Retreat dress is casual, jeans welcome.

**Monday, September 8 – Retreat**

12:00 p.m.  Welcome, Introductions, and Lunch  
*Beth Willis, Chair*

1:05 p.m.  Executive Session  
*To review the performance of a public employee*

5:00 p.m.  Adjournment

6:00 p.m.  Dinner Meeting for State Board Members and Executive Director

**Tuesday, September 9 – Retreat**

8:30 a.m.  Breakfast and Open Government Training Act  
*Facilitated by John Boesenberg*

9:30 a.m.  Break

9:45 a.m.  Welcome, Introductions, and Retreat Overview  
*Beth Willis, Chair*

10:00 a.m.  Combined Mission and Direction  
*Discussion facilitated by Marty Brown*

11:15 a.m.  WACTC Allocation Recommendations  
*Discussion facilitated by Denise Graham, Ed Brewster, and Nick Lutes*

12:30 p.m.  Lunch

1:30 p.m.  Basic Education for Adults: A Proposed Funding Model to Promote Excellence in Outcomes  
*Discussion facilitated by Jon Kerr, Nick Lutes, and Alison Grazzini*

3:00 p.m.  Role of Community and Technical Colleges in Baccalaureate Degree Production  
*Discussion facilitated by Joyce Hammer and Darby Kaikkonen*

4:30 p.m.  Adjournment

5:30 p.m.  Dinner Meeting for State Board Members and Retreat Participants  
*Twanoh Room*
Wednesday, September 10 – Business Meeting

8:00 a.m. Breakfast
Room B & C

9:00 a.m. Welcome and Call to Order
Beth Willis, Chair

9:05 a.m. Adoption of Business Meeting Agenda
Action

9:10 a.m. Approval of Consent Agenda
Action  Tab 5
  a) State Board Meeting Minutes: June 19, 2014
  b) Edmonds Community College, Increase Local Expenditure Authority, Gateway Hall
     Resolution 14-09-49
  c) Columbia Basin College, Local Expenditure Authority, Social Science Center
     Resolution 14-09-50
  d) Columbia Basin College, Certificate of Participation, HSC Building at Richland
     Resolution 14-09-51
  e) Centralla College, Acquisition of Vacated Streets for Parking
     Resolution 14-09-52
  f) Yakima Valley Community College, Property Acquisition
     Resolution 14-09-53
  g) Bellevue College, Local Expenditure Authority, Upgrade Athletic Fields and Facilities
     Resolution 14-09-54
  h) Clark College, Local Expenditure Authority, STEM Building
     Resolution 14-09-55
  i) Wenatchee Valley College, Local Expenditure Authority, Property Acquisition
     Resolution 14-09-56
  j) Lower Columbia College, Certificate of Participation, Fitness Center/Myklebust Gymnasium
     Resolution 14-09-57
  k) Clark College, Certificate of Participation, Culinary Arts Facility
     Resolution 14-09-58

9:15 a.m. Consideration of Revised Baccalaureate Approval Process
Resolution 14-09-59
Joyce Hammer
Action  Tab 6

9:45 a.m. Public Hearing: Revisions to WAC 131-28-025 Governing the method of assessing tuition and fee charges for competency based education programs
Resolution 14-09-60
Denise Graham and Jan Yoshiwara
Action  Tab 7

10:15 a.m. Consideration of 2015-17 Operating Budget Request
Resolution 14-09-61
Nick Lutes
Action  Tab 8

10:45 a.m. Math Acceleration Strategic Plan Update
Discuss  Tab 9
Wayne Martin, Elizabeth Chen, and Jan Yoshiwara

11:30 a.m. Adjournment
System Direction – Mission Study Targets and Dashboard Indicators

Brief Description
The State Board adopted the System Direction in 2006 with three major goals related to economic demand, student success and innovation. The System Direction has served as the framework for the Board’s work. In 2010, the Board adopted ten recommendations for the Mission Study “to find more and better ways to reduce barriers and expand opportunities so more Washingtonians can reach higher levels of education.” Each recommendation has a twenty-year target for where the system should be in 2030 to meet the three major goals in the System Direction. Intermediate benchmarks are also mapped.

Last year at the Board retreat, the Board asked for a dashboard with access and success indicators for 11 contemporary issues of interest to the Board. Many of these indicators fall within the ten recommendations for the Mission Study. New areas such as serving veterans are also added.

Both the Washington Student Achievement Council Roadmap and the Governor’s Results Washington have also put forth goals for the higher education system. Results Washington establishes our system’s share. The Roadmap has yet to do so.

How does this link to the System Design, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
The targets and indicators are the performance metrics for the Mission Study and the Board’s dashboard. These metrics show annual progress toward the intermediate benchmarks and long term targets. The Board dashboard also measures annual performance growth.

The timeframes established for each set of indicators are somewhat different. However, together they describe a similar set of circumstances, challenges and opportunities for the system and higher education as a whole.

Background Information and Analysis
Many of the indicators have an enrollment base that is required in order to accomplish the longer term Mission Study goal. Targets were set before the economic downturn. With the economy in recovery, smaller high school graduating classes and college enrollments declining, the system has fallen behind in many access and success areas. This suggests that enrollment growth without policy action will be insufficient to meet our long-term goals. Some of our Mission Study targets also need to be reviewed in light of the goals, indicators and timeframes that were subsequently identified in the Roadmap and Results Washington.

Potential Questions
• What is the current performance of the system for the Mission Study goals and the Board dashboard?

Recommendation/Preferred Result
This year we should review our twenty-year goals for the current post-recession circumstances.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: David Prince, Research Director
360-704-4347, dprince@sbctc.edu
**Mission and Direction**

Better Jobs, Brighter Futures, a Stronger Washington

---

**Mission Study**

(2010-2030)

1. Serve more people
2. Close skills gap for technically trained
3. Increase funding for adult basic skills
4. Contribute to tac-caluare production
5. Partner with P-20 to create easy-to-navigate pathways
6. Use performance measures and funding as incentives to improve retention and achievement
7. Invest in faculty and staff excellence
8. 21st century learning infrastructure
9. Promote web-based and mobile technology for learning and online services
10. Devote larger share of system resources to teaching and learning by making smarter use of technology and promoting efficiencies

---

**System Direction**

- **Student Success**
  - Point 1
  - Point 3

- **Student Success**
  - Point 2
  - Point 3

- **Economic Development**
  - Point 5

- **Student Success Innovation**
  - Point 5
  - Point 8

---

**Mission Study Action Plan**

**Statewide Attainment Goals**

**(2013-2023)**

1. All Adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a high school diploma or equivalent.
2. At least 70 percent of all adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a postsecondary credential.

---

**Results Washington**

**(2013-2017)**

**Success**

1. Increase graduates in academic transfer STEM
2. Increase earning awards in high employer demand professional-technical programs
3. Increase adult basic education and English-as-a-second-language students
4. Increase postsecondary graduates who, during the third quarter after graduation are enrolled in postsecondary education or training or are employed in Washington

**Access**

1. Increase students who are enrolled in academic STEM courses
2. Increase students who are enrolled in high employer demand professional-technical programs
3. Increase students who access online and hybrid classes

---

**Vision**

Building strong communities, individuals and families, and achieve greater global competitiveness and prosperity for the state and its economy by raising the knowledge and skills of the state’s residents.

---

**Principles**

- The State Board will build upon the strengths and successes of the college system.
- Policy Direction and investments are centered upon student needs, student diversity, the impact of new technologies, and enhancing students’ knowledge, skills and educational attainment.
- Talented faculty and staff representing the state’s diversity are essential to student success.
- To meet the changing needs of our communities, the college system will continue to leverage new and existing public investments by partnering with local organizations and repositioning programs and services.

---

**2023 State Wide Attainment Goals**

**(2013-2023)**

1. All Adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a high school diploma or equivalent.
2. At least 70 percent of all adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a postsecondary credential.

---

**Results Washington**

**(2013-2017)**

**Success**

1. Increase graduates in academic transfer STEM
2. Increase earning awards in high employer demand professional-technical programs
3. Increase adult basic education and English-as-a-second-language students
4. Increase postsecondary graduates who, during the third quarter after graduation are enrolled in postsecondary education or training or are employed in Washington

**Access**

1. Increase students who are enrolled in academic STEM courses
2. Increase students who are enrolled in high employer demand professional-technical programs
3. Increase students who access online and hybrid classes

---

**Support implementation of Common Core testing to measure successful transition to higher education without remediation.**

---

**To ensure student success, adopt a system-wide approach to improving faculty and staff salaries.**

---

**Advocate for adequate state funding and minimize tuition for students.**

---

**Increase communication and partnerships across the community and technical college system and business, labor, and other stakeholders to strengthen the overall goals and mission.**

---

**Export our system’s best practices in a national context to understand and move forward the national dialogue on community and technical colleges.**

---

**Export our system’s best practices in a national context to understand and move forward the national dialogue on community and technical colleges.**

---

**Export our system’s best practices in a national context to understand and move forward the national dialogue on community and technical colleges.**
Mission and Direction
Better Jobs, Brighter Futures, a Stronger Washington

**Mission Study (2010-2030)**
1. Serve more people
2. Close skills gap for technically trained
3. Increase funding for adult basic skills
4. Contribute to baccalaureate production
5. Partner with P-20 to create easy-to-navigate pathways
6. Use performance measures and funding as incentives to improve retention and achievement
7. Invest in faculty and staff excellence
8. 21st century learning infrastructure
9. Promote web-based and mobile technology for eLearning and online services
10. Devote larger share of system resources to teaching and learning by making smarter use of technology and promoting efficiencies

**Vision**
Building strong communities, individuals and families, and achieve greater global competitiveness and prosperity for the state and its economy by raising the knowledge and skills of the state’s residents.

**Principles**
- The State Board will build upon the strengths and successes of the college system.
- Policy Direction and investments are centered upon student needs, student diversity, the impact of new technologies, and enhancing students’ knowledge, skills and educational attainment.
- Talented faculty and staff representing the state’s diversity are essential to student success.
- To meet the changing needs of our communities, the college system will continue to leverage new and existing public investments by partnering with local organizations and reprioritizing programs and services.

**2023 State Wide Attainment Goals (2013-2023)**
1. All Adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a high school diploma or equivalent.
2. At least 70 percent of all adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a post-secondary credential.

**System Direction**
- Student Success
- Economic Development

**Mission Study Action Plan**
- Point 6
- Point 2
- Point 1
- Point 2
- Point 1
- Point 3
- Point 3
- Point 9
- Point 4

**Statewide Attainment Goals**
- Goals 1 & 2
- Goal 2
- Goal 1
- Goals 1 & 2
- Goals 1 & 2
- Goals 1 & 2
- Goal 2
- Goal 2

- Success 1, 2, 3
- Success 2
- Success 1
- Success 2, 3
- Success 2 & 4
- Access 1, 2, 3
- Access 1, 2, 3
- Access 1, 2, 3
- Access 1, 2, 3
- Success 3
- Access 3
- Success 1

**Dash Board**
- Increase Student Achievement Points per person
- Increase workforce awards per student enrolled
- Increase transfer degrees per student enrolled
- Increase post-secondary attainment for Washingtonians of color
- Successfully return Worker Retraining students to work and assure that Worker Training capacity is adequate for demand
- Serve veterans, active military and dependents at least equal to their percent of state population
- Increase the number of people in basic education programs
- Increase enrollments in programs that combine basic skills, English language, academic and job skills training
- Increase the percent of basic skills that move beyond basic skills
- Increase eLearning enrollments
- Increase our production of baccalaureate degrees
Vision

Build strong communities, individuals, and families and achieve greater global competitiveness and prosperity for the state and its economy by raising the knowledge and skills of the state’s residents.

Principles

- The State Board will build upon the existing strengths and successes of the college system.
- Policy direction and investments are centered upon student needs, student diversity, the impact of new technologies, and enhancing students’ knowledge, skills, and educational attainment.
- Talented faculty and staff representing the state’s diversity are essential to student success.
- To meet the changing needs of our communities, the college system will continue to leverage new and existing public investments through partnerships with local organizations and reprioritization of programs and services.

Ten-Year Goals (2008)

- **Student Success**
  
  Achieve increased educational attainment for all residents across the state:
  
  - Enroll more underserved populations.
  - Improve academic achievement for all students.
  - Ensure community and technical college is affordable and accessible, especially for basic skills and part-time students, by developing bold, creative, and innovative methods, including low tuition, need based tuition waivers and restructured financial aid.
  - Provide smooth transitions from K12 to colleges to universities.
  - Expand the pipeline to associate and bachelor’s degrees, particularly in math, science, engineering and health sciences.
• **Economic Demand**
  Strengthen state and local economies by meeting the demands for a well-educated and skilled workforce.
  - Continually reassess the knowledge and skills needed for a thriving economy at local and state levels.
  - Meet the needs of changing local economies by increasing the number of skilled employees in the areas of greatest unmet need.
  - Support strategic industries by appropriately focusing program growth and development.
  - Meet the unique needs of innovative, entrepreneurial people who are operating small businesses, working as creative, independent contractors in the knowledge-based society.
  - Be responsive to the changing needs of the business community by offering high quality, relevant, flexible programs.

• **Innovation**
  Use technology, collaboration, and innovation to meet the demands of the economy and improve student success:
  - Recognize and adapt to the changing nature of how people learn, how they access information and communication by making technological advancement part of the system’s strategic direction.
  - Ensure state-of-the-art, lifelong education that is relevant, convenient, and efficient.
  - Produce better education that meets the needs of local communities by taking full advantage of cost-effective partnerships and leveraging outside resources.
  - Accomplishment of these goals rests upon the shoulders of our faculty and staff. They are essential to innovation in our colleges.

**Mission Study Action Plan (2010)**

While other nations are increasing the educational attainment of new generations of citizens, the U.S. and Washington are not. Instead, the percentage that is well-educated stagnates or even declines.

• Serve more people, including groups who have been underserved in the past.
• Close the statewide skills gap for technically trained workers.
• Increase funding for adult basic skills programs.
• Contribute more to the production of baccalaureate degrees.
• Work with our partners in the P-20 education system to create seamless, easy-to-navigate pathways for all students.
• Use performance measures and funding as incentives to improve student retention and achievement.
• Invest in sustaining faculty and staff.
• Build a 21st century learning infrastructure.
• Promote the adoption of web-based and mobile technology tools for eLearning and online student services.
• Devote a larger share of system resources to teaching and learning by making smarter use of technology and promoting efficiencies in college direct governance.

**Dash Board Measures (2013)**

• Increase Student Achievement points per student (ACTION PLAN PT. 6)
In 2009-10 system-wide our Student Achievement points per student enrolled were 1.59. This increased to 1.69 points per student in 2012-13.
Measure of success = more than 1.69 points per student to take into account changes in enrollment.

• Increase workforce awards (completion of professional-technical degrees, apprenticeships, and certificates of at least 20 credits) per student enrolled (ACTION PLAN PT. 2)
In 2009-10 system wide 18 students per 100 earned awards which increased to 21 students per 100 students enrolled in 2012-13.
Measure of success = more than 21 students awarded per 100 enrolled to take into account changes in enrollment.

• Increase transfer degrees awarded per student enrolled (ACTION PLAN PT. 4)
In 2012-13 we awarded 14 students transfer degrees for every 100 enrolled, up from 12 per 100 enrolled in 2009-10.
Measure of success = more than 14 per 100 transfer students enrolled to take into account changes in enrollment.

• Increase post-secondary attainment for Washingtonians of color (ACTION PLAN PT. 1)
Award production is currently 16 per 100 white students enrolled, 15 per 100 Asian students, 12 per 100 Hispanics, 11 per 100 African Americans, 13 per 100 Native Americans, and 14 per 100 other race students.
Measure of success = award production per 100 students for lowest producing groups is raised to highest producing group level.

• Successfully return Worker Retraining students to work and assure that Worker Retraining capacity is adequate for student demand (ACTION PLAN PT. 2)
Worker Retraining FTE enrollments closely follow employment rates. If unemployment spikes then strains can occur in capacity. Conversely, as rates slowly come down or moderate there is less demand.

Measure of success = system meets all its performance goals in 2013-14

- Serve veterans, active military and their dependents at least equal to their percent of the state population (ACTION PLAN PT. 1)
  6.5 percent of our award-seeking students are veterans. 6.2 percent of the state population is veterans in college-going ages of 18-54 years.
  Measure of success = continue to serve a higher percentage of veterans than the state population of veterans.

