



Community and Technical College Mission Study Summary of Findings to Date

June 19, 2009

Educational Attainment in Washington State

- Despite an overall high education level in Washington, the 36% of adults born in the state are less likely to have an Associates' degree or higher than those not born in the state
- Adults under 25 have less educational attainment if they are:
 - From low income families
 - Male
 - Have no high school diploma
 - Need English as a Second Language (ESL) training
- Adults 25 to 64 have less educational attainment if they are:
 - From rural Southwest and Central Washington
 - Hispanic or Native American
- Those adults less likely to attend college in Washington are:
 - Those in Central Washington communities and some Southwest Washington communities
 - Younger adults from lower income families
 - Males
 - Adults without a HS diploma or who need ESL training
 - While Hispanic or Native Americans attend college classes at parity with % in population, a higher than parity level participation is needed given current low education attainment levels.

Population Growth

- Due to population growth, about 45,000 additional students will seek enrollment in community and technical colleges by 2028 (about 22,000 additional FTEs)
- Overall enrollments will shift to an older student population
 - One fourth of the growth will be among traditional age college students
 - One fourth among younger adults (25-34 years old)
 - Half of the growth will come from adults 35 and older
- Applied bachelors degrees at community and technical colleges could grow to 2,400 students (1,900 FTEs) over the next 10 years

- To keep up with growing number of technical degrees earned and increase transfer opportunities for technical degree graduates
- Means broader range of degree programs, additional colleges

Needs of the Future Economy:

- Ratio of non-employer to employer firms will remain constant over next 20 years (2 : 1).
- Firms with 20 or more employees are 13% of employer firms, but account for 75% of employment. Firms with less than 20 employees are 87% of employer firms, but account for 25% of employment. This will remain constant for next 20 years.
- Sector growth in service industries over the next 20 years: health care; accommodations and food services; green engineering; waste remediation; utility infrastructure maintenance; high value-add manufacturing; computer networking; warehousing; law enforcement.
- Can shift the wage distribution curve up by increasing the participation rate of colleges.

21st Century Job Skills:

- 3 most important applied skills for new entrants in the workforce are: Professionalism/Work Ethic, Teamwork/Collaboration and Oral Communications.
- 2 skills increasing in importance: knowledge of foreign languages and creativity/innovation.

21st Century Learning:

- People and digital content are connected globally and everyone can participate—no existing business model or structure is immune
- Digital, online content and online courses are growing exponentially.
- Textbook costs continue to rise – and we can significantly reduce students’ textbook costs with open, free textbooks
- People and colleges are sharing their content through open educational resource initiatives.
 - WA education institutions could share all instructional digital resources including: courses, textbooks and library resources.
 - WA education institutions could use common teaching and learning, student services, and administrative technologies and support services.
 - We could design courses that enable and encourage students to contribute, change, remix course content.
- 21st Century education will focus on problem-solving rather than knowledge acquisition. Colleges may need to hire faculty who are process specialists rather than content specialists.
- 21st Century students will be seeking personalized, customized learning plans via “webways” designed by faculty and “mediated” by librarians. Someone else can host our IT, so we can focus on our core competencies

Lessons from Disrupting Class, Clayton Christensen:

- Disrupting innovations come from non-traditional innovators working on seemingly small or tangential issues that eventually change not only the way of doing business, but can change the very structure of the market and what is valued.
- We should expect such change in higher education. An example is student-centric learning based on user networks and open content separate and apart from planned curriculum in accredited higher education institutions.
- A digital, networked world creates a level playing field where disruptive innovations can flourish very quickly because millions of people have access to computers and the web. All it takes is an idea (e.g., <http://www.uopeople.com/>)
- We need to pay attention to the nontraditional innovations to avoid having change come “out of the blue.” The inherent threat is traditional structures typically don’t (or can’t) watch for disruptive innovations because (a) the disruptors are not the mainstream customers and (b) the disruptive innovations do not (at least initially) threaten the traditional products / services.

Governance:

- **Student perspective:** Single-college districts or multi-campus districts with one curriculum and common practices at all sites in the geographic area have an advantage for students. Students in an area that attend more than one college in multi-college districts can find the different courses and different practices confusing. Multi-college districts are required, for example, to have separate financial aid offices. Thus a student attending multiple colleges has the same issues as students who attend two separate single-college districts. Students identify with their campus –regardless of governance structure.
- **Community perspective:** Single districts are viewed as having more clout in the community. Where colleges serve the same overlapping community, clout is divided among the colleges.
- **Geography matters:** Some colleges are geographically isolated and thus gain the advantage of being the “only game in town.” Among colleges geographically close to each other but not in a single district there typically is a level of competition for students and local resources.
- **Program duplication:** The system’s program approval process addresses unnecessary duplication regardless of governance choice.
- **Cost effectiveness:** Lack of consensus regarding any differential between multi-campus versus multi-college cost effectiveness.

