion, substantial completion, occupancy, and final contract close out

11. Implementation

- Timing of the budget request and college priority
- Anticipated method of construction – Design-Bid-Build, GCCM, Design Build, etc.

Attachments (2009-11)

- C-2
- C-100
- Submit forms depending on type of request

- Matching fund project
- Renovation project
- Replacement project
- Growth project at predesign, design or construction stage
- Alternatively financed project
- Estimating documents supporting special needs, mitigation or extenuating circumstances associated with the project

Diagrams and Sketches

- Site map showing project location
- Preliminary drawings and sketches

Appendices (required where cited in proposal)

- Any site-specific materials important to the project – structural engineering report, geotechnical report, etc.
- Selected material from Facility Condition Survey
- Selected material from the master plan and strategic plan that ties directly to the scoring criteria
- LEED completed checklist
- Other relevant material where referenced in proposal may be included as appendices

Format Expectations

- Narrative should follow headings from this set of guidelines
- Length should not exceed 10 pages, single-spaced (excluding project cost, diagrams and sketches, and appendices, cover sheet, title page, and table of contents); type font should be Times New Roman 12 point and margins should be 1 inch
- College should submit **ten** originals for the evaluation team along with an electronic copy of the request.
- SBCTC will forward copies of the Project Request Reports to OFM, HECB and legislative staff upon completion of the selection process. Extra copies will be returned to the college.

**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
2009-11 Selection Criteria Guidelines
Development of Project Submittals for
Matching Fund, Renovation, Replacement and Growth Projects**

Key to the success of any capital project is a clear, accurate, and specific understanding of the facility need/problem to be addressed and a thoughtful analysis of the options to meet the need or solve the problem.

Colleges will be asked to prepare proposals for projects, addressing issues contained in the selection criteria. The requests will include a Project Request Report (PRR) and documentation necessary to support the request.

For projects requiring them, colleges are encouraged to initiate predesigns early to assure adequate planning and cost estimating to generate the PRR. Formal predesigns are due to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) on July 1, 2008 for projects that will begin the design phase in 2009-11. Projects seeking predesign funds will turn in their predesign in July 2010.

Only one project in each category (Matching Funds, Renovation, Replacement and Growth) can be submitted by a college each biennium.

Schedule for Reporting and Selection

Scoring and ranking of projects will be done by a team of not less than fourteen members. Representation will include members from WACTC, BAC, OFC, Instruction and Student Services Commissions and ITPG. The SBCTC Director-Capital Budget will staff the selection committee, answer questions, and ensure consistency in the process. A minimum of three members will score each project.

College requests must be submitted for consideration by Wednesday, December 5, 2007. Following the scoring review, scheduled for December 19-20, 2007, the project list will be approved by WACTC. Colleges will be notified of the preliminary order of projects as soon as possible. The Capital Budget Task Force makes the final determination on sizing the request. The approved priority listing will be part of the SBCTC capital budget request submitted to the Office of Financial Management.

**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
2009-11 Capital Budget Request
Matching Funds - Project Selection Criteria**

Background

Matching fund requests have totaled \$7 million each of the last two biennia. To continue to provide greater participation in this category and recognizing that the request limit has increased to \$2 million, we will maintain at least \$10 million in quality matching fund projects.

Criteria

1. Minimum criteria (project will not be scored if criteria are not met)

- a. The facility is state owned or a condominium interest is held (state capital funds cannot be spent on leased space)
- b. Equipment is 40 percent or less of the matching request
- c. Project does not change the intent of a previously appropriated project
- d. Project is not an exclusive enterprise function such as a bookstore, dormitory or contract food service
- e. Project is not dependent on a future state appropriation
- f. Project does not include improvements to temporary or portable facilities
- g. Projects exceeding \$4.5 million have a commitment to complete the predesign by July 1, 2008.