- Increase the number of students in adult basic education programs (ACTION PLAN PT. 1)
  2012-13 FTE enrollments were 19,912 down from a high of 23,250 in 2009-10.
  Measure of success = more than 19,912 enrollments

- Increase enrollments in programs that combine basic skills, English language, academic and jobs skills training (ACTION PLAN PT. 3)
  I-BEST enrollments were 1,750 FTES in 2012-13, up from 1,674 FTES in 2011-12.
  Measure of success = more than 1,750 enrollments

- Increase the percent of basic skills students that move beyond basic skills (ACTION PLAN PT. 3)
  13 percent of current and former basic skills transitioned to pre-college and college courses in 2012-13, up from 10 percent in 2009-10.
  Measure of success = transition rate higher than 13 percent in 2013-14

- Increase eLearning enrollments (ACTION PLAN PT. 9)
  2012-13 online and hybrid course enrollments were 38,910 FTES, up from 26,483 FTES in 2008-09.
  Measure of success = more than 38,910 online and hybrid course enrollments

- Increase our production of baccalaureate degrees (ACTION PLAN PT. 4)
  In 2013 our colleges awarded 192 baccalaureate degrees, up from 35 in 2009.
  Measure of success = 240 or more baccalaureates awarded in 2013-14

### 2023 Statewide Attainment Goals (2014)

- All adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a high school diploma or equivalent.
- At least 70 percent of all adults, 25-44 years of age in Washington, will have a postsecondary credential.
Governor Inslee’s Results Washington (2014)

Goal 1: World Class Education

Every child deserves a world class education that prepares him or her for a healthy, productive life. We have developed preliminary outcome measures that focus on increasing access to education to provide every student with 21st century skills to succeed in school, job, career, and communities.

Community and Technical College Indicators: Access

- Increase the number of students who are enrolled in academic STEM courses in public community and technical colleges from 41,936 in 2012-13 to 42,775 by 2016-17.
- Increase the number of students who are enrolled in high employer demand professional-technical programs in public community and technical colleges from 40,759 in 2012-13 to 41,574 in 2016-17.
- Increase the number of students entering public higher education who access online and hybrid classes in public community and technical colleges from 186,232 in 2012-13 to 189,957 in 2016-17.

Community and Technical College Indicators: Success

- Increase the number of graduates in academic transfer STEM in public community and technical colleges from 1,987 in 2012-13 to 2,017 in 2016-17.
- Increase the number of students earning awards in high employer demand professional-technical programs in public community and technical colleges from 12,359 in 2012-13 to 12,790 in 2016-17.
- Increase the percent of adult basic education and English-as-a-second-language students in public community and technical colleges who transition to pre-college or college-level within two years from 12 percent in 2010-11 to 15 percent in 2016-17.
- Increase the percentage of postsecondary graduates from public community and technical colleges who, during the third quarter after graduation are either enrolled in postsecondary education or training or are employed in Washington from 80 percent in 2012-13 to 82 percent in 2016-17.

State Board Policy Focus (2013)

- Adopt an allocation model that increases student success and ensures access to low income, basics skills, English language, and academic and job skills students.
  - Goal = allocation model ready for implementation by 2015 academic year
• To ensure student success, adopt a system-wide approach to improving faculty and staff salaries.
  o Partner with trustees, presidents, faculty, and staff to achieve a consensus on how we increase salaries.
  o Goal = reach accord on going to Legislature in 2015 with an agreed approach to increasing salaries

• Advocate for adequate state funding and minimize tuition for students.
  o Goal = increased funding resulting in no need for tuition increases

• Increase communication and partnerships across the community and technical college system and business, labor, and other stakeholders to strengthen the overall goals and mission
  o Goal = The entire system will be included in the development of the legislative agenda, other legislative-related activities, system-wide communication plans and decisions on innovative policy initiatives impacting colleges and every board meeting will have students participate.

• Support implementation of Common Core testing to measure successful transition to higher education without remediation.
  o Goal = agreement on using the Common Core test for college placement

• Export our system’s best practices in a national context to understand and move forward the national dialogue on community and technical colleges
  o Goal = more recognition of our great programs

**Other Board Issues**

Implement the first wave of ctcLink. (Scheduled for fall of 2014)

Develop and implement at least one competency based degree by the fall of 2015. (Scheduled for January 2015)

Increase the number of low income students receiving need-based aid in our system.
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
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Mission Study Action Plan and State Board Dashboard
Student Access and Success Indicators
Trends Over Time

State Board Community and Technical Colleges
September 2014 Retreat
Trends Over Time

Today’s presentation shows trends in access and success for the Mission Study Goals and Board dashboard.

- Charts show two symbols.
- First (arrow) symbol represents the long term trend from the first year shown to the most recent year.
- Second symbol represents the most recent one-year trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trend Direction</th>
<th>Long trend from first year to most recent year</th>
<th>One-year trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>![Positive Trend Arrow]</td>
<td>![Positive Trend Arrow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>![Flat Trend Arrow]</td>
<td>![Flat Trend Arrow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>![Negative Trend Arrow]</td>
<td>![Negative Trend Arrow]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access:
• Following the recovering economy and demographics, overall FTE enrollments are declining.
• Despite the overall decline groups within overall enrollments are growing or maintaining - I-BEST, BAS, e-Learning and veterans.

Student Progress and Success:
• Total student achievement, transfers and graduates following enrollments are starting to plateau or decline.
• Efficiency for achievement points and completions per students served is maintaining or increasing.

Going forward:
• Future enrollment growth will come from non-traditional older students and students of color.
• Meeting goals for transfers and graduates will require both greater efficiency and enrollment growth.
Growth in state funded enrollments
State Board Mission Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>147,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>159,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>161,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>152,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>146,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>142,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increase enrollments in basic education

Increase Enrollments in Basic Education State FTES
State Board Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>21,570</td>
<td>19,653</td>
<td>19,912</td>
<td>19,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expand programs that combine basic skills, English language, academic and jobs skills training

Increase Enrollments for Integrated Basic Skills (I-BEST, All Funds)
State Board Dashboard

• I-BEST is an important means to transition students beyond Basic Education. FTES increased 16% last year.
As part of effective transitions, work with P-20 partners to create seamless pathways for students.

Running Start will increase by 35%.
State Board Mission Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Running Start FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>13,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>13,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>16,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promote adoption of technology and web-based tools for eLearning and student services

Every student will enroll in at least one eLearning class by 2030

State Board Mission Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Online FTES</th>
<th>Hybrid FTES (mixed online and in-person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>16,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,708</td>
<td>19,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9,775</td>
<td>20,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10,376</td>
<td>20,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10,742</td>
<td>20,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11,973</td>
<td>21,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>49,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>62,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>81,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serve worker retraining students commensurate with needs in the economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>WRT FTES Enrollment</th>
<th>Calendar Year Unemployment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>8,462</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>12,738</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>13,403</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>11,152</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>9,188</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate thru May 2014*
Serve more veterans, active duty and their dependents

Veterans, Active Duty and Dependents
Annual FTES (All Funds)
State Board Dashboard

2012-13
- 12,347 FTES
- 62%
- 13%
- 18%
- 8%

2013-14
- 12,298 FTES
- 67%
- 8%
- 18%
- 6%

Active Duty
Dependent
Veteran Not Receiving Benefits
Veteran Receiving Benefits
Increase the number of students receiving need based aid
Use performance measures and funding as incentives to improve student retention and achievement.
Use performance measures and funding as incentives to improve student retention and achievement.

Colleges will increase total achievement 60% by 2030
State Board Mission Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Basic Skills Points</th>
<th>Pre-College Points</th>
<th>College Points</th>
<th>College Math Points</th>
<th>Total Projected for Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>543,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>565,649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>535,294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>515,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>608,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>714,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>792,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>870,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educate more Washingtonians for good jobs through degrees, certificates (20+ credits) and apprenticeships- History

Educate More Washingtonians for Good Jobs
State Board Dashboard

![Bar chart showing progress in educating more Washingtonians for good jobs through degrees, certificates, and apprenticeships. The chart displays headcount and awards made from 2009-10 to 2012-13, with a steady increase from 17% to 20% of students educated annually.]
Contribute more to the production of baccalaureate degrees

The number of students who transfer will need to increase by 25%.
State Board Mission Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Transfers to 4 Years</th>
<th>Applied Baccalaureate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17,931</td>
<td>17,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18,946</td>
<td>18,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>19,358</td>
<td>19,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20,178</td>
<td>20,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>21,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prepare more students for transfer with the transfer degree.

Transfer Students Enrolled and Awards Made
State Board Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort headcount</th>
<th>Awards Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>9 per 100 students</td>
<td>10 per 100 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>10 per 100 students</td>
<td>11 per 100 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>11 per 100 students</td>
<td>12 per 100 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>12 per 100 students</td>
<td>11 per 100 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 2,000 4,000 6,000 8,000 10,000 12,000 14,000
0 20,000 40,000 60,000 80,000 100,000 120,000 140,000

2009-10 2010-11 2011-12 2012-13

Cohort headcount Awards Made
Increase our production of baccalaureate degrees while maintaining our core mission.

Bachelor of Applied Science
State Board Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAS Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Student Enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>446</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- 2009-10
- 2010-11
- 2011-12
- 2012-13
- 2013-14
Increase post secondary attainment for Washingtonians of color

Total Awards Made by Student Race and Ethnicity
State Board Dashboard

- Asian/Pacific Islander: 2,642 (2009-10), 2,947 (2010-11), 1,402 (2011-12), 1,679 (2012-13)
- Black: 1,948 (2009-10), 1,948 (2010-11), 2,532 (2011-12), 2,532 (2012-13)
Close gaps in disparity for race/ethnic groups for award production.

Awards Made per 100 Students by Race/Ethnicity
State Board Dashboard

- Black: 10 (2009-10), 11 (2010-11)
- Hispanic: 11 (2009-10), 12 (2010-11)
- Native American: 10 (2009-10), 13 (2010-11)
- Other, Multiracial: 12 (2009-10), 14 (2010-11)
- White: 14 (2009-10), 16 (2010-11)
WACTC Allocation Recommendations

Brief Description
WACTC has completed its nearly year-long effort to review the methods used to allocate state general fund operating dollars to the community and technical colleges. WACTC is recommending that the State Board make significant changes to the allocation model, including increasing the amount allocated based on the Student Achievement Initiative and using allocations to provide incentives to offer Basic Skills courses and high cost, priority courses and programs. (See Attachment A, WACTC Recommendations on Allocations.)

How does this link to the System Design, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
The Board’s 2013-14 policy focus includes the following: “Adopt an allocation model that increases student success, and ensures access to low income, basic skills, English language, and academic and job skills students.”

Background Information and Analysis
The Legislature appropriates state operating funding for the community and technical colleges to the State Board. It is the Board’s responsibility to determine how those state dollars are distributed across the system.

Allocation methodologies can be divided into three categories: performance, base plus/minus, and formula. (See Attachment B, Primary Allocation Methodologies Values Matrix.) Since 2000, the Board’s primary allocation methodology has been base plus/minus: Colleges retain base funding from one year to the next and incremental changes are driven primarily by changes in the legislative budget. A base plus/minus allocation model provides stability and predictability in funding for districts. Additionally, decisions made by one district (e.g., to increase enrollments) do not impact funding for other districts. The base plus/minus methodology, however, is slow to respond to changes in enrollment patterns among districts and does not recognize different costs for different programs. Over time, this results in disparities in funding among colleges that cannot be explained.

In response to increasing concerns regarding such disparities, WACTC created its Allocation and Accountability Task Force in the fall of 2013. (See Attachment C for an overview of Task Force membership and meetings.) After reviewing system financial and enrollment data, the Task Force, staff by the State Board identified the following problems with the current base allocation model:

1. The current system does not put enough money into performance.
2. There is too much of a difference in funding per FTE student across the system and those differences cannot be explained.
3. There is no recognition of different costs for different programs or mission areas.
4. District enrollment targets are not adjusted in any meaningful way – some districts are chronically over-enrolled, some under.
5. There is not enough focus on funded district service levels (district enrollment targets as percent of district population).

(See Attachment D, WACTC 2014 Allocation Recommendations to the State Board - Briefing, for data on each problem statement.) The Task Force determined that the first problem could be addressed by increasing the amount allocated based on the Student Achievement Initiative. They also determined the current model could not adequately address the remaining problems and that a formula allocation model should be used instead. A formula allocation model can be more responsive to changes in
enrollment patterns and can also recognize different costs for different programs. (For a summary of the Task Force discussion on the benefits and drawbacks of a formula allocation model, see Attachment B, Primary Allocation Methodologies Values Matrix.)

After receiving the Task Force’s report at their July retreat, WACTC voted to adopt the recommendations to the State Board contained in Attachment A, WACTC Recommendations on Allocations. The recommendations include:

- Increasing the amount allocated based on the Student Achievement Initiative
- Providing a minimum operating allocation to each college
- Allocating the remaining funds based on a weighted-enrollment funding formula that:
  - is more responsive to increases and decreases in district enrollments
  - provides incentive to offer Basic Skills courses
  - provides incentive to offer high cost, priority courses

WACTC also identified the following additional implementation issues to be assigned to WACTC committees:

- Percent of allocation to be based on the Student Achievement Initiative
- The method for identifying high cost, priority courses for enrollment weighting
- The weighting factor for high cost, priority enrollments and for Basic Skills enrollments
- Stop loss and stop gain percentages
- Timing for implementation

If adopted, WACTC’s recommended allocation model has the potential to significantly impact the funding available to some districts. The answers to the remaining implementation issues will determine the impacts on each district and the timing of the impacts.

**Potential Questions**

- Does WACTC’s recommended allocation model better align the distribution of funds with the Board’s policy objectives?
- Does the Board wish to see any changes to the allocation model recommended by WACTC?
- What portion of state funding should be allocated each year based on the Student Achievement Initiative?
- If adopted, when should the new allocation model be implemented? What are the pros and cons of implementing the new model beginning with fiscal year 2016 (which begins next July) versus beginning with fiscal year 2017?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**

WACTC’s recommendations to change the current system of allocating operating funding to the community and technical colleges will be discussed.

Policy Manual Change  ☐ No  ☒

Prepared by: Denise Graham, Deputy Executive Director, Finance Division
360 704-4350, dgraham@sbctc.edu
WACTC Recommendations on Allocations

WACTC voted to adopt the following recommendations from the Allocation and Accountability Task Force:

I. To address the identified allocation system problems, WACTC recommends to the State Board the adoption of an allocation formula that contains the following elements:
   A. Performance:
      1. Increase the amount of funding allocated based on the Student Achievement Initiative to at least five percent and not more than 10 percent of state appropriations to the community and technical college system, utilizing the metrics adopted by WACTC and the State Board in 2012.
      2. Of the funding allocated based on the Student Achievement Initiative, allocate 45 percent based on total points less completions, 10 percent based on completions, and 45 percent based on points per student.
   B. Fixed Costs: Allocate to all colleges a $2.85 million “minimum operating allocation” (MOA) to recognize the fixed, minimum costs needed to run a college. The flat MOA acts as a small college adjustment factor.
   C. Access: Allocate enrollment funding based on a weighted-enrollment funding formula including the following elements:
      1. Allocations should be based on the lesser of three-year average actual enrollments or three-year target enrollments. Enrollment FTE and funding should be taken from under-enrolled districts and redistributed to over-enrolled districts.
      2. ABE enrollments should be weighted to reflect the lack of tuition revenue and to provide incentive to offer ABE courses. If the Legislature adopts the caseload funding methodology for ABE as proposed in the system’s 2015-17 budget/policy request, this recommendation will be revisited and adjusted accordingly.
      3. Enrollments in high-cost, priority courses should be weighted to provide incentive to offer high cost, priority courses. The high cost, priority courses to be weighted will be identified through data analysis and a survey conducted every four years. The weighting factor should be set at a value considered sufficient to encourage districts to offer high cost, priority courses.

II. In recognizing high cost, priority enrollments for additional weighting, the following principles will be used:
   A. Districts should receive more state funding for FTE enrollments in courses that are both high cost and a priority for the college/system.
   B. The additional funding is not intended to reimburse actual costs. Instead, the purpose of allocating more state funding for enrollments in high cost, priority courses is to provide a financial incentive to offer such courses despite their high cost.
III. The remaining implementation issues will be assigned to the appropriate WACTC committees to make recommendations to WACTC in time to apply the new allocation model within the 2015-17 biennium. Remaining issues include:
   A. Percent of allocation to be based on the Student Achievement Initiative
   B. The method for identifying high cost, priority courses for enrollment weighting
   C. The weighting factor for high cost, priority enrollments and for ABE enrollments
   D. Stop loss and stop gain percentages
   E. Timing for implementation

IV. WACTC’s Critical Issues Committee will examine current rules regarding coding international students and make recommendations to WACTC.