Expenditure Efficiencies:

- **20% spent on administration:** The share of total expenditures for administration (about 20%) is about the same across colleges and universities.
- **Expenditures per FTE vary because of # of staff per FTES.** UW and WSU spend 2.5 times more and regional universities spend 1.5 times more on total expenditures per FTES than CTCs spend. Higher administrative expenditures at universities is a result of more staff. Community and technical colleges have one-third fewer staff per student than universities have.
- **College size drives administrative spending per student.** The largest college districts spend less per student and the smallest college districts spend more. The primary variable in spending is the number of staff per student. Large colleges have fewer staff per student and smaller colleges have more staff per student.
- **Washington colleges spend less overall than their national peers.** The national average for administrative spending in FY 2006 was \$2,492 per student, while Washington's community and technical colleges spent an average of \$1,462.
- **Washington's colleges spend more on instruction** as a share of their budgets than their national peers. They spend slightly less on academic and institutional support, slightly more on facility operations and maintenance, and about the same on student services, when compared to their national peers.

Administrative Best Practices through Technology:

There are several promising strategies that embrace information technology (IT) best practices consistent with the vision outlined in the Strategic Technology Plan.

- **K-12 Enterprise Email Project (KEEP):** The KEEP consists of five strategic technologies that would shift the system out of back office email functions. The system is spending approximately \$2.5 million per year (25-27 FTEs) to manage over 100 email servers.
- **Enterprise Service Desk Project:** This strategy implements a system wide service desk. A service desk acts as a central point of contact for IT user's service requests. This tool helps IT manage users' needs more quickly and efficiently, gaining greater user satisfaction while at the same time reducing organizational costs. Today each college campus has one or more help desks or service desks. The system has increased support costs and the user experience differs from college to college due to a lack of common best practices.
- **Standardized Network Hardware Applications:** This strategy creates a single standard for network hardware appliances throughout the community and technical college system, resulting in increased security levels, economies of scale through common purchasing mechanisms, and common knowledge to reduce staff effort and costs. Network hardware appliances are used to inter-connect computers on campus and to access networks to the Internet and to the K-12 system. Our colleges have a wide variety of network appliances in differing states of repair and maintenance.

- **Database Consolidation and Administration:** This strategy creates an enterprise database environment to support the colleges' ad hoc database applications, providing increased system capabilities with a corresponding decrease in the required hardware, software, and support staff.
- **Enterprise Server Hosting:** This strategy centrally hosts and manages all enterprise servers used for CTC core system applications. Today's lack of a central hosting methodology increases IT infrastructure and staff costs for the entire system.

Lessons from Community College, The Unfinished Revolution, James Rosenbaum

- Private 2-year colleges (including for profit and nonprofit) serve similar students and have higher completion rates than public 2-year colleges (51% compared to 34%).
- Public 2-year colleges can adapt promising strategies used by private career schools to improve student outcomes and increase effectiveness.
 - Offer highly structured programs to attain explicit career goals within a distinct compressed time frame.
 - Expand procedures to help students access federal and state financial aid, guide student choices and prevent mistakes, such as intake advising for choosing programs, frequent mandatory advising, group advising, peer cohorts and student information systems.
 - Teach "soft skills" such as attendance, punctuality, self-presentation and communication, and work habits.
 - Offer job-search preparation, career advising, and resume and interview workshops, and help graduates find jobs.

Approaches Used by For-Profit Colleges and Universities, Loretta Seppanen and Cable Green

Other common choices made by for-profit institutions include:

- **Focused student population:** Such as working adults only.
- **Very focused high demand curriculum:** Focusing on applied curriculum – business, education, nursing, human services are common majors. Institutions require the same broad general education required at public colleges (selections of courses in humanities, social science, and natural science) but they offer a limited set of courses options in each area. Courses in the major mirror the major's courses offered at colleges and public universities.
- **Student as customer:** Plenty of parking, quality customer service, and quick resolution of customer service issues.
- **Customer relationship management tools:** Tracking prospective students from the first contact, with the goal of placing them in a program that meets their needs and makes them feel like valued customers.
- **Strong advising:** Helping students apply for financial aid and providing hands on academic counseling.
- **Course schedule:** Setting institutional calendars and class schedule based on the population served.

- **Focusing on removing barriers to success:** Identifying linchpin courses and focusing resources on increased tutoring in those courses.
- **Unbundled faculty functions:** Approaching the teaching function with a goal of lowest cost with most effectiveness by unbundling the traditional faculty roles, with classroom faculty focused on delivering subject matter, assessing student learning, and helping students understand materials tailored to their individual learning styles/levels of understanding. Designing courses using curriculum development managers and standardized course templates, where faculty are permitted to personalize courses.
- **Faculty development:** Offering professional development opportunities, encouraging adjunct faculty to participate in department meetings, and providing online faculty lounges for sharing ideas.
- **Driving decisions through analytics:** Using systems to gather information on academic processes and provide feedback for continuous improvement.