2. Elements of competitive matching fund proposals

- a. Project improves quality and benefits students by providing access, upgrading educational space, or enhancing services
- b. Project need is well justified and is consistent with the college facilities master plan, the strategic plan, and institutional goals
- c. Project solves a substantial capital problem
- d. Project and funding schedules are defined
- e. Evidence of the likelihood of success and good local participation

3. Funding Issues

- a. Matching funds must be matched at least one-to-one with non-state and federal cash resources
- b. Land and in-kind contributions may be accepted but cannot be counted toward the match
- c. Additional local funds, beyond the non-state match, can be used to expand total project funding
- d. Matching fund requests by a college can be a minimum of \$250,000 to a maximum of \$2,000,000

Qualifying Non-State Resources

Foundation Resources
Cash Donations
Private Grants
Federal Funds awarded for
Capital Construction

Non-Qualifying Resources

S & A Balances or Fees
Enterprise Funds
Parking Fees
COP Funds

4. Schedule Considerations

- a. Non-state resources must be generated before June 30, 2011. Failure to make substantial progress may cause funding to be lapsed by OFM.
- b. Construction bids should be taken before the end of the 2009-11 biennium. (This may involve the college self-funding design in the 2007-09 biennium to be ready for construction.)
- c. A timeline addressing critical milestones should be included

2009-11 Matching Funds Scoring Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Scoring Standard	
Meets minimum criteria	Reference items 1, a-g	Yes No
Project clearly benefits students	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 4)</i> Increases program access Increases efficiency Improves service to students Simplifies space relationships	1 1 1 1
Ability to enhance institution's achievement of goals	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 3)</i> Directly tied to facilities master plan Directly tied to strategic plan Directly tied to institutional goals	1 1 1
Demonstrated need	Serves a critical need Enhances program delivery Improves space Not addressed	6 3 1 0
Project completion timeline	Completion within 2 years Completion within 3 years Completion within 4 years	3 1 0
Project schedule	Project and funding milestones are clearly identified Project schedule w/o a funding schedule Schedule is uncertain or not evident	3 1 0
Project feasibility	Assessment of the likelihood of success and good local participation	Up to 5 points

**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
2009-11 Capital Budget Request
Renovation Projects – Project Selection Criteria**

Guidelines

Renovation projects should represent a complete renovation of a facility or area of a facility. Renovation projects shall not require secondary projects, future appropriations or be dependent on another project in the current request. A general rule of thumb is that a renovation project should cost between 60-80 percent of current replacement value and restore the renovated area to at least 20 years of useful life. Renovation includes costs to address repairs, interior and exterior finishes, seismic upgrades, code compliance, hazardous material abatement, and program driven improvements.

Renovation projects can include additions, up to 30 percent of the adjusted assignable area, to improve access and enhance the relationship of program or support space. Total square footage cannot exceed 70,000 gross square feet without the prior approval of the WACTC Capital Budget Committee.

Criteria

- 1. Minimum criteria (project will not be scored if criteria are not met)**
 - a. Project does not exceed 70,000 gsf without WACTC Capital Budget Committee approval
 - b. Renovation cost does not exceed 80% of the current replacement cost
 - c. Facility proposed is at a single site
 - d. Building has been owned by the college for 20 years at the time of request
 - e. Project meets LEED Silver Standard requirements
 - f. Project extends the useful life of the building at least 20 years
 - g. Projects exceeding \$4.5 million have a commitment to complete the predesign by July 1, 2008.
 - h. Project is not dependent on another project in the current request

- 2. Elements of competitive renovation proposals**
 - a. Age and condition of the building
 - b. Project need is well justified and is consistent with the college facilities master plan, the strategic plan, and institutional goals
 - c. Increase in efficiency or utilization of space
 - d. Meets significant program needs or provides flexibility in making program changes
 - e. Addresses significant health, safety, and code requirements
 - f. Importance of the project to the successful operation of the college
 - g. Length of extended operational life of the facility
 - h. If additional square footage is added, need is appropriately justified