V. The following will be excluded from consideration in the allocation of state funds:
   A. Tuition revenues (except the lack of tuition revenues from ABE students should be taken into account)
   B. Local fees
   C. International Contract Enrollments
   D. Headcount
   E. Running Start Students
   F. Contract and self-support enrollments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value Statement</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Method:</strong></td>
<td>Most of the funding in our current allocation system is allocated this way. Districts must hit certain enrollment targets or risk losing funding. Fairness is operationalized by having a rational basis for distributing new funds. Equity has been defined by the regression line, which takes into account state enrollment targets in calculating an ideal per FTE funding for each district. New funding has periodically been allocated to colleges below the regression line.</td>
<td>Access, enrollments, stability, local decision making, and independence of college budgets from decisions of other colleges.</td>
<td>• Focus is on providing access to students.</td>
<td>• Focus is not on student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base plus, with enrollments as accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides incentive to maintain enrollments at least at target levels.</td>
<td>• Per FTE state funding varies widely for no apparent reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus is on local decision making.</td>
<td>• District enrollment targets are not adjusted in any meaningful way – some districts chronically over-enrolled, some under-enrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Districts do not compete with one another for current funding.</td>
<td>• Lack of annual or periodic adjustments to enrollment targets (and related funding) results in uneven distribution of funded district service levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• College budgets are relatively stable from year to year (barring system budget reductions from legislature).</td>
<td>• Does not recognize varying costs/revenues of different mission areas and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local decisions regarding over-enrollment, mission mix, etc., do not impact other colleges.</td>
<td>• No adjustments to distribution of funding among colleges in absence of new funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Aligns with how the legislature appropriates most of system funding.</td>
<td>• Provides few levers to promote specific statewide educational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Periodic allocation of new funding for districts below the regression line attempts to equalize per target FTES funding based on college size.</td>
<td>• Does not provide incentives to offer high cost workforce programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not provide incentives to enroll ABE students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Enrollment Funding Formula</strong></td>
<td>With a funding formula, more funding can be provided for certain types of enrollments. Weighting can be used to ensure more funding for high cost programs or as a policy lever to incent colleges to enroll certain types of students (e.g., ABE).</td>
<td>Generally, focus is on access. More responsive to changes in enrollment patterns among districts (total state enrollments and enrollments by specific programs). Weighting specific types of enrollments provides incentives to increase those types of enrollments.</td>
<td>• Weighting enrollments can be used to promote specific, statewide policy goals (e.g., increase ABE and STEM).</td>
<td>• Local decisions impact funding for all districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Weighting enrollments can be used to more accurately reflect the relative costs of different types of enrollments, e.g., high cost workforce.</td>
<td>• Districts compete with one another for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Formulas are responsive to changes in enrollment patterns across the state (total state enrollments and enrollments by weighted types of enrollments).</td>
<td>• Lack of stability and predictability in district budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Formulas can recognize higher costs per student for small districts (i.e., base costs to run a college)</td>
<td>• Lack of transparency and understanding of formulas and inputs can be an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can include hold-harmless provisions to decrease funding instability.</td>
<td>• Requires close monitoring of data used to drive out money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall System Design: Primary Allocation Methodologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value Statement</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance – Student</td>
<td>Colleges receive funding based on Total Points, Completions, and Points</td>
<td>Funds based on outcomes (student achievement) rather than inputs (enrollments).</td>
<td>- Focus is on student outcomes.</td>
<td>- Funding is not stable from year-to-year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Initiative</td>
<td>Per Student. Distribution of Performance Funding: 45% Total Points, 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rewards efficiency (points per student), productivity (total points), and effectiveness (total completions)</td>
<td>- Colleges compete with one another for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completions, 45% Points Per Student. Less than 1 percent of system’s state</td>
<td></td>
<td>- SAI designed to give all colleges a fair opportunity to receive performance funding.</td>
<td>- District funding depends not only on its own students’ achievement, but also on the district’s achievement relative to other districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funding is allocated based on performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Funding method is responsive to legislative interest in increasing completions and other student achievement indicators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment B**

**TAB 2**
WACTC’s Allocation and Accountability Task Force

**Purpose:** WACTC has created the Allocations and Accountability Task Force to promote a thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the current allocation and accountability system, consider alternatives, and determine what, if any, changes should be made. If changes are recommended, the Task Force will present the recommendations and an implementation timeline at the WACTC July 2014 retreat.

**Additional WACTC and State Board Involvement:** The Task Force will work closely with WACTC’s Operating Budget Committee. WACTC will brief the State Board regularly on its progress and will forward recommendations to the State Board for consideration.

**Timeline**
- September 2013 – Kick off meeting
- Task Force recommendations to WACTC July 2014
- WACTC recommendations to State Board Fall 2014
- State Board and presidents discuss during Fall 2014
- If new allocation methodology is adopted, begin implementation with June 2015 allocation for FY 2015-16.

**Meetings:**
- September 26th, Thursday, 8:15 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., Clark College
- November 14th, Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., Peninsula
- December 19th, Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., Bellevue
- January 21st, Tuesday, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., SBCTC
- February 20th, Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., SBCTC
- March 28th, Friday, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., SPSCC
- April 24th, Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., Walla Walla
- May 29th, 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., Edmonds
- June 16th, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., SBCTC
- July 16th, 8:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m., Ocean Shores

**Task Force Membership**

**WACTC Members**
- Ed Brewster, Grays Harbor College, Chair
- Eileen Ely, Green River Community College
- Michele Johnson, Pierce College District
- Linda Kaminski, Yakima Valley Community College
- Bob Knight, Clark College
- David Mitchell, Olympic College
- Patty McKeown, Bellingham Technical College

**Commission Members**
- Deborah Frazier, Peninsula College
- Bill Thomas, Lake Wash Institute for Tech
- Patty James, Bellevue College
- Ty Jones, Columbia Basin College

- Scott Morgan, Spokane Community College
- Eric Murray, Cascadia Community College
- Gary Oertli, South Seattle Community College
- Jim Richardson, Wenatchee Valley, Chair, OBC
- Luke Robins, Peninsula College
- Pamela Transue, Tacoma Community College

**Business Affairs Commission**
- Deborah Frazier, Peninsula College
- Bill Thomas, Lake Wash Institute for Tech
- Patty James, Bellevue College
- Ty Jones, Columbia Basin College

**Instruction Commission**
- Bob Mohrbacher, Big Bend Community College
- Jeff Wagnitz, Highline Community College

**Research and Planning Commission**
- Student Services Commission

**Student Services Commission**
- Bill Belden, Clark College

**July 2014**
WACTC 2014 Allocation and Accountability Recommendations to the State Board - Briefing

Nicholas Lutes
Operating Budget Director
August 2014
Part I

- Overview of Allocation Concepts
  Past and Present
The Allocation Formula – 1985 through 1999

- From 1985 to 1999 a multi-stepped formula was used to divide funding among colleges.
- Formula was provided input based on each college’s expenditure activities (both $ and FTE) from prior years.
- Allocated all state funds every year
- Five components, with an approach of cost reimbursement
  - Instruction
  - Libraries
  - Student Services
  - Administration
  - Plant
- Formulas tried to account for:
  - Economies of scale (small school adjustment)
  - Variable costs
Internal Issues that Spelled the End of the Old Formula

- Complexity of formula made it very difficult to understand.
- Formula produced unpredictable funding from one year to the next.
- Colleges affected their own and other college’s funding by altering local factors
  - Salaries, faculty full-time/part-time mix, course coding
• Developed by WACTC in 1999-2000, adopted by State Board.
• Adjustments made incrementally each year to base budgets rather than starting from zero.
• State funding only – Tuition not considered
• Outcomes?
  – College funding was more predictable from year to year
  – Local decisions & actions would not impact state allocation
  • Student Achievement has been a recent exception
  – Base plus method made incremental changes to budget easier to understand.
Base Plus Methodology

- Starts with prior year funding and makes incremental changes mirroring legislative budget changes.
- Allocates new funding on basis consistent with legislative purposes and an agreed upon ‘best fit’ method
  - Methods are discussed annually with presidents and approved by the State Board.
- Allocates funding reductions based on each district’s proportionate share of state funding.
- Used Enrollment Plan to allocate Budgeted General Enrollments
  - Plan served as the tool for an informed distribution of new funding.
  - Plan used to distribute new enrollments to each college based on various factors (e.g., population growth).
  - Enrollment plan has lost visibility during era of reductions resulting from the Great Recession.
• Ease and predictability in setting the annual allocation has left the process lacking in flexibility to react to changing environment
  – Overenrolled Districts
  – Years of budget reductions
  – Changes in Mission Mix

• Growing level of dissatisfaction with Model
  – Multiple perceived problems in Base Plus that need fixing
## Problem Statement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td>The current system does not put enough money into performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td>There is too much of a difference in funding per FTE across the system with no clear reasons for the differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
<td>There is no recognition of different costs for different programs/mission areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong></td>
<td>District enrollment targets are not adjusted in any meaningful way – some districts are chronically over-enrolled, some under.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong></td>
<td>There is not enough focus on setting enrollment targets using agreed-to variables that result in a more equitable distribution of funding across the state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The current system does not put enough money into performance.
2. There is too much of a difference in funding per FTE across the system with no clear reasons for the differences.
3. There is no recognition of different costs for different programs/mission areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2013 Operating Revenue PER FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>$2,989</td>
<td>$3,099</td>
<td>$6,087</td>
<td>$3,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>$2,190</td>
<td>$2,090</td>
<td>$4,279</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>$3,415</td>
<td>$3,383</td>
<td>$6,798</td>
<td>$2,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-College</td>
<td>$2,742</td>
<td>$2,305</td>
<td>$5,047</td>
<td>$3,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach. Applied Science</td>
<td>$3,330</td>
<td>$3,301</td>
<td>$6,632</td>
<td>$7,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 2013 Expenditures (state and tuition) PER FTE**

- **Academic**
  - Instruction: $2,989
  - Support: $3,099
  - Total: $6,087

- **Basic Skills**
  - Instruction: $2,190
  - Support: $2,090
  - Total: $4,279

- **Workforce**
  - Instruction: $3,415
  - Support: $3,383
  - Total: $6,798

- **Pre-College**
  - Instruction: $2,742
  - Support: $2,305
  - Total: $5,047

- **Bach. Applied Science**
  - Instruction: $3,330
  - Support: $3,301
  - Total: $6,632
4. District enrollment targets are not adjusted in any meaningful way - some districts are chronically over-enrolled, some under.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>(172)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Columbia</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>(191)</td>
<td>(291)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(798)</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Puget Sound</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee Valley</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>(222)</td>
<td>(148)</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima Valley</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>(215)</td>
<td>(473)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(146)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Valley</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>(157)</td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(195)</td>
<td>(324)</td>
<td>(649)</td>
<td>(366)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>(171)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>(293)</td>
<td>(583)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>(205)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>(249)</td>
<td>(291)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>(959)</td>
<td>(384)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>(237)</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>(782)</td>
<td>(497)</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. There is not enough focus on setting enrollment targets using agreed-to variables that result in a more equitable distribution of funding across the state.
Part II

Allocation Methods: Principles
Problems & Solutions
An allocation system should:

1. Be stable
2. Be predictable
3. Be understandable
4. Treat all colleges consistently and impartially
5. Do as little harm as possible to other colleges
6. Allow for flexibility in local decisions about use of funding
7. Achieve an appropriate balance between access/enrollment and performance/student outcomes
### Problem Statement Addressed by AATF

1. The current system does not put enough money into performance.

### WACTC Recommendations

Increase the amount of funding allocated based on SAI performance to at least 5% of the state appropriation and not more than 10%.
### Addressing Identified Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Statement Addressed by AATF</th>
<th>WACTC Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. There is too much of a difference in funding per FTE across the system with no clear reasons for the differences.</td>
<td>A formula funding method is recommend which will recognize specific variables that will drive differences in funding per FTE for individual districts. The first is a flat allocation of $2.85 million per college as a ‘minimum operating allocation’ (MOA) to recognize the fixed, minimum costs needed to run a college. This adjustment, or weight, acts as a small college factor when examining the differences in per FTE funding at the district level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Addressing Identified Problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Statement Addressed by AATF</th>
<th>WACTC Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. There is no recognition of different costs for different programs/mission areas.</td>
<td>The formula will be weighted to emphasize particular types of enrollments. Enrollments in 1) Basic Education for Adults and 2) High cost, priority courses will be weighted to reflect their differential impact on college operating budgets and to reflect system priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Addressing Identified Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Statement Addressed by AATF</th>
<th>WACTC Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. District enrollment targets are not adjusted in any meaningful way – and when compared to their actuals, some districts are chronically over-enrolled, some under. And, 5. There is not enough focus on setting enrollment targets using agreed-to variables that result in a more equitable distribution of funding across the state.</td>
<td>The formula method will allocate with a starting point which recognizes an enrollment target set each year based on the lesser of a district’s three-year average actual enrollments or three-year target enrollments. (Note: This starting point will be weighted by the adjustments discussed in problem statement three).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WACTC has tasked a subcommittee with making recommendations on the following:

- **Finalize Formula**
  - SAI percentage share
  - Criteria for inclusion as a high cost, priority course/program
  - Value of weight to be applied to basic skills & to high cost, priority courses/programs
- **Finalize Implementation Strategies**
  - Designed to graduate the impact of changing methodologies
    - Stop loss and Stop Gain measures
    - Implementation Timing
QUESTIONS?
Basic Education for Adults: Proposed Funding Model to Promote Excellence in Outcomes

Brief Description
The State Board will provide guidance for possible 2015 agency-request legislation that will support Basic Education for Adults programs to expand student access, transition, and completion. The legislation being discussed will support the 2015-17 Biennial Agency Budget request which seeks caseload funding for Basic Education students, increases available funding per student by linking to the K-12 Basic Education Rate, and increases projected enrollments by 2,000 FTE over two years.

Finding a way to neutralize the fiscal disincentive for providing Basic Education programs and create a financial basis that allows colleges to meet the expanding basic skills needs of Washington’s workforce is critical to our state’s economic wellbeing. Identifying policy options for consistently and appropriately funding Basic Education programs will ensure our state’s underprepared adults have access to postsecondary education opportunities and develop the necessary skills in order to contribute to a growing economy.

How does this link to the System Design, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
The State Board has identified basic education as a critical issue area for the state’s community and technical college system. This proposal would directly contribute to the expansion of Basic Education programs and increase opportunities for Washington’s adults, consistent with the System Design, Mission Study, and State Board Policy Focus. The new Basic Education 5-year state plan details innovations and programming needed to meet system, state, and national outcomes, but full implementation is not possible without a stable funding model.

This proposal would also contribute to the Legislature’s statewide educational attainment goals adopted during the 2014 session under HB 2626, as well as Governor Inslee’s Results Washington performance goals that strive to improve education and workforce outcomes statewide.

Background Information and Analysis
An estimated one million adult Washingtonians lack the basic math, reading, writing, technology, or English-language skills to succeed at work. In the 2012-2013 school year, Basic Education programs enrolled only 37,080 state supported students in Washington.

Research shows that the fastest growing regions of the state are also the regions with the highest concentrations of people with less than high school credentials and whose English skills are insufficient. At the same time, the educational bar to a living-wage job is getting higher. While the need for college credentials will increase by almost 60 percent by the year 2030, the state’s population will grow by only 10 percent over that same period. Community and technical colleges need to fill this gap with working adults – a faster growing population that is burgeoning in those areas of the state where educational attainment is lagging (A Skilled and Educated Workforce Report, 2011).

At the same time the need for adult basic skills is growing, our state is seeing a clear and consistent pattern of decline in Basic Education services and programming due to a lack of viable, permanent funding. This decline could potentially be devastating to our citizens’ ability to lead productive lives and contribute to our state’s economy. With Basic Education state supported enrollments decreasing by 16.9 percent over the last five years, finding a long-term solution is more critical than ever before.
State budget reductions and double-digit tuition increases have made colleges more financially dependent on tuition revenues, which now cover about 35 percent of the cost of education, up from 24 percent in 2009. Most full-time academic transfer and workforce students pay approximately $3,100 annually in operating fees (the portion of tuition used to support college instruction and general operations). In recognition of their limited financial resources, those Basic Education students who can pay are charged a flat $25 fee per quarter; this fee is waived for those who can’t pay. The overall increase in college dependence on tuition revenues and the lack of such revenue from Basic Education students has made it increasingly difficult for colleges to maintain, let alone expand, these programs.

Under the proposed caseload funding model, by contrast, the Legislature would fund each basic skills student who enrolls for the program, similar to the way the state funds K-12 students. The funding rate for each basic skills student at a community or technical college would be tied to the K-12 basic education funding rate. The implementation of a caseload funding model could be accomplished through a budget bill proviso; additionally, agency-request legislation could be introduced that would codify the funding methodology into ongoing state law.

**Potential Questions**

- What are the benefits and drawbacks of implementing a caseload funding model for Basic Education programs? How would a caseload funding model for Basic Education programs affect college budget decisions concerning these programs?
- How would a caseload funding model affect the quality of instruction, student success, and completion?
- What are the benefits and drawbacks of introducing agency-request legislation in the 2015 session that ties state funding for each basic skills student to the K-12 basic education funding rate? Would the system be able to garner support from legislators and other external stakeholders?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**

Through discussion, a thorough understanding of the implications of the proposed caseload funding model for basic skills students will emerge. Additionally, the discussion will inform the development of potential agency-request legislation.

Funding actual Basic Education enrollments and linking Basic Education funding to the K-12 basic education rate, increasing annual Basic Education funding per FTE to $5,800 over four years, would adequately support implementation of the *Washington State Adult Education 5-year Plan – 2014-2019: Pathways to College and Careers for Washington’s Emerging Workforce* and neutralize the financial disincentive to offering basic skills programs. This provides a long-term financial solution that will enable programs to meet expanding basic skills needs in their communities and successfully scale innovation to meet the requirements of the new state and federal mandates.

**Policy Manual Change** Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Denise Graham, Deputy Executive Director, Finance 360-704-4350, dgraham@sbctc.edu
Nick Lutes, Operating Budget Director 360-704-1023, nlutes@sbctc.edu
Jon M. Kerr, Director, Basic Education for Adults 360-704-4326, jkerr@sbctc.edu
Alison Grazzini, Legislative Director 360-704-4394, agrazzini@sbctc.edu
Role of Community and Technical Colleges in Baccalaureate Degree Production

Brief Description
When the Washington State Legislature passed E2SHB 2483 in 2012, authorizing the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) to approve all applied baccalaureate degree (BAS) programs, a rapid growth in the number of BAS proposals ensued. As a result of this growth and in support of maintaining quality standards and statewide oversight of mission adherence, the Board requested a third-party evaluation. SBCTC staff hired Washington State University researchers through the Extension Energy Program office. This agenda item will detail the results of this evaluation, Bachelor of Applied Science Degree Programs in Washington State: Issues of Initial Implementation (Attachment A), and the Bachelor of Applied Sciences Policy and Outcomes Evaluation (Attachment B), which was conducted by SBCTC staff and includes estimation models developed by a workgroup of the Research and Planning Commission. In addition, the proposed changes to the applied baccalaureate degree approval process will be reviewed based on feedback from the June 18-19, 2014, State Board meeting and in support of efforts to inform and improve practice (see Tab 6).

How does this link to the System Design, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
Assessing the development and implementation of applied baccalaureate degree programs throughout Washington community and technical colleges from a statewide perspective is in alignment with the Board’s System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus.

System Direction. Applied baccalaureate degrees address Student Success by increasing educational attainment especially for place bound, working adult students, many of whom are from traditionally underserved populations. In addition, these degrees address Economic Demand by meeting the need for a well-educated and skilled workforce and increasing the number of skilled workers in high demand occupations. Many applied baccalaureate degree programs also are designed to be responsive to the business community through less traditional and more flexible course offerings.

Mission Study. Applied baccalaureate degrees contribute to two goals: (a) close the skills gap for technically trained workers and (b) contribute more to the production of baccalaureate degrees. Expansion of applied baccalaureate degrees is specifically identified as a means to increase our contribution.

Policy Focus. The college system is implementing applied bachelor’s degrees as a system level effort under the State Board’s authority to approve degree programs. Washington is known nationally as a state that approached BAS degrees as a system level effort, rather than direct authority provided by the legislature to individual colleges. SBCTC staff continues to research best practices in order to improve statewide coordination and efficiency.

Background Information and Analysis
As noted at the May State Board meeting and in response to questions raised by the State Board regarding the impact of applied baccalaureate degrees on the overall mission of the colleges, SBCTC staff contracted with a third-party evaluator to conduct an analysis of applied baccalaureate programs.
Concerns about impact on college resources and community efficacy also were addressed in the study which included interviews conducted at seven community and technical colleges and comprised of colleges currently offering applied baccalaureate degrees, planning to launch new programs, and colleges that have abstained from offering applied baccalaureate degrees.

In addition, SBCTC research staff, in collaboration with the Research and Planning Commission and commissioned by WACTC, conducted an outcomes evaluation on applied baccalaureate degree policy. The completed analysis includes current statistics on enrollment, employment rates, and median annualized earning for BAS enrollees and graduates; trends pertaining to under-represented students participating in BAS programs; and projections involving applied baccalaureate degree offerings and completions involving estimated growth through the 2017-2018 academic year.

**Potential Questions**

- What impact are applied baccalaureate degrees having on individual colleges and the college system?
- What are the system-wide implications for applied baccalaureate degrees in regard to capacity and sustainability throughout the system?
- What direction to staff on next steps does the Board wish to make?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**

State Board members will have an opportunity to provide input on the assessment and outcomes evaluation work as well as feedback and direction for informing the applied baccalaureate degree process.

Policy Manual Change  Yes ☒ No ☐
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Bachelor of Applied Science Degree Programs in Washington State: Issues of Initial Implementation

Purpose
This research project examined the implementation of Bachelors of Applied Science (BAS) degree programs by the community and technical college system in Washington State. The report is based on interview data collected primarily from a sample of:

- Administrators, program managers and faculty at three colleges currently operating BAS degree programs;
- Two colleges preparing to launch approved BAS programs; and
- Two colleges that have chosen not to develop programs as of 2014.

This summary report describes the major findings of the inquiry. Findings will be shared with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges at the Board Retreat in early September 2014.

Background
Washington State legislation passed in 2005 (E2SHB 1794) sought to expand access to baccalaureate degree programs across the state.¹ The legislation enabled the SBCTC to select and fund four pilot programs to initiate applied baccalaureate degree programs on community and technical college campuses. The intent was to increase the number of applied baccalaureate graduates in high-demand occupations to meet industry demand for advanced technical certification and related management careers. Subsequent legislation allowed all of Washington’s community and technical colleges to propose and offer applied baccalaureate degree programs, if approved by the SBCTC.²

The legislation was informed by the 2005 baccalaureate capacity study completed by SBCTC in partnership with the Workforce Education and Training Coordinating Board, which analyzed statewide and regional demand for upper-division enrollment. That study included a review of options and costs for expanding capacity, and advocated for applied baccalaureate degree programs at community and technical colleges to help meet state goals for increasing the total number of baccalaureate degrees awarded by 2019 to 42,400 per year.

To accomplish this, the community and technical college system would need to:

- Increase the number of students who transfer to a baccalaureate program by 20,400, including 1,400 applied baccalaureate degrees awarded.
- Expand the workforce mission of community and technical colleges to serve the needs of local and state employers.
- Increase educational pathways for professional and technical associate degree graduates who had been limited in their ability to apply credits toward a bachelor degree.

The workforce student population was then—and continues to be—comprised of a large portion of people of color, older working adults, and people (primarily women) who are place bound with family responsibilities. BAS degrees are expected and intended to assist these students.

By 2013, the number of BAS degree offerings had grown exponentially, and 26 new degree programs were approved by the Board that year. This increase led the Board to question the impact of BAS degrees on the overall mission of the colleges. Questions arose about how much time and energy these degrees may or may not draw from other programs:

- Are colleges turning their attention to upper-division classes and focusing less on Basic Education for Adults?
- Would having baccalaureate degrees result in the colleges changing their approach to serving their community?

This project addressed these core questions about college mission. It also sought to provide the State Board with a third-party analysis of the impact that BAS degrees are having on individual colleges and the college system. The findings are intended to support policy discussions regarding future BAS degree development.

**Methodology**

WSU researchers reviewed existing information on the BAS degree program, including individual programs and outcomes data, and consulted with SBCTC staff to confirm the overall research design of the study. This included selecting colleges and programs, designating individual interview participants, reviewing the interview protocol, and refining the research questions.

The research design and initial list of institutions were recommended by WSU researchers with SBCTC staff input and was deemed to be the most responsive approach for addressing the Board’s stated questions within the time available. The WSU researchers each have extensive community and technical college system knowledge and experience. The design maximized data collection from three colleges with fully developed programs and a range of up to seven experienced staff at each college, while also including limited data collection from two institutions that are about to launch new programs and two that have abstained from developing BAS degree programs. A total of 29 interviews were conducted.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

For this study, telephone interviews were preferred over a mailed questionnaire because of the qualitative nature of the data needed and to ensure good response rates.

1. **Telephone interviews**: Researchers spent up to 90 minutes with each individual in confidential interviews. There were some call-backs for clarification and additional information.

2. **Thematic data analysis and integration**: The data collected were organized and analyzed, both by institution and by respondents’ role at the college, to find commonalities and themes across institutions.
Research Questions
In the interview questionnaire, respondents were asked general, open-ended questions about their college's reasons for offering BAS degrees; the impact of the BAS degree on their college's mission; and what they considered to be the related challenges, accomplishments, and benefits.

Additionally, respondents were asked specific questions regarding their:
- Knowledge of how degree development was funded at their college;
- Perception of the impact on the BAS program(s) on their college's other programs, such as Basic Education for Adults;
- Assessment of BAS program sustainability; and
- Prediction of any anticipated mission changes that might result from offering BAS degrees.

Institutions
SBCTC suggested including a cross-section of institutions in various stages of degree development for this study to ensure that a range of perspectives were represented. Thus, the participating colleges included:
- Those with considerable experience developing and implementing BAS programs – Bellevue College, Columbia Basin College, and Peninsula College;
- Those about to launch new programs – Skagit Valley College and Clover Park Technical College; and
- Those that have thus far abstained – Big Bend Community College and South Puget Sound Community College.

Geographic diversity was also considered when selecting the participating institutions.

Summary of Findings
This section presents the major findings of the research and generally follows the order of topics and questions posed during the interview (see Appendix). All respondents were guaranteed confidentiality; therefore, only WSU researchers had access to the interview data, and no quotes in the report are attributed to individuals or specific colleges.

Initiation and Startup
Many respondents said they understood that the state of Washington requires an increase in the number of the state's baccalaureate level graduates to meet the workforce needs of industry. Respondents believe that offering BAS degrees can help to meet that need. They emphasized that their colleges have the required infrastructure in place to offer these degrees, and that they feel well positioned to be part of the solution.

Colleges Currently Offering or Actively Planning BAS Programs:
When asked to describe the key factors that drove their college’s decision to offer a BAS degree, all respondents at colleges that offer or are planning BAS programs said that a primary reason for doing so

3 For the full interview protocol, see the Appendix.
was to respond to community (market) demand. This demand was reported to stem from three primary sources:

- **Employers** who appreciate the community college graduates they hire, but now find that in many cases they need a higher level of technical skills from both entry level and existing employees.
- **College faculty** who are eager to meet the demand from students and industry by ramping up the offerings in their program areas and addressing their own professional development needs.
- **Students** who are place bound with financial or other limitations that keep them from being able to attend a four-year baccalaureate college.
  - In fact, geography was a major issue for respondents from colleges offering or developing BAS degrees. In some cases, the colleges are located in rural locations where the opportunities for attending classes locally to earn a baccalaureate degree are severely limited.
  - The cost of upper-division education was also a factor. Some respondents noted that even in instances where universities are located nearby in rural or urban settings, the price is often too steep for many interested students and enrollment is extremely limited.

By offering their own BAS degree, these colleges felt sure that they were expanding the educational opportunities in their communities. As one person noted, “The reality is that 30-35% of our students were ending up in an educational cul-de-sac because of the terminal degree they earned here. Offering the BAS degree seemed like a natural extension on our mission.”

Some respondents noted that each college had existing partnerships with regional universities – whether through “university centers” or other agreements or articulated programs – and that they had vetted their BAS degree programs with their university partners prior to implementation primarily to explore potential new degree and cost-sharing agreements, and to avoid program duplication. Several respondents said that since the BAS degrees are technical in nature; build on terminal, professional/technical degrees; and will serve a small number of FTEs, universities often were uninterested or unable to offer the requested degree. One founding faculty member recalled:

> Before we decided to do this, I had met with folks [at a regional university that also maintains a Center on the two-year college campus]. I was trying to see if I could teach our courses through them – let students get their degrees, we’d just teach the courses. But they didn’t really want it, they were reluctant to take it on, they thought it was a good idea but they didn’t want to take it on. What I needed was a structure to be able to do that. I would have set all that up. The content would be ours, but we would’ve shared the tuition, and the degree would have been a BS from the university, not from us. I met with a bunch of the other big players in the region but it didn’t fly with any of them. Many thought it was just too complicated. So, the others should not complain. I asked them.

Many respondents noted that the expense involved in ramping up a new program for a small number of students is hard for most universities to justify financially. Some respondents emphasized that because these degrees are highly technical and applied in nature, the specialized equipment and additional lab
space required to support these programs can be very costly, and many universities do not already have the equipment or extra lab space available in the community where the students live.

While many respondents said that they perceive that their university partners are publicly supportive of BAS programs, some indicated that there is still a sense that behind the scenes the universities are not happy that the two-year colleges are offering and expanding these degree offerings. Some respondents said that the universities may not have lodged any formal protests because they know they had the first right of refusal for these degrees, and they elected not to offer the degrees themselves. Others said that the universities are not objecting publicly because they want to preserve the existing relationships they have with the two-year colleges around university centers and other articulation agreements they have worked to establish.

**Colleges Not Planning BAS Programs**

In contrast, respondents from colleges that do not currently offer a BAS degree reported that the primary reason they chose to not develop BAS degrees was a lack of community demand. They said that employers are simply not requesting that their college offer BAS degrees. These respondents emphasized that if a need for a special niche program emerged, or a major employer came forward with a specific need, they would be willing to look into offering a BAS degree.

A second reason noted for not proposing a BAS program was a lack of student demand: respondents said that their students have transfer options that are working well as vehicles for earning baccalaureate degrees, so students are not demanding BAS options.

In short, respondents from non-BAS degree colleges said that currently there is insufficient demand from both employers and students for their college to develop and operate BAS degree programs. While no respondents took issue with colleges that offered highly technical or specialized programs, some respondents said that they did not think that some of the BAS programs rose to level of being true “niche” programs. They specifically identified the management-focused degree programs, which they saw as fairly generic and not specialized; several questioned how many management degree programs the state really needs.

**Resources and Accreditation**

**Colleges Not Planning BAS Programs**

Respondents from colleges that are not currently offering BAS programs identified several resource- and accreditation-related concerns. One respondent said he is worried that developing a BAS degree would take resources away from other program areas like Basic Education for Adults. One respondent said that in the current climate, which is marked by a general shortage of state and federal funding, re-directing resources away from existing ‘core mission’ programs would be akin to “taking very thin peanut butter and spreading it even thinner.” Some respondents also expressed concern about other resource-related issues, including:
• **The availability of classroom space**: With campuses that are already crowded, there is a concern that scheduling space to hold classes for any new degree programs would be difficult or would require an expansion.

• **The added preparation and risk associated with undergoing an accreditation review**: Some respondents said they are concerned that too many changes to campus support services and administration might be required by accreditation reviewers.

• **Whether (and how) faculty salaries would need to change to support upper-division courses**: If salary adjustments are needed, could a sense of fairness and equity be maintained? There was a perception that if faculty salaries are different for those who are teaching upper-division classes, the disparity may cause dissension among the faculty ranks.

• **Collecting program data and tracking student outcomes**: One issue was the time and effort required to maintain program and student data. Another was whether BAS programs are really producing good outcomes for students. One question raised was, “What can we really know about these programs when the number of graduates is still so small?” These respondents were interested to know how BAS graduates fare in terms of salaries and employment, compared to graduates from other programs.