2009-11 Renovation Scoring Matrix

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Standards		
Meets minimum criteria		Reference items 1, a-h		Yes No
Age of the building		Over 50 41 – 50 36 – 40 31 – 35 26 – 30 20 – 25 < Less than 20 years	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	
Condition of the building		Greater than 600 526 - 600 476 - 525 451 - 475 351 - 450 276 - 350 0 - 275	1 4 6 4 1 0 -2	
Ability to enhance institution's achievement of goals		<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 5)</i> Directly tied to facilities master plan Directly tied to strategic plan Directly tied to institutional goals		2 2 1
Program related improvements	(Assignable Square Feet) Classroom, labs Student Services Library Childcare Faculty offices Administrative Maintenance/Central Stores/Student Center	Percentage of total	x score	Total
			5 5 5 4 3 2 1	
Significant health, safety, and code issues		<i>Add up points from each category (Max 4)</i> Seismic issues (documentation required) Life safety ADA access Energy code issues		1 1 1 1
College project priority		<i>Select one</i> 1 st priority 2 nd priority 3 rd priority		5 3 1
Extension of building life		31 + years 26 – 30 years 20-25 years		3 2 1
Additional space		Well justified need Need not clearly indicated No space added beyond adjustments		3 1 3
Fitness for Use		Adequacy for use		Up to 3 points

**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
2009-11 Capital Budget Request
Replacement Projects – Project Selection Criteria**

Guidelines

A replacement project should be based on replacing space in an optimum arrangement. Space planning should take into consideration consolidation of program and office space in the replacement facility to improve program delivery and to resolve access issues. New space may be programmed for the same or different use than the space being replaced. Any replaced portable building must be removed from inventory and cannot be acquired by another college.

Replacement projects can include additions, up to 30 percent of the adjusted assignable area, to improve access and enhance the relationship of program or support space. Total square footage cannot exceed 70,000 gross square feet without the prior approval of the WACTC Capital Budget Committee.

Criteria

- 1. Minimum criteria (project will not be scored if criteria are not met)**
 - a. Project does not exceed 70,000 gsf without WACTC Capital Budget Committee approval
 - b. Building has been owned by the college for 20 years at the time of request
 - c. Project is not an exclusive enterprise function such as a bookstore, dormitory or contract food service
 - d. Project meets LEED Silver Standard requirements
 - e. Projects exceeding \$4.5 million have a commitment to complete the predesign by July 1, 2008

- 2. Elements of competitive replacement proposals**
 - a. Age and condition of the building
 - b. Project need is well justified and is consistent with the college facilities master plan, the strategic plan, and institutional goals
 - c. Project clearly identifies why the replacement is essential
 - d. Program use of the space is clearly addressed
 - e. Focuses on educational programs and student support
 - f. Addresses significant health, safety and code requirements
 - g. Importance of the project to the successful operation of the college
 - h. If additional square footage is added, need is appropriately justified
 - i. Planning for removal of the replaced building

2009-11 Replacement Scoring Matrix

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Standard			
Meets minimum criteria		Reference item 1, a-e		Yes	
				No	
Age of the building		Over 50		6	
		41 – 50		5	
		36 – 40		4	
		31 – 35		3	
		26 – 30		2	
		20 – 25		1	
		< Less than 20 years		0	
Condition of building		681 - 730		6	
		601 - 680		5	
		526 - 600		4	
		476 - 525		3	
		451 - 475		2	
		351 - 450		1	
		276 - 350		0	
		0 - 275		-2	
Ability to enhance institution’s achievement of goals		<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 5)</i>			
		Directly tied to facilities master plan		2	
		Directly tied to strategic plan		2	
		Directly tied to institutional goals		1	
Comprehensive project planning		<i>Add up points from each category:(Max 5)</i>			
		Space improves program delivery and student support		1	
		Well planned site placement		1	
		Reasonable cost estimate and building efficiency		1	
		Expected building life – 50 years or greater		1	
		Plan for removal of existing building		1	
Program related improvements	(Assignable Square Feet)	Percentage of total	x score	Total	
	Classroom, labs		5		
	Student Services		5		
	Library		5		
	Childcare		4		
	Faculty offices		3		
	Administrative		2		
	Maintenance/Central Stores/Student Center		1		
Significant health, safety, and code issues		<i>Add up points from each category (Max 6)</i>			
		Seismic issues (documentation required)		2	
		Life safety		2	
		ADA access		1	
		Energy code issues		1	
College project priority		<i>Select one</i>			
		1 st priority		5	
		2 nd priority		3	
		3 rd priority		1	
Additional space		Well justified need		3	
		Need not clearly indicated		1	