**Colleges Currently Offering or Actively Planning BAS Programs**

These concerns are especially noteworthy because they contrasted sharply with the perspectives reported by respondents with established BAS degree programs. Few of these respondents reported problems with scheduling classroom space or support services. Most said this was because they had engaged in thorough planning and had many conversations with staff and faculty from various departments, which helped address concerns and build support that smoothed the way for implementation on many fronts. Classroom space was handled differently at each college. Some BAS programs are offered only in the evenings, some are hybrid courses (courses that combine online and classroom learning), and some are offered entirely on-line. Regarding accreditation, while respondents reported that the site review process did require thorough preparation and extra attention, they did not see the accreditation process as being much of a challenge or overly burdensome.

Further, on the issue of faculty pay, colleges with BAS degree programs are addressing this issue in slightly different ways. Based on respondents’ remarks, however, it does not appear that faculty who taught upper-division courses earned salaries that were much different from the salaries of colleagues who taught lower-division (associate degree level) courses. Some respondents said that faculty at their college simply “moonlight” to teach the upper-division courses and earn extra pay, but at the usual *rate* of pay. There was one exception: At one college, respondents reported that BAS salary levels, which were enhanced, had been negotiated into the faculty bargaining agreement, and everyone seemed satisfied with the terms of the contract.

In general, respondents from colleges that currently offer BAS programs said that the faculty who want to be involved in teaching BAS classes are engaged, yet those who are not involved do not feel left out or “less than” their colleagues who teach the upper-division courses.
Industry and Campus Support

Colleges Currently Offering or Actively Planning BAS Programs

Respondents from colleges with BAS programs were also asked about the levels of support they received from industry and from the college campus community for their programs. A related question was whether that level of support had changed over time. Respondents from colleges with BAS programs, including those in development, indicated there had been strong support from employers and the campus community, and that the level of support had not diminished over time. Regarding industry support, remarks like the following were typical: “Good industry support. They’ve wanted these degree programs, there’s a need, and we did market research showing that.”

Many respondents reported that employers participate actively in advisory committees, teach the courses, and even attend student graduations; this level of involvement has had a positive ripple effect across the community. They also said that college staff and administrators were supportive of these programs from the beginning, and that the level of support has remained consistent or increased. One participant noted:

“We’re building ties with our local industries that are really solid. You see that in the students at graduation, and in who comes to graduation – their industry mentors and administrators are coming to graduations, too. It’s a visible thing, and it’s very gratifying to see that kind of support.”

In several cases, college staff members have earned their own BAS degree on campus, resulting in some promotions and increased leadership opportunities for those individuals. On the campuses where this is happening, BAS degrees were described as effective tools for raising the educational level across the staff ranks.

Respondents from colleges with programs uniformly indicated that their faculty members are enthusiastic about these new degrees for two main reasons:

- They are passionate about their field and look forward to being able to offer higher-level courses, and
- They view the opportunity to teach 300- and 400-level courses as a useful source of professional development. Teaching these higher-level courses calls for new research and curriculum development that faculty members often view positively.

Respondents said a small number of faculty members (typically those who were not directly connected to the BAS programs) are concerned about how BAS degrees fit into the college’s mission. One transfer degree administrator noted: “Faculty who are tangential to the BAS degree look at it and would call it mission creep. Those sentiments are out there but definitely in the minority.” For the most part, respondents’ comments about faculty support were very positive and suggest that faculty members are bringing the intellectual horsepower and energy needed to make these programs work.

Other members of campus communities were initially skeptical about the impact of the new BAS programs on their work and resources. In the few instances where this was mentioned, support for the programs was reported to have grown over time, as most of the initial concerns were either resolved or
proved to be unfounded. One respondent noted: “On campus, counselors were skeptical about the transferability of courses, and worried that funding would be drawn from other programs. The campus community is very supportive now.”

For the most part, respondents said that other parts of the campus community – financial aid, counseling, library services, registration, information technology, or other academic departments – have generally been very supportive of BAS programs. One respondent noted that the modest size of most BAS programs helped to alleviate the fears some campus employees had about the changes these new programs would require: “When people realize there are limits on the scope of these degrees – they’re really specific to prof-tech students who just want to get to the next level – then they get comfortable with them.”

Several respondents from colleges with operating BAS programs said their community members have a sense of pride and ownership about these degree programs. As one respondent noted, “Most community members went to school here so they’re supportive of the college. BAS degrees are increasing the overall education level of the community. It seems healthy for the community. Generally, that means employment levels and income levels can go up, resulting in a healthier community.”

**Program Resources: Startup and Sustainability**

**Colleges Currently Offering or Actively Planning BAS Programs**

The development and startup of BAS programs required new investments in staff time and equipment, as well as changes or enhancements to a variety of campus services to support the instructional and administrative needs of the new programs. Two of the colleges that participated in this research project were among the four pilot colleges that developed the first BAS degrees. They received initial program start-up funds, as well as an enhanced FTE rate for those programs that has remained intact. These colleges were able to use the start-up funds to develop curriculum, hire program coordinators, market the new degree, and enhance library resources and other support services. The enhanced FTE rate continues to be helpful to these programs because they can use those funds to continue to support and enhance their programs.

College programs that were not among the designated pilots, including programs added later by the same pilot colleges, were not awarded program start-up funds, nor were they awarded an enhanced rate for BAS-driven FTEs (these colleges do charge the regional university tuition rate for their BAS degrees). Instead, they chose to cover their start-up costs with external or grant funding, or they invested resources from the college’s general fund. Respondents said that while they would have welcomed additional start-up funds from the state and the enhanced FTE rate, they felt compelled to move forward without it due to employer and student demand; they believed that the programs could eventually become self-supporting. In several cases, respondents reported that faculty had demonstrated great enthusiasm for developing the new programs. Even in these cases, however, the college still needed to find funding for administrative support, such as the enhanced library resources, space, or equipment that was required. No respondents, however, reported that any of these expenses were prohibitive or prevented them from moving forward.
When asked, respondents from colleges offering or developing BAS degrees did not agree that the resources used to develop BAS degree programs had come at the expense of other core instructional programs or services. This was true even among colleges that did not receive development (pilot) funding. Many respondents agreed that there was a perception among some faculty and staff that some of the funding used to support BAS program development and operations was diverted from existing programs, or that grants or other discretionary funds from local sources may have been directed to BAS programs instead of to other areas where there was also a need. Yet, there was a widespread belief among respondents that this perception was held by a minority on their campuses, *and that it held no basis in fact*. As one respondent noted:

> I’m not aware of any place where we took resources away from an existing program area to be able to pay for the applied degrees. I don’t think there’s that kind of competition here; it’s certainly not a widespread view I’ve heard.

One faculty member was emphatic that there was no re-allocation of resources from other programs or services to subsidize the development of BAS programs. She noted:

> No changes, really; we didn’t shift resources away from anything or change the emphasis on any of our existing programs. Really, it was just an add-on for us, and in keeping with what we felt like we were doing all along, which was serving the economic needs of the community.

When asked if the BAS degree on his campus had negatively impacted other programs, one basic skills director responded:

> No, not at all. If anything, it allows us to have a better experience. We are working with students who are starting pre-college. Our budget has stayed pretty level. Even through the recent recession and such, we’ve had good support and haven’t had to give up funding because of BAS.

The development and launch of the BAS programs did demand considerable time, effort, and leadership from college staff. All respondents said that the initial start-up and approval phases relied heavily on existing faculty and staff members who did the work. For those colleges with programs underway, all have hired at least one staff member to help oversee and manage the program. Several respondents said their colleges hired an additional counselor/adviser to try to avoid unduly burdening existing student services staff. One college hired one outreach and retention coordinator for each degree they offer. In most cases, respondents said that the programs are still quite small, so only a few new positions have been created at each college. In general, beyond the program launch phase, the impact of the BAS students on the day-to-day workload of existing campus staff was reported to be fairly minimal.

In addition to start-up costs, colleges were asked about how their BAS degree(s) will be financed to ensure the program(s) can be sustained in the future. In many cases, colleges were developing programs that were designed to break even with a class enrollment of 13 to 15 students. Because of the higher tuition rate that BAS students pay, colleges are able to create programs with small numbers of students and still have the potential to be self-supporting.
Over the past year, the enrollment declines that have plagued many colleges have also had a negative effect on some BAS programs, making it harder for some programs to achieve self-sufficiency. Most respondents reported that, for now, they plan to work harder to market their programs to maintain and increase enrollments. A few programs have continued to enjoy strong student demand and are now generating enough revenue to support the cost of the programs. Looking ahead, even colleges that have well-established programs are sensitive to the need to be financially sustainable, and some programs have yet to reach that goal. As one person put it:

"The main reason we’re in the red is we have small cohorts, sometimes by design, because we’re learning as we go. We’re new at this, we’re learning, we have a high faculty-student ratio, but we need to find equilibrium in these programs. Do we need to pay faculty in these programs at a different rate? Will we charge more in tuition to make that pencil out? Do we need more support staff or different wrap-around services for students at the third and fourth year? We need to get a handle on these questions. We’ll spend a few years getting this dialed in, then we need to push ahead to self-support."

The overarching need to achieve financial self-sufficiency also influenced how different colleges chose to develop and launch their BAS programs. Since the colleges and programs participating in this research are each at different phases of implementation (or abstention, in the case of two colleges), discussions regarding startup, operations, and long-term sustainability varied considerably. Each program developed in a manner that was somewhat unique to the college's location, culture, leadership, and available resources. In terms of the common strategies, respondents suggested that there was a continuum of approaches to BAS degree implementation – and that there should be. The extreme ends of the continuum can loosely be described as the “go slow” approach and the “long-term investment” model. Naturally, some colleges and programs employed variants of both approaches.

At the "go slow" end of the continuum, colleges are establishing programs carefully, working to limit their risk and building on their successes while working to ensure that the program proves to be successful for students and employers and financially viable as well. The colleges are building one small program at a time, as they can afford it, and they have based that development on paying close attention to student demand to ensure that class enrollment meets a minimum threshold. As one college participant noted, “We deliberately started small, we didn’t want to stumble out of the gate. We’re a great value proposition, but we had to prove ourselves.” A couple of colleges said that they designed their program to be self-sustaining with only 13 to 16 full-time students. As one college participant said, “We planned cash flow to occur at 15 to 16 students, and now most of our programs have 24 to 30 students.”

At the "long term investment" end of the continuum, colleges are opting to support the development of multiple degree programs simultaneously, based on strong employer demand and support. This approach assumes a somewhat higher level of financial and political risk, and college leadership and staff accept that it may require an investment horizon of five to ten years before a program is able to become truly self-supporting. They also accept that the initial investment could be lost if the economy changes and employer needs and student interests shift. Developing, launching, and supporting multiple
BAS programs also requires more staff support, coordination, management, and resources, which can be difficult for many colleges to devote to even one new program, much less for several. Because these programs are based largely on employer demand, and less on student demand, it takes more focused marketing to build public awareness and more effort to recruit students to fill the classes. As one interviewee noted, “My opinion is if you want to start a new program, you put money behind it and DO it. That has been a successful approach for us.” One respondent said that they do not expect their programs to be self-sustaining for five to ten years, but that it was an investment that college was willing to make.

While the models at each end of the spectrum describe very different approaches to launching BAS degree programs, they highlight the range of decisions, strategies, and actions that college leadership and staff have chosen to pursue.

Accomplishments and Challenges

Colleges Currently Offering or Actively Planning BAS Programs

When asked to describe what they thought the institutional benefits were to offering BAS degrees, respondents from colleges operating programs had long lists of benefits to report. These included:

Campus-wide upgrades
Enhancements to campus facilities and student services, such as an expanded library collection, IT-equipped classrooms, and enriched advising and counseling resources, effectively benefitted all students on their campus.

Community standing
Some noted that the college’s standing in the community had increased by offering the demand-driven upper-division degrees. Most respondents reported that their relationships with industry and local businesses were enhanced because the degrees were responsive to employer and workforce needs. Similarly, several respondents reported that many community members had earned their BAS degree at their college, resulting in increased education levels in the community and increased local support for the college overall. As one person noted, “Our college is the oldest, biggest college in the area. Most community members went to school here so they’re supportive of the college. Now, having added these BAS degrees, the community feels proud because they see people around them having more educational opportunities.”

Visualization for students
Several respondents said that their students have expressed pride in their college for offering BAS degrees, even if they are not pursuing that degree yet. Many respondents said that the fact that a next-level degree is available to students has helped with retaining students and showing them that there are pathways and opportunities to build upon after earning their ‘terminal’ associate degrees. One respondent noted: “I know the buzz among students has been very positive. A number of students have been very excited that the option is here. And some students, frankly, said they wouldn’t have gotten a four-year degree otherwise.”
Some faculty and basic skills directors said that students coming to the college for developmental education were often excited to learn that a BAS degree could be part of their educational journey, and without having to leave town or incur excessive expenses. As one faculty member put it:

There are many people here who would never be able to financially, or for a variety of reasons, be able to go on to a four-year university, especially if it is out of the area. People are now able to earn a degree [here], when there’s probably a 99 percent chance they wouldn’t have been able to get it otherwise. That can totally change their lives. They can get a better job and then they can afford to send their kids to school and then things just keep getting better, right?

The basic skills director from the same campus added: “It used to be that we heard from students that they were just here to get there GED and then they’d be out of here. We are starting to hear that those students are starting to put together long-term goals. They are recognizing that they can get a job and then come back to college to pursue more education.”

Several respondents indicated that having the BAS degree available on their campus was helping students to set longer-term goals and expand their view of what they could accomplish. As one person noted, the BAS program helps to make the concept of a four-year education very real for their student population:

- We get all kinds of people from all walks of life, and many of them have very low expectations and a very narrow horizon. One of the things that we do for them is to raise their expectations and expand their horizons. Being right here, taking your English 101, as you are struggling to take the first step, knowing there are people right there with you who are going into their third and fourth year, I think helps people grasp that as a real possibility.

**Faculty enrichment**

Faculty members are also among the beneficiaries of the new BAS degrees. The opportunities for professional development associated with planning, designing, and teaching upper-division courses was noted by most respondents. Respondents from each of the colleges offering BAS degrees reported that they already had a large number of faculty members on staff who held PhDs. These faculty members are already qualified to teach upper-level courses, and respondents said that most are excited to do so. One vice president noted:

- I think the BAS degrees give our faculty more opportunities, more blue sky, the ability to teach more advanced and different things, and I think we might be able to draw more of the best talent, be more influential, and better able to attract top talent in faculty and administrators.

**Challenges**

**Colleges Currently Offering or Actively Planning BAS Programs**

While respondents from colleges offering BAS programs were clear about the benefits of offering the degree, they also identified several of the most challenging aspects associated with development and implementation.
Accreditation process
In designing the research questions, it was anticipated that the process required to accredit each college to offer four-year degrees would surface as a challenge. Yet, for all of the colleges that participated in this study that have gone through this process, none reported that the accreditation process was particularly difficult or arduous. Respondents did report that the planning, site visits, and extra preparation required to achieve accreditation took concerted staff time and extra effort. The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities requires evidence for the same five standards for a BAS degree as it requires for the two-year degrees: mission, resources, planning, effectiveness, and sustainability. Thus, while accreditation required extra time and effort, the criteria and process used to receive approval were already very familiar to these colleges.

Achieving sustainability
Achieving long-term sustainability was the most-often noted concern of many respondents, especially in light of the enrollment challenges currently faced by many colleges. Even at institutions that have succeeded in attracting local funding to support new BAS program development, there are concerns that the lack of future state funding could constrict the college’s ability to expand and sustain these programs, and build on the progress that has already been achieved. One chief financial officer noted:

We’re strong with our local resources, we view this as an investment, and we’ll do that as long as we’re able to, as long as we think we’re making progress. But, internally we don’t have a lot of wiggle room. We have local funds, yes, but there’s a limit to how much of that we can use. There are a lot of other demands on those funds, and we can’t just chew through those funds, so I can’t imagine us having multiple programs still in the incubator phase operating in the red. If we can’t do better on their viability, sustainability, we should look for ways to jettison those, or look for partners who could do it better. If it’s not penciling out, we can’t afford to support them with local funds indefinitely. But, we’re not going to see state funds any time soon, and that’s a shame because it’s exactly what we need to boost the number of four-year degrees. It would be too bad to give up on the progress we’ve made.

Marketing
Marketing the new BAS degrees has been a formidable challenge for some of the programs. Colleges developed their programs based on student demand in some cases, and on demand from employers in other cases. In the cases where programs were built to meet employer demand, respondents said that making students aware of the opportunity, and getting them enrolled, is a process that has taken more time than was initially expected.

Image
Several respondents described how offering a four-year degree at a two-year college complicates the branding for the institution. One participant said: “Our brand is now confused. What are we? A four-year that provides two-year degrees or a two-year that offers four-year degrees? We’re starting to tread in a gray area now.”
Another respondent noted that convincing the public to think differently about the college is a goal that will take time to effect. He added:

What is the feeling that you have when you think about our college? Kind of a confused feeling. Well, okay, that’s fine but that’s not going to be a very strong brand out in the community. A company with a strong brand knows exactly what they want you to feel about them. If I ask ‘How do you feel about Apple?’ most people can say right away ‘Oh, they’re innovative, cool, sleek, and user friendly.’ That’s exactly what Apple wants you to think. So when we talk about brand, it’s that stuff: what do we want them to think, and what do we want them to feel? We have to figure that out and we need to align all these pieces to make it work. And we’re not there yet. I think that’s going to be a huge challenge for the community colleges.

**Peer scrutiny**

In general, respondents from colleges with operating programs emphasized that as early innovators, they felt pressure to be successful because they felt they were being “watched” by their colleagues and also by employers, students, and other colleges and universities who were monitoring the expansion of these degree programs. Many said they felt they were on-task to show that their college could succeed in developing and sustaining four-year degree programs.

**University responses**

Several respondents reported that some universities were opposed to the college developing four-year degrees because they feared it would force them to compete for increasingly limited state funding for higher education. Others said the universities were initially doubtful that two-year colleges could succeed, but many are now accepting BAS graduates into master’s degree programs because they can see that the BAS degrees are sufficiently rigorous. For the most part, colleges that have moved forward with new BAS offerings have expressed confidence that these programs add value and deserve to be supported by the state because they produce good outcomes for students.

One respondent noted:

The state should provide support to these programs; these are work-specific degrees, developing professionals. They are applied degrees, and our goal is to get people hired, so the state should be willing to support them. It’s going to make them look good, because people are going to get jobs. Ten or twelve of our graduates have gone on to earn master’s degrees over the last few years. Some people in higher education, those who are critical of these degrees, they better just get over it. They’re working for professionals.

When they were asked if they changed their name (dropping “community”) in an effort to be more like a regional university, some respondents said that the name changes are unrelated to these degrees, and were done as part of a larger marketing strategy. They noted that the name changes have caused more confusion or concern than intended; a few respondents even described the name change as “unfortunate” because serving their communities is the centerpiece of their mission. One noted that they had never had the word “community” in their original college name, yet they had always been rigorously committed to meeting the needs of their service area.
Impact on Campus Programs and Services

Each respondent was asked if the development and/or implementation of the BAS degrees affected other programs or services at the college. In general, respondents indicated that where there were impacts, they were usually positive and had the effect of improving existing programs or services. One said, for example, that most students graduating with a two-year, terminal professional technical degree at his college have not achieved the college-level math skills required of the BAS degrees or to transfer to a four-year institution. In response, the college is now working to boost the rigor of existing programs, while also incorporating teaching and learning methods that are a good fit for students pursuing the BAS. His college, for instance, is developing a statistics course that has a more applied approach and incorporates more real-world and business examples in the curricula, while not watering down any of the core math concepts.

Respondents consistently reported that in examining the general education credits that are required by a BAS degree, they concluded that they needed to ratchet up the curriculum and assessments for these classes, which has had the effect of enhancing the quality of general education courses for all students. Several respondents said that their college had been pressed to assure that these general education classes are rigorous enough that universities will accept the degrees and allow students to move on to earn master’s degrees. The hope is that these degrees continue to open doors for students and do not inadvertently create another cul-de-sac degree that limits students’ options by being judged as sub-par or not transferable to other institutions and programs. One respondent said: “I anticipate that as the rigor is higher in these baccalaureate degrees, it could also impact the rigor within associate degrees. I look forward to it being a positive impact.”

Other respondents reported that in their work with basic skills and English as a Second Language (ESL) students, they are intentionally mentioning the BAS degree in their advising conversations to help students realize that they are capable of earning this higher degree and to show them there is a pathway that can help them succeed as a continuing student at the college and also in the workplace. One ABE director noted: “Our college’s mission is accessibility and affordability. Students now see us as a place for reaching longer-term goals. Students see us as ‘home’.”

Several respondents said that additional staff members have been added to support the new degree programs, but the number of new hires has been very limited. At some colleges, advising, counseling, program coordinators, and administrative support staff have been added to manage the added workload; at other colleges, the workloads of existing employees have been adjusted to incorporate BAS-related tasks.

Financial aid was raised as a very important issue. Several respondents said that adding the BAS degrees introduced a new level of complexity to the financial aid process, which required more time and extra effort to manage. Two respondents reported that while the accreditation process was not overly burdensome, waiting for the U.S. Department of Education to approve their program so that they can offer financial aid is time consuming, and implementation can be further complicated because the
financial aid rates are different for upper-division courses and a new coding protocol needed to be established.

BAS Degrees and the College Mission
When asked what effect offering BAS degrees has had on the overall mission of their college, respondents uniformly reported that adding BAS degrees has simply allowed them to expand their workforce mission to serve their communities more effectively; none said that the new program has had the effect of changing the overall mission of the college. Indeed, most said it was consistent with their core mission. As one president put it: “We think specifically about the mission: More access, more opportunity. The BAS provides both.” Another respondent said, “This is an extension of our two-year mission, which is to provide relevant workforce education. The number of years that takes isn’t specifically mentioned in our mission. It is more about what a student needs.”

Respondents said that offering the degree helps the college respond to changes in industry, and that most employers now require a higher level of skill than in the past. The BAS degree gives colleges the tools needed to help students and incumbent workers meet those rising expectations. One respondent noted, “This is really just an extension of our existing professional-technical programs. There’s not a great sense that this is going to radically change what we do or change our mission that much; it’s just a natural extension of it. In certain prof-tech areas now, you need more training so we’re delivering more training.”

Just as respondents did not forecast wholesale changes to their mission, approach, or student mix due to BAS degrees, several said that offering BAS degrees seems to be a national trend, one that may also portend a more competitive future for community and technical colleges. One respondent said, “Applied baccalaureate degrees are the wave of the future and BAS degrees are a big part of that. Students need more integrated, contextualized learning. A systems approach to teaching and learning is needed. Applied learning is the future of education.”

Others were even more direct about what they saw as the risk of not offering BAS degrees at their college. “Schools that don’t change will be the Blockbuster (Video) of education.” Offering BAS degrees was seen by many respondents as one more tool for helping students prepare for the changing world of work. As one noted, “The world of workforce employment has been busily changing. Increasing expectations for the level of degrees and level of background, general knowledge, and skills sets, including getting along with people, continue to increase. Without the bachelor’s degrees, we wouldn’t really have the time or the ability to keep pace with the expectations with the world of work.”

Looking to the Future
Respondents were asked to look to the future – five to ten years out – to forecast how the experience of developing and offering BAS degrees will impact their college. Across the board, respondents said that

---

4 Blockbuster Video was an American-based provider of home movie and video game rental services that filed for bankruptcy in 2010, reportedly due to a failure to innovate or to effectively compete with companies such as Redbox and Netflix, which offers web-based streaming video services.
they are not expecting much change at their colleges, nor in the number of BAS degrees they develop; most said that they expected that only two or three new BAS degrees would be developed in the next five to ten years. Most reiterated that their college is developing BAS degrees based on requests by local employers and students, to whom they intend to be responsive. Many respondents noted that even with these possible expansions, the BAS programs are small and likely to remain so, and their existing degrees and program areas will continue to be the predominant business of the college.

Some respondents said that in the long term, the credibility of all degrees offered by two-year colleges may be enhanced in part because of the increased visibility that BAS degrees will confer on the colleges. As one respondent said, “I think the four-year programs will add legitimacy to our college. Long-term, it will be positive for us and provide continuity for our students.” Other respondents said they thought that offering BAS degrees may have the long-term impact of increasing enrollment, as more students, including those at the basic skills level, begin to see that the BAS pathway is available to them. Among colleges that offer the BAS, respondents could not conclude that the BAS program is currently increasing enrollment, in part because their workforce programs are already enrolled to capacity; others said that while it is too early to tell, they expected the programs would help boost future enrollment.

The Way Ahead: The Voices of Experience
At the conclusion of each interview, respondents were asked if they had any additional comments or input on these topics. Several respondents noted that while the BAS degrees are a great tool to have and that they work well where they are in demand by employers and students, initiating BAS programs is not a strategy that is likely to work effectively for every college or every community. Several respondents were adamant that each college must carefully weigh the time and financial investment needed to start and operate a program, and that even with adequate resources and local demand, there are no guarantees that these programs can be sustained. As one respondent put it:

The decision needs to be made campus by campus. Just because it works for us doesn’t mean it would work for all. It’s not for everybody. We have the capacity to do applied BAs, but many may not. We don’t have any problem finding qualified faculty to teach in these programs. Urban colleges with large population centers are better able to pull it off. We don’t have large numbers of students in most of these programs, and we receive no state support at all for this program, but we have the resources to support it, at least for now.

Another point raised by several respondents was assuring that the college had the needed infrastructure in place to accommodate the new demands these programs create, and being mindful that the pace of implementation does not exceed the college’s ability to support the programs. One founding faculty member warned:

I have one cautionary note, one criticism: If you develop too many too fast, the pressure on the support systems at the college is overwhelming. Financial aid, student services, library, support staff, IT, online learning, all that. The resources to support these programs may be stretched too far. For online, the IT component was always a big challenge; in different systems, changes are hard. Colleges that want to do this need to keep in mind how to maintain the support systems
needed to teach these programs. You have to make sure you maintain high-quality programs. With online programs and courses, if your IT part of it doesn’t work, it’s a mess.

Several respondents voiced their opinions about the role of state policy regarding BAS degree expansion, but there was little consensus about the model that should be followed. One respondent proposed that, as part of an overarching state strategy, the BAS degrees could be limited to targeted fields that are more tightly tied to labor market demand. One person added: “As a state, we’re not being strategic about our comprehensive higher education system. By and large, students don’t care who offers the degree. They just want us to figure out what it takes for them to seamlessly move through their education to reach their goals.”

Most respondents reported that the existing BAS degree approval process works well for ensuring that these degrees are meeting demand. Others said that the SBCTC should limit the number of new BAS programs that can be offered so that rapid growth in the number of new degree programs does not flood the market. One respondent said that tighter oversight and more stringent criteria for approval could help limit the expansion of new degrees to those colleges that are best able to support them financially and to sustain them for the long term. One respondent said he thought that some colleges would “breathe a sigh of relief” if the state limited growth in BAS degrees to a limited number of institutions, especially by those colleges who may feel pressure from some community members to offer them, but are currently not in a good financial position to develop and sustain them.

Finally, many respondents said they thought state support was critical to sustain current programs and support future expansions needed to help meet the state goals for increasing the number of four-year degrees. But most conceded that, in the current economic climate, they did not expect to see additional state support, at least not in the short-term.

Conclusions
The interviews conducted for this report support conclusions that will be of critical interest to those assessing the BAS degree in Washington. These conclusions chiefly address issues of community college mission, effect on other programs, and operating costs.

Mission
The vast majority of respondents asserted that BAS degrees are an important extension of their college’s core mission. Specifically, they considered the BAS as a way to support their responsibility to:

- Provide programs and services that meet industry and community demand,
- Enhance and expand access to postsecondary education, and
- Further the career goals and economic prosperity of students and their communities.

Importantly, no one reported that they believed the college mission was being compromised by adding the BAS degree or that the degree was inconsistent with the current or future mission of their institutions.
Effect on Resources, Other Programs, and the Campus Community

Where BAS degree programs are already in place, respondents emphasized that they have been well-supported by industry, students, and the campus community. These colleges have leveraged existing campus infrastructure and services, and have attracted qualified faculty. Only a few new employees have been added to support the programs. While extra effort was required to prepare for re-accreditation, these reviews proceeded smoothly and resulted in approval.

Beyond the campuses with BAS experience, however, there remains concern that funding for these new programs and operations may require cuts to other core programs. While colleges with current BAS programs acknowledged that this perception occurred on their campuses, too, during the start-up phases, it was reportedly held by only a minority of faculty and staff at the time. The perception – more prevalent among individuals who were not directly associated with program development – has reportedly subsided with implementation experience.

Among individuals at colleges still developing programs, or at colleges that have not yet chosen to pursue the BAS, these perceptions and concerns endure.

Benefits to Entire Campus Community

BAS degrees are considered by the colleges that offer them to be a catalyst for raising the quality and rigor of all programs, and for expanding access to four-year degrees for all students. Respondents consistently reported that having more exposure and responsibility for higher-level courses was creating more awareness about what students need in order to be prepared for the next level of education. The result has been increased rigor in general education courses and associate degrees in general.

Investments in BAS programs, such as expanded student services and IT-equipped classrooms, typically benefit all students. New applied math courses are being developed to boost student math skills for real work settings while also increasing students’ math achievement and their ability to transfer into other university programs.

The availability of the BAS degree on campus has also raised the education and career goals of basic skills, ESL, and developmental education students, who can now clearly see that they have the opportunity to progress beyond the associate level. They can visualize earning an affordable four-year degree, and at a local campus that they are already familiar and comfortable with.

Looking Ahead, Especially Fiscally

Some respondents, especially those who had experience establishing BAS programs, offered some cautionary notes as well. Some of those who received start-up funds during the pilot phase said the state financial support was very important to their success. Programs that did not receive pilot support have had a somewhat harder time financially because the current climate of economic austerity and competing priorities has led to limited state support and softer enrollments.

Some colleges are now relying on external funding and grants to support program development that meet industry and student demand. This approach has been effective for most, and some programs are
generating enough income to cover program costs. Even so, concerns remain on some campuses about long-term sustainability, including how much the colleges will be able to contribute to the state’s goal of increasing baccalaureate degree production without future state support. It should be noted, however, that other campuses have found an operating model they believe is sustainable under current funding models and rates.

Respondents also cautioned that the costs and long-term investment needed to develop and sustain BAS degree programs may exceed the ability of some colleges to support them, even if there is industry and community support. It may not be feasible for some colleges to offer them without sufficient demand and additional, stable funding. As one respondent noted, “Long term, even we don’t have the resources to support applied degrees without support. To meet the state goals for applied baccalaureate production, we need to ramp up in a big way.”

While most said that colleges should have the ability to decide for themselves whether to offer BAS degrees, a few individuals said that the state should explore whether to:

- Limit BAS development to a small number of colleges or for specific types of high-demand programs, and
- Increase the rigor of the criteria used as part of the state approval process to help ensure that new BAS programs are successful and sustainable.

Some respondents urged the state board to clarify how the BAS degrees are integral to the state’s strategic plan for all of higher education.
Appendix: The Impact of BAS Degrees on College Mission

Interview Protocol
This project will examine the impact of Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) degree programs on the overall mission of the community and technical college system. The project will produce an integrated report based on interview data collected primarily from a sample of executives, program managers, and faculty at colleges that currently operate BAS degree programs, colleges that are preparing to launch approved BAS programs, and some colleges that have chosen not to develop programs thus far. The final products will include a summary report and presentation materials that describe the major findings of the inquiry. Findings will be shared with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges at the Board Retreat in early September.

Survey Topics and Interview Questions
Initiation and Startup
Q1. What key factors drove the decision to offer a BAS degree at your college?
   (For non-participants: why have you chosen not to develop/offer BAS degrees?)

   (For colleges with University Center partnerships: Did the UC partnership influence your decision to offer BAS degrees? How?)

Q2. How would you describe the level of buy-in and support from the campus community and industry for offering the degree(s)? Has that support changed over time?

Resources
Q3. How was (or will) your BAS degree development (be) funded?

Q4. How would you describe the level of staff time that has been invested in your BAS degree(s)? Did you hire new people or reallocate existing staff time?

Q5. Going forward (whether in development or fully implemented), how will your BAS degree(s) be financed to ensure it is sustainable? (self-supporting vs. reallocation of existing resources, grants, etc.).

Accomplishments/Challenges
Q6. What have been the institutional benefits to offering BAS degree(s)?

Q7. What have been the most challenging aspects of developing and offering BAS degree(s)?
   (Listen for experiences with accreditation and college name changes, etc.)

Mission Impacts
Q8. Did the development and/or implementation of the BAS impact other programs or services at the college? What/how?