	No space added beyond adjustments	3
Fitness for Use	Adequacy for use	Up to 3 points

DRAFT

**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
2009-11 Capital Budget Request
Growth Projects – Project Selection Criteria**

Guidelines

The system needs to identify predesign projects for 2009-11 and will review the need for growth projects on a biennial basis. The campus should focus on real and well-understood enrollment and program demands. Growth projects should provide significant capacity for student demand and support and improve access. Projects should include evidence of thoughtful space planning based on current and future enrollments.

Requests for new off-site satellite facilities need to be approved by the State Board before the PRR is submitted to the selection committee. (Additional information may be found at <http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/college/f-acquisitions.aspx>.)

Total square footage cannot be less than 25,000 gross square feet or exceed 70,000 gross square feet without the prior approval of the WACTC Capital Budget Committee.

Criteria

1. Minimum criteria (project will not be scored if criteria are not met)

- a. Project is not less than 25,000 gsf or does not exceed 70,000 gsf without WACTC Capital Budget Committee approval
- b. Project is not a gymnasium or recreational facility
- c. Project is not an exclusive enterprise function such as a bookstore, dormitory or contract food service
- d. Project meets LEED Silver Standard requirements

2. Elements of competitive growth proposals

- a. Project is based on enrollment growth in academic, vocational, and/or basic skills
- b. Addresses SF/FTE of the current campus
- c. Project need is well justified and is consistent with the college facilities master plan, the strategic plan, and institutional goals
- d. Addresses campus needs as well as improves capacity, utilization, and/or add underserved programs in the community
- e. Provides essential educational program and student support space
- f. Includes evidence of thoughtful space planning based on current and future enrollments
- g. Space is designed to be flexible
- h. Conversion to future program space is simple and straightforward
- i. Reasonable project cost
- j. Importance of the project to the successful operation of the college

2009-11 Growth Project Scoring Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Scoring Standard	
Meets minimum criteria	Reference item 1, a-d	Yes No
Enrollment trends	Over 100 FTE/year 76 - 99 FTE/year 50 - 75 FTE/year 36 - 49 FTE/year 26 – 35 FTE/year 0 – 25 FTE/year	9 8 7 5 3 1
Efficiency – use of space	SF / FTE - Community Colleges - Technical Colleges	< 90 = 3, < 110 = 2, > 110 = 1, > 150 = 0 < 125 = 3, < 140 = 2, > 140 = 1, > 165 = 0
Ability to enhance institution’s achievement of goals	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 6)</i> Directly tied to facilities master plan Directly tied to strategic plan Directly tied to institutional goals Includes partnerships with K-12, 4 yrs, business, etc.	2 2 1 1
Comprehensive project planning	<i>Add up points from each category:(Max 10)</i> Space improves program delivery and student support Programs and student support space are identified by usage and square footage Location of project is identified by site Special initiatives beyond participation rates Reasonable cost estimate and building efficiency Expected building life – 50 years or greater	Up to 4 Up to 2 1 1 1 1
Reasonableness of cost – efficient utilization of funds (Building being proposed)	<i>Add up points from each category: (Max 6)</i> \$/Net new FTE \$/GSF Building efficiency (ASF/GSF) Baseline comparison with like projects	1 1 2 2
College project priority	<i>Select one</i> 1 st priority 2 nd priority 3 rd priority	5 3 1