   (Listen/ask about specific program areas; changes that were positive/negative or planned/unintended; program priorities or changes, etc.)
Q9. Has offering BAS degrees impacted the overall mission of your college? How?

Q10. Looking forward, how do you think the experience of developing and offering BAS degree(s) will impact your college?

Q11. That’s the last of our questions. Do you have any additional comments or input on these topics you think is important, or topics we didn’t cover? Do you have any questions about the study?

Thank you for your participation.
The results of this survey should be available in September 2014.
Jan Yoshiwara from SBCTC will let you know how to access the report when it becomes available.
Bachelor of Applied Sciences Policy and Outcomes Evaluation:

**Expand the workforce mission of CTCs further to better serve the needs of local and state employers.**

- In 2013-14, CTCs enrolled 597 full-time equivalents (FTE), 857 headcount enrollments in 17 bachelors of applied science (BAS) programs in 10 colleges.
- The BAS mix has increased beyond business and management with the addition of more healthcare and information technology related degrees. These were created in response to demand from local employers.
- The overall employment rate for all graduates since 2011, seven quarters after graduating, is 75 percent. The median annualized earnings for all BAS graduates is $36,786.
- For the 2012 graduates who had both pre and post earnings, the earnings gain was $17,451 (38 percent), including a 63 percent increase for Bellevue’s Interior Design program.

**Increase educational pathways for professional-technical associate graduates who have been limited in their ability to apply credits toward a bachelor degree. The workforce student population is comprised of a large portion of people of color, older working adults and people (primarily women) who are place bound with family responsibilities.**

- Student diversity in BAS programs has increased over time as students who identify as African-American and Hispanic represent a larger share of the enrollment than when the programs first began.
- The gender gap is decreasing as the percent of males has increased as programs have been added at the technical colleges.
- In most programs, students of color are participating in BAS programs at a higher rate than in colleges’ workforce programs in general and are earning degrees at a rate equivalent to their participation rate. However, three programs show a gap in both participation and completion, suggesting a possible area for focus and improvement.
- Similar to ensuring equity of completion outcomes for historically under-represented students, a challenge for colleges — and an area of future study — is the demonstrated disparity for students of color in employment rate and earnings.

**Meet state goals for increasing the total number of baccalaureate degrees awarded by public two-year and four-year institutions to 42,400 per year. To do this, the CTC system will need to increase the number of students who transfer to baccalaureate programs by 25 percent and increase the number of applied baccalaureate degrees to 1,400 by the year 2030 to achieve this goal.**

- The number of graduates in BAS programs has nearly quadrupled from 52 in 2010 to 198 in 2013.
- Colleges retained or graduated an average of 90 percent of their fall enrollment by the end of the academic year, a retention rate which has increased over time as more students are attending full-time.
- The three-year completion rate for students beginning in a BAS program has increased from 47 percent for the fall 2008 cohort to 57 percent for the fall 2010 cohort.
- Through the coupling of growth in program offerings and enrollment, resultant completion rates indicate the BAS programs are positively contributing to baccalaureate production in the state and are on track to meet the 2030 goal of 1,400 completions.
Projection Model for Applied Baccalaureate Degree Production

An estimation model for applied baccalaureate degree projection was developed by a Research and Planning Commission workgroup. The model uses a series of estimates derived from actual enrollment and completions in the context of a first, second, or third year of a program to predict how many completions to expect based on the number of new programs starting in an academic year. The State Board has approved 18 new programs to begin in 2014-15 and 3 programs in 2015-16. In addition to the 18 programs already underway, this results in 39 programs approved by the end of 2015-16. Using the expected number of programs beginning in the next two years, the model predicts there will be approximately 817 completions in academic year 2017-18.
Bachelor of Applied Sciences:
Policy and Outcomes Evaluation
August 2014

Introduction and Purpose of Study

Washington’s community and technical colleges (CTCs) play an important role in producing baccalaureate degree graduates in the state. Bachelors in applied science (BAS) degrees provide expanded opportunities for both graduates and employers by providing the upper-division coursework in an applied field. These degrees build upon professional-technical associate degrees. BAS degrees developed at CTCs provide a clear pathway for students who may be place bound or have difficulty finding a transfer opportunity for their associate degree. BAS degrees also help address employers’ need to successfully recruit qualified applicants who have both job-specific technical skills as well as the skills learned through a baccalaureate program. In addition to serving the needs of employers, BAS programs are beneficial to employees already working in technical fields who wish to be promoted to higher level management or to specialized positions which may require a bachelor’s degree.

BAS degree programs are approved through the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) to achieve the following policy goals:

1. Increase educational pathways for professional-technical associate graduates who have been limited in their ability to apply credits toward a bachelor degree. The workforce student population is comprised of a large portion of people of color, older working adults and people (primarily women) who are place bound with family responsibilities.

2. Meet state goals for increasing the total number of baccalaureate degrees awarded by public two-year and four-year institutions to 42,400 per year. To do this, the CTC system will need to increase the number of students who transfer to baccalaureate programs by 25 percent and increase the number of applied baccalaureate degrees to 1,400 by the year 2030.

3. Expand the workforce mission of CTCs further to better serve the needs of local and state employers.

The following brief is a summary of the status of the BAS programs as of 2014 and how the outcomes align with SBCTC’s policy goals.

---

Executive Summary

In 2013-14, CTCs enrolled 597 full-time equivalents (FTE), 857 headcount enrollments in 17 bachelors of applied science (BAS) programs in 10 colleges. This is an increase from four programs and 77 FTES, 141 headcount enrollments in 2008, the first year programs were offered. The BAS mix has increased beyond business and management with the addition of more healthcare and information technology related degrees. These were created in response to demand from local employers. Student diversity in BAS programs has increased over time and the gender gap is decreasing. Students who identify as African-American and Hispanic represent a larger share of the enrollment than when the programs first began. The percent of males has also increased as programs have been added at the technical colleges. The majority of students begin their baccalaureate studies already having earned an associate’s degree from a Washington community or technical college (CTC).

The number of graduates in BAS programs has nearly quadrupled from 52 in 2010 to 198 in 2013. Colleges retained or graduated an average of 90 percent of their fall enrollment by the end of the academic year. The retention rate has increased over time because more students are attending full-time. The three-year completion rate for students beginning in a BAS program has increased from 47 percent for the fall 2008 cohort to 57 percent for the fall 2010 cohort. Through the coupling of growth in program offerings and enrollment, resultant completion rates indicate the BAS programs are positively contributing to baccalaureate production in the state and are on track to meet the 2030 goal of 1,400 completions. In most programs, students of color are participating in BAS programs at a higher rate than in colleges’ workforce programs in general and are earning degrees at a rate equivalent to their participation rate. However, three programs show a gap in both participation and completion, suggesting a possible area for focus and improvement.

All graduates since 2011 with at least seven quarters (two years) following completion of their program were matched for employment and earnings. The total employment rate for these three cohorts of BAS graduates is 75 percent. The median annualized earnings for all BAS graduates is $36,786, with the highest earners coming from Bellevue’s Radiology program ($85,199) and the lowest from Peninsula’s Applied Management program ($27,420). Graduates from 2012 who were employed at the time of graduation were also evaluated for increases in median earnings seven quarters following their last quarter enrolled. For the graduates who had both pre and post earnings (Interior Design, Nursing, Hospitality Management and Radiology), the earnings gain was $17,451 (38 percent), including a 63 percent increase for Bellevue’s Interior Design program. The increase in earnings was due in part to a greater percentage of graduates finding full-time employment seven quarters after graduation (45 percent to 73 percent). Similar to ensuring equality of completion outcomes for historically under-represented students—a challenge for colleges and an area of future study—is the demonstrated disparity for students of color in employment rate and earnings.
Programs, Enrollments and Demographics

Applied baccalaureate programs (BAS) were introduced in 2007. At the conclusion of academic year 2013-14, 39 programs in 17 colleges have been approved for BAS, with students enrolled in 17 programs in 10 colleges:

- **Centralia College** – Applied Management, 2012
- **Green River Community College** – Information Technology and Network Administration, 2013
- **Lake Washington Institute of Technology** – Applied Design, 2009
- **Olympic College** – Nursing, 2007
- **Peninsula College** – Applied Management, 2007
- **Seattle Central College** – Behavioral Science, 2009
- **Seattle North College** – International Business, 2013
- **South Seattle College** – Hospitality Management, 2007; Professional Technical Teacher Education, 2012

The pipeline of programs is greater than those listed above, with many more colleges expressing interest in offering one or more programs. **Figure 1** below shows the distribution of programs across the state by college, designated by programs that are approved, proposed, and intent expressed.

**Figure 1**
Figure 2 below shows the headcount and FTE of all matriculated\textsuperscript{7} students in the system through 2013-14. As a result of greater full-time attendance (Figure 3), headcount growth leveled off in 2013 while FTES continued to increase. With the introduction of seven new programs in 2014 (Figure 4), both headcount and FTES increased substantially. Figure 5 shows the annual growth rates in both headcount and FTE between 2007 and 2014.

\textbf{Figure 2}

All Bachelors of Applied Science Programs: System Total FTES and Headcount 2008-2014

\textbf{Figure 3}

Distribution of Full and Part Time Enrollments

\textsuperscript{7}“Matriculated” students are those who in a BAS program through meeting admission requirements and under the baccalaureate tuition schedule. Additional FTE are served to students not in a program, but who take upper division courses.
Figure 4

Bachelor of Applied Science:
Five Year Historical FTES by College and Program

- Seattle South: Hospitality Management
- Seattle South: Professional Technical Teacher Prep
- Seattle North: International Business
- Seattle Central: Behavioral Science
- Peninsula: Applied Management
- Olympic: Nursing
- Lake WA: Tech. in Applied Design
- Green River: Network Administration and Security
- Columbia Basin: Project Management
- Columbia Basin: Cyber Security
- Columbia Basin: Management
- Centralia: Applied Management
- Bellevue: Nursing
- Bellevue: Information Systems and Technology
- Bellevue: Healthcare Technology and Management
- Bellevue: Radiology and Imaging Sciences
- Bellevue: Interior Design
Diversity of students in BAS programs has increased.\textsuperscript{8} In 2008, students identifying as “white” made up 78 percent of all enrolled students. This percentage dropped to 68 percent as of 2014. The percent of participation for students identifying as African-American and Hispanic has doubled between 2008 and 2013 for both groups, from four percent to nine percent, and five percent to 10 percent, respectively. In 2014 the distribution shifted slightly, with a one percent drop in students reporting as African-American (\textbf{Figure 6}).

\textsuperscript{8} Students are counted in up to two reported race/ethnicities for the entirety of the report.
As noted in the introductory goals of BAS programs, one of the service populations of the programs is place bound females with family responsibilities. This is demonstrated by females making up more than three-fourths of the students in 2008 (Figure 7). However, as new programs come on board, particularly in the technical colleges, the diversity in gender has increased. The percent of female students served decreased to less than two-thirds in 2014. Even at this level, females are more highly represented in BAS programs as compared to workforce programs overall (approximately 58 percent male to 42 percent female).9

---

9 Enrollment and Staffing Report. Fall 2013. SBCTC.
All students accepted into BAS programs are required to have at least an associate degree. The data on prior education of BAS students shows that the majority of BAS students begin the program with an associate degree from a Washington CTC, a figure that grows each year (Figure 8).
Retention and Completions

Colleges began graduating students with bachelors of applied science (BAS) degrees in 2010, three years after some BAS programs began. The number of graduates has grown substantially each year (Figure 9), due in part to high retention rates across the programs. As shown in Figure 10, colleges retained or graduated an average of 90 percent of their fall enrollment by the end of the 2013-14 academic year with several programs having a 100 percent retention rate.

Figure 9
Graduates by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Applied Arts in Inter. Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radiology and Imaging Sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>Applied Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Central</td>
<td>Behavioral Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle South</td>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall retention rate for students in BAS programs has increased over time as more students are attending full-time. As a result, the three-year completion rate for students beginning in a BAS program has increased from 47 percent for the fall 2008 cohort to 57 percent for the fall 2010 cohort. Through the coupling of growth in program offerings and enrollment, the resultant completion rates indicate the BAS programs are positively contributing to baccalaureate production in the state and are on track to meet the 2030 goal of 1,400 completions.
Equity of outcomes for students, particularly with the expansion of the workforce mission into applied baccalaureate degrees, is an important community and technical college policy goal. High retention and completion rates, as well as diversity in participation, make a compelling case for the positive contribution BAS programs have on baccalaureate educational attainment in Washington. However, with the changing demographic landscape in the years ahead, attainment for historically underrepresented groups is critical. Figure 11 provides a comparison of the composition of students of color in the workforce student body, the percentage participating in BAS programs, and the percentage of BAS graduates. This shows where there may be a gap between participation and completion. Most of the colleges show equal or higher participation rates for students of color in BAS programs as compared to the student body, with Bellevue and Seattle South colleges as the exceptions. In the colleges where the participation rates are comparable, completion rates are on par for students of color. For colleges where participation rates are not comparable, completion rates are substantially lower. This suggests a future area for focus and improvement.

**Figure 11**

![Students of Color: Enrollment and Outcomes](chart)

**Employment and Earnings of Applied Baccalaureate Degree Completers**

All graduates since 2011 with at least seven quarters (two years) following completion of their program were matched for employment and earnings (Figure 12). The total employment rate for these three cohorts of BAS graduates is 75 percent. The median annualized earnings for all BAS graduates is $36,786, with the highest earners coming from Bellevue’s Radiology program ($85,199) and the lowest from Peninsula’s Applied Management program ($27,420).
In addition to the snapshot employment rate, graduates from 2012 who were employed at the time of graduation were evaluated for increases in median earnings seven quarters following their last quarter enrolled. For the graduates who had both pre and post earnings (Interior Design, Nursing, Hospitality Management, and Radiology), the earnings gain was $17,451 (38 percent), including a 63 percent increase for Bellevue’s Interior Design program (Figures 13 and 14). An increase in full-time employment status after graduation has an impact on earnings, as shown below in Figure 13. With the exception of Radiology, graduates were substantially more likely to be working full-time seven quarters after graduation than at the time of graduation.
As previously noted, equity of outcomes is a critical tenet of the CTC mission and should be evaluated within all metrics of success for a program. Figure 15 demonstrates a disparity in employment outcomes for graduates who identify as white and non-white, with white graduates having a moderately higher employment rate, significantly higher median earnings, and a moderately greater increase in earnings seven quarters following graduation. These data are an important benchmark for the early employment outcomes for BAS graduates, but overall implications require further study for impacts of region, type of BAS program, employment demand for the program, and other factors which could explain the differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2012 Graduates</th>
<th>Employment Rate</th>
<th>Median Earnings</th>
<th>Earnings at Graduation</th>
<th>Earnings 7 Quarters After Graduation</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$46,265</td>
<td>$38,255</td>
<td>$47,548</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of Color</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$27,350</td>
<td>$23,436</td>
<td>$27,350</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Washington’s Community and Technical Colleges
## Applied Baccalaureate Degree Programs

**September 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Outcomes thru 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH CARE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Central</td>
<td>Allied Health Science</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Behavioral Science - Youth Development</td>
<td>Approved 3/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Central</td>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Began 2009</td>
<td>79 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>Beginning 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Health Care Technology and Management</td>
<td>Began 2011</td>
<td>2 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Health Promotion Lifestyle Intervention</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Molecular Sciences (STEM)</td>
<td>Board review 10/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Nursing RN-B</td>
<td>Began 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>Nursing RN-B</td>
<td>Board review 2/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>Nursing RN-B</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>Nursing RN-B</td>
<td>Began 2007</td>
<td>110 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Central</td>
<td>Nursing RN-B</td>
<td>Approved 5/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee Valley</td>
<td>Nursing RN-B</td>
<td>Approved 5/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Radiation and Imaging Sciences</td>
<td>Began 2007</td>
<td>66 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Respiratory Care</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Outcomes thru 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Seattle</td>
<td>Application Development</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Application Development (STEM)</td>
<td>Beginning 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>Computer Integrated Manufacturing</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>Cyber Security</td>
<td>Began 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Cyber Security and Forensics</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Data Analytics</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>Database Administration</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>Information Systems (STEM)</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Information Systems and Technology</td>
<td>Began 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Central</td>
<td>Information Technology: Networking</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>Information Technology: Network Administration and Security</td>
<td>Began 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>Information Technology: Software Development (STEM)</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Falls</td>
<td>Information Systems &amp; Technology</td>
<td>30-day review complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Integrated Resources Management</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUSINESS/MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Applied Accounting</td>
<td>Board review 6/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima Valley</td>
<td>Applied Business Management</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>Applied Design</td>
<td>Began 2009</td>
<td>59 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>Began 2012</td>
<td>20 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>Began 2009</td>
<td>134 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>Board review 2/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>Began 2007</td>
<td>103 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Falls</td>
<td>Applied Management</td>
<td>30-day review complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>Energy Systems Engineering Technology</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Outcomes thru 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>Facility Management</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>Global Trade and Logistics</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Homeland Security-Emergency Management</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Seattle</td>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>Began 2007</td>
<td>107 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Seattle</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>Began 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>Leadership and Supervision</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>Manufacturing Operations</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>Marketing and Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Beginning 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>Operations Management</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Began 2013</td>
<td>5 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Seattle</td>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>Transportation and Logistics Management</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>Aeronautical Science</td>
<td>Board review 5/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering Technology (2+2 with EWU)</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>Court Reporting and Captioning</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia</td>
<td>Diesel Technology</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Valley</td>
<td>Environmental Conservation</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>Forest Resource Management</td>
<td>Board review 5/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor (Joint)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Began 2009</td>
<td>147 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Seattle</td>
<td>Professional Technical Teacher Education</td>
<td>Began 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>Public Safety Administration</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Seattle</td>
<td>Sustainable Building Science</td>
<td>Beginning 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia</td>
<td>Sustainable Practices (STEM)</td>
<td>Beginning 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia</td>
<td>Teacher Education/Special Education</td>
<td>Intent expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>832 graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BAS Study

- Designed to investigate impact on college mission.
- Seven colleges in various stages of involvement participated.
- 29 interviews conducted.
Findings: BAS programs are consistent with the college mission

- Colleges see BAS programs as an extension of their basic mission; they are an enhancement for the individuals, employers and communities served by the college.
- BAS programs do not supplant or compromise existing core programs or services.