(NOTE: This section will actually be behind the site repairs in the instructions section, but is included here for review since it was discussed as part of the committee meeting)

**State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
2009-11 Capital Budget Request
Infrastructure Projects – Project Selection Criteria**

Guidelines

Separate supporting documentation will be required to secure funding for infrastructure projects that exceed \$1,000,000. These are treated as major stand alone projects, addressing infrastructure needs that represent major, life-safety issues.

Scoring and ranking of projects will be done by a team of four OFC members. The SBCTC Director-Capital Budget will staff the selection committee, answer questions, and ensure consistency in the process.

College should submit **six** originals for the evaluation team along with an electronic copy of the request.

Criteria

- 1. Minimum criteria (project will not be scored if criteria are not met)**
 - a. Project cost is more than \$1,000,000
 - b. Project is not a facility repair project
 - c. Request is a single project
 - d. Majority of the work is beyond the footprint of buildings

- 2. Elements for evaluating infrastructure projects**
 - a. Involves significant health and safety issues
 - b. Evidence of infrastructure failure
 - c. Reasonable estimate
 - d. Impact of the project on the college
 - e. Deferability
 - f. Engineering study

2009-11 Infrastructure Project Scoring Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Scoring Standard	
Meets minimum criteria	Reference item 1, a-d	Yes No
Significant life safety, and code issues	<i>Add up points from each category (Max 6)</i> Seismic issues (documentation required) Life safety Local code violations	2 2 2
Evidence of failure	Multiple failures over the last 2 years Recent failure High cost maintenance issues	5 3 1
Reasonable estimate	Detailed cost estimate Rough order of magnitude estimate Undocumented estimate	5 3 1
Impact on the college	Serious impact on college operations Potential impact on college operations	3 1
Deferability	Catastrophic system failure is imminent Periodic component failure System unreliable, but maintainable	5 3 1
Engineering study	Comprehensive engineering study and estimate Site survey and recommendations Opinion letter and order of magnitude cost	5 2 1

2009-11 SBCTC Capital Budget Request Preparation Timeline

December 2006	<i>Capital Criteria Review Committee establishes project evaluation criteria</i>
January 2007	Colleges evaluate college needs, strategic plan and 10-year master plan. Formulate request strategy for the 2009-11 capital submittal.
February	SBCTC staff provide strategic and facility master planning training
March	Contract with Facility Condition Survey team
June	<i>Capital Budget Request Instructions sent to colleges</i>
July/August	SBCTC staff provide budget development training
December	Facility Condition Survey data due – used to establish targets
	Colleges submit Growth, Matching, Renovation and Replacement requests (PRR's)
January 2008	A Selection Committee scores and ranks PRR's by category
	WACTC reviews ranking and recommends size of request categories
February	SBCTC staff advise colleges of project ranking
March	2009-11 Capital Budget Request information to the State Board
	Capital Task Force begins discussions on sizing, priority setting and funding sources.
	WACTC discusses sizing categories and priority setting recommendations
April	Colleges submit their total capital budget request
	Evaluate and edit capital request documents, take care of problems and issues
May	Capital Task Force evaluates actual college capital budget requests, looks at future biennia impacts and sets system request level
	WACTC reviews Task Force information and provide comments
June	Capital Task Force makes final recommendations to SBCTC
	The State Board approves the capital budget
July	Predesign studies forwarded to OFM and Legislature by SBCTC staff
August	Staff prepares the capital budget request, briefing information, etc.
September	SBCTC staff submits the formal budget request to the Governor, Legislature and HECB
December	Governor makes budget recommendations to the Legislature
January – May 2009	Support legislative consideration of capital appropriations bill
May – June	Prepare and allocate 2009-11 capital appropriations and RMI funds to the colleges