“The BAS enhances the mission, it doesn’t change it.”
“The BAS is an enhanced service for students we were serving anyway.”
Findings: Programs Based on Demand

- Colleges develop BAS programs based on student and employer demand.
- Colleges that do not offer BAS degrees are not participating due to lack of demand from their communities.

“Our employers don’t need BAS degrees. They say they would prefer grads with liberal arts degrees. The government is our largest employer and they are not looking for technical degrees.”
Findings: BAS Degrees Impact Institutions Positively

- Stimulating increased rigor across programs

“There is interest in the vision for the BAS degree. It is generating conversation on campus about expanding pathways. It is changing expectations for Gen Ed faculty to prepare students for higher level degrees.”

- Progress in preparing students for higher levels of math.
Findings: BAS Degrees Impact Institutions Positively

• College staff and community are proud of new degree offerings.

“People on campus see it as a real complementary program to the other sorts of things that we do. It provides a great transitional opportunity for students who want to continue with their education in business, but they are place bound and need to stay here.”
Findings: BAS Degrees Add Resources to Campus

- Additional library resources are required, and this benefits the campus as a whole.
- IT classrooms and lab space have been enhanced with new equipment to support new degrees.
- Additional advisors and faculty added in many cases.
Findings: Funding Matters

• Colleges’ approach to funding BAS degree programs varies.
• Some programs have been successful in bringing in enough revenue to cover program costs.
• To grow these programs and add more, additional revenue is needed.

“We have a lot fewer administrative costs than a university would, and we’re building on existing infrastructure, but we still have a lot to pay for.”
Findings: University Role Unclear but Improving

- Colleges not always sure that universities support their programs.
- In some cases, universities opted not to offer program because of small number of FTEs or facilities and equipment costs.
- Universities have a role in the approval process.
- Some universities have already accepted BAS graduates into Masters degree programs.
Follow Up Issues

- Additional financial resources needed to support and grow BAS degrees to meet state goals.
- Relationship/partnership with universities needs to be clarified and strengthened.
- Research about BAS programs across the country could inform Washington’s approach.
- Continue to monitor BAS outcomes in Washington to ensure effectiveness.
Action Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-06-30</td>
<td>Adoption of Consent Agenda: Approval of State Board Regular Meeting Minutes for May 8, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-31</td>
<td>Bellevue College, Energy Savings Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-32</td>
<td>Everett Community College, AMTEC Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-33</td>
<td>Green River Community College, Acquisition for Auburn Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-34</td>
<td>Green River Community College, Student Life Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-35</td>
<td>Green River Community College, Trades and Industry Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-36</td>
<td>Spokane Falls Community College, Campus Classrooms Project Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-37</td>
<td>Walla Walla Community College, COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-38</td>
<td>Edmonds Community College, Parking Lot and Building HVAC Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-39</td>
<td>Edmonds Community College, Snohomish Hall Third Floor Remodel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-40</td>
<td>Olympic College, Energy Savings Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-41</td>
<td>Spokane Community College, Equipment on Institute for Extended Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-42</td>
<td>2015 Corrections Education Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-43</td>
<td>Clark College, COP for Student Recreation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-44</td>
<td>Approval of Renton Technical College Applied Baccalaureate Degree in Application Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-45</td>
<td>Approval of Revised Applied Baccalaureate Approval Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-46</td>
<td>Approval of 2015-17 Biennial Operating Budget Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-47</td>
<td>Approval of 2014-15 Adult Basic Education Awards and Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06-48</td>
<td>Approval of 2014-15 Federal Workforce Awards and Allocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regular meeting minutes
The State Board held a study session on June 18, 2014, from 1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The Board heard presentations on subjects including: 1) 2017-19 Capital Budget Development, 2) 2015-17 Biennial Budget Development, 3) Student Voice Panel on Early Childhood Education and the Early Achievers Opportunity Grant, 4) Applied Baccalaureate Statements of Need, 5) Trustees’ Report, 6) Presidents’ Report, and 7) Executive Director’s Report. No action was taken at the study session.

State Board members present
Beth Willis, Shaunta Hyde, Jim Bricker, Elizabeth Chen, Wayne Martin, Anne Fennessy, Jay Reich

State Board members absent
Carol Landa-McVicker, Larry Brown

Call to Order and Welcome
Chair Beth Willis called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., welcomed those present, and asked for audience introductions.

Adoption of Regular Meeting Agenda
Motion: Moved by Shaunta Hyde and seconded by Jay Reich that the State Board adopt its June 19, 2014, regular meeting agenda as presented.

Host College Presentation
Olympic College President David Mitchell highlighted the RN-BSN program. Students in the program gave presentations highlighting their community health projects: Providing Health Services to a Vulnerable Population (Kitsap Immigration Assistance Center) and Breast Feeding Support in Kitsap County.

Adoption of Consent Agenda (Resolutions 14-06-30 through 14-06-42 and 14-06-48)
Motion: Moved by Shaunta Hyde and seconded by Wayne Martin that the State Board adopt the consent agenda for its June 19, 2014, regular meeting as follows:

a) Approval of State Board Regular Meeting Minutes for May 8, 2014
b) Resolution 14-06-30: Bellevue College, Energy Savings Project
c) Resolution 14-06-31: Everett Community College, AMTEC Project
d) Resolution 14-06-32: Green River Community College, Acquisition for Auburn Center
e) Resolution 14-06-33: Green River Community College, Student Life Building
f) Resolution 14-06-34: Green River Community College, Trades and Industry Building
g) Resolution 14-06-35: Spokane Falls Community College, Campus Classrooms Project Equipment
h) Resolution 14-06-36: Walla Walla Community College, COP
i) Resolution 14-06-37: Edmonds Community College, Parking Lot and Building HVAC Systems
j) Resolution 14-06-38: Edmonds Community College, Snohomish Hall Third Floor Remodel
k) Resolution 14-06-39: Edmonds Community College, Property Acquisition for Parking
l) Resolution 14-06-40: Olympic College, Energy Savings Project
m) Resolution 14-06-41: Spokane Community College, Equipment on Institute for Extended Learning Addition to Building 15
n) Resolution 14-06-42: 2015 Corrections Education Contract
o) Resolution 14-06-48: Clark College, COP for Student Recreation Center

First Link Panel

Mike Scroggins of the State Board staff presented that since 2010 the State Board has been actively involved in the advancement, planning, and sponsorship of the ctcLink Project. ctcLink is the implementation of a single, centralized system of online student and administrative functions that will give students, faculty, and staff anytime, online, and mobile access to a modern, efficient way of doing their college functions. It includes a new set of integrated software tools for student administration, academics, student finance, college financials, HR/payroll, and reporting. As the legacy software is replaced with modern technology, all 34 colleges also will redesign and align core business processes with streamlined, standardized practices.

Final Consideration of Applied Baccalaureate Degree, Renton Technical College, Application Development (Resolution 14-06-43)

Joyce Hammer of the State Board staff presented that Renton Technical College completed an initial step in the approval process when college administrators met with State Board members on October 23, 2013, to discuss how the proposed Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Application Development aligns with the college’s strategic goals and meets regional/statewide needs.

Renton Technical College proposes to develop a Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Application Development. This is one of five STEM degree proposals selected to receive development funding provided by 2SSB 5624 in 2013. Application development, a rapidly evolving discipline in computer science and software development, has consistently shown high demand and need for a qualified and highly educated workforce and encompasses various aspects of data analysis, application and software development, programming, and project management. Renton Technical College has a long history of successful collaboration and curriculum alignment with local high schools and their districts (e.g., Kent, Auburn, and Renton school districts), and as a result, Renton Technical College will create a seamless 2+2+2 pathway for high school students to enter into the proposed BAS in Application Development program.

In addition, the proposed BAS degree will broaden professional development for faculty who have demonstrated success with diverse learning formats and effective cohort methodologies. Renton Technical College has worked with Green River Community College to avoid duplication with their IT BAS degree program and create articulation agreements that will allow both colleges’ respective AAS graduates to enroll at either college for an applied baccalaureate degree in the IT field.

Motion: Moved by Jim Bricker and seconded by Shaunta Hyde that the State Board adopt Resolution 14-06-43 approving the Renton Technical College Applied Baccalaureate Degree in Application Development.
Motion carried.
Consideration of Revised Applied Baccalaureate Approval Process (Resolution 14-06-44)

Joyce Hammer of the State Board staff presented that due to rapid growth in the number of applied baccalaureate degree proposals by colleges across the system, the Board has asked for revisions to the approval process to streamline the process for the Board, the colleges, and SBCTC staff, while maintaining the integrity and rigor of proposal reviews and adherence to criteria set in enabling legislation and Board policy.

The following changes are proposed.

1. Continue the current Statement of Need presentations at Board study sessions. Refocus the staff agenda item descriptions and college presentations on student demand, employer demand, wages, and unmet need for the proposed program.
2. Consolidate the Statement of Need presentations at two to three Board meetings during the year.
3. Continue the current Program Proposal presentations and Board consideration during business meetings. Agenda item descriptions will restate the unmet need for the program, identify Board member questions raised during the Statement of Need discussion, summarize feedback to the college from staff or the peer review committee, and summarize college responses.
4. Program proposals will describe collaboration with similar degree programs offered by other community and technical colleges either on upper division curricula or articulation agreements with their associate degree programs.
5. Colleges that already have implemented and received accreditation through NWCCU to offer BAS degrees will have a staff review for their program proposal rather than a staff review and peer review. Agenda item descriptions will indicate whether the college is proposing their first applied bachelor’s degree or the current status of approved programs.

Motion: Moved by Anne Fennessy and seconded by Jay Reich that the State Board postpone Resolution 14-06-44 approving the Revised Applied Baccalaureate Approval Process until the September 10, 2014, meeting. Motion carried.

Consideration of 2015-17 Biennial Budget Development (Resolution 14-06-45)

Nick Lutes of the State Board staff identified the policy investments to be included in the 2015-17 operating budget request for the community and technical college system. The request is due to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) in September 2014. With the adoption of the Preliminary Recommended Policy items, the Board will be directing staff to develop the formal biennial request document to be submitted to OFM. Final consideration and adoption of the Board’s 2015-17 budget request will occur at the September retreat.

Motion: Moved by Elizabeth Chen and seconded by Shaunta Hyde that the State Board adopt Resolution 14-06-45 approving the 2015-17 Operating Budget Development Request. Motion carried.

Consideration of 2014-15 Adult Basic Education Awards and Allocations (Resolution 14-06-46)

Jon Kerr of the State Board staff presented recommendations for the distribution of federal funds for Adult Basic Education to 34 colleges and nine community-based organizations. They are based on the first year of awards resulting from the 2014-19 five-year, competitive application process. These applications detail innovations and improvements in instructional programming to increase student progress toward federal performance targets, student progression and transition to postsecondary education and employment, and the completion of high school credentials, certificates, and
degrees that lead to family sustaining employment. Applicants also outlined plans and strategies to implement the new Washington State Adult Education Five-year Plan –2014-2019: Pathways to College and Careers for Washington’s Emerging Workforce.

The new plan builds on a decade of innovation that includes the complete I-BEST pathway, High School 21+, and other research-based and data-driven practices that move more adults more quickly through basic education to certificates and degrees that will result in family-wage jobs.

The FY14-19 Adult Basic Education funding formula is working as intended in support of these proven innovative best practices. The new funding formula is based upon a three-year average of actual numbers for enrollments, Student Achievement total points and points per student, and transition. In contrast, previous funding was a legacy formula based upon census need. In the old formula, funding to each college in a region was pooled and then divided up by the providers as they saw fit. In addition, a hold harmless made it difficult to move money from one region to another. Each region retained the money regardless of actual services provided, which for some was a disincentive to maintain or expand basic skills programming.

Because the FY 14-19 formula was put into effect without any hold harmless (per input from stakeholders), the most significant funding shifts will occur during this first year. In subsequent years, providers will see more modest changes, largely driven by increases or decreases in Student Achievement points and any enrollment changes in Basic Skills. The goal of the new formula is to focus providers on student advancement, expanding access through increased basic skills enrollments rather than cutting programming.

Motion: Moved by Wayne Martin and seconded by Shaunta Hyde that the State Board adopt Resolution 14-06-46 approving the 2014-15 Adult Basic Education Awards and Allocations. Motion carried.

Consideration of 2014-15 Federal Workforce Education Awards (Resolution 14-06-47)

Jim Crabbe of the State Board staff presented that colleges fund workforce education programs in multiple ways, including the use of general enrollment funding and state and federal targeted funding. The state targeted funding for fiscal year 2014-15 was approved by the Board at the May 2014 meeting. What follows is proposed targeted federal funding for:

- Carl D. Perkins Grant
- WorkFirst
- Basic Food Employment and Training
- Early Achievers Opportunity Grant

The State Board awards federal workforce training funds to the community and technical colleges to support programs operated for entry level training, skills upgrade, or retraining for the state’s workforce. Each program provides for residents across the state to achieve increased educational attainment.

Motion: Moved by Jay Reich and seconded by Jim Bricker that the State Board adopt Resolution 14-06-47 approving the 2014-15 Federal Workforce Education Awards. Motion carried.
Chair Notes

Chair Willis thanked Board member Sharon Fairchild for her dedicated years of services to the Board. Sharon thanked her fellow members and noted that she was honored and privileged to have served so long.

Adjournment/next meeting

There being no further business, the State Board adjourned its regular meeting of June 19, 2014, at 12:00 p.m. The State Board will hold next meeting September 8-10, 2014, at Alderbrook.

Attest: ________________________________

Elizabeth Willis, Chair

______________________________

Marty Brown, Secretary
Edmonds Community College – Increase Local Expenditure Authority – Gateway Hall Improvements

**Brief Description**
Edmonds Community College is seeking approval to spend an additional $2,800,000 in local funds on the remodel of Gateway Hall. The College’s board designee approved the addition on August 5, 2014.

**How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus**
Remodeling this area is an investment in sustaining faculty and staff excellence. It also contributes toward a 21st century learning infrastructure with reduced future capital and maintenance costs.

**Background Information and Analysis**
Gateway Hall was built in 1986 as an office building. The College purchased the property in 2012 and has since made minor improvements to meet campus needs. The State Board approved up to $2,000,000 for the remodel in resolution 13-12-57 and an additional $1,200,000 in resolution 14-06-37. The additional expenditure authority will be used to improve the building entrance, signage, fix drainage issues, and complete renovation of the building’s HVAC system.

**Potential Questions**
Is this project consistent with State Board’s goals of building a 21st century learning infrastructure with reduced future capital and maintenance costs?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-49, increasing Edmonds Community College authority from $3,200,000 up to $6,000,000 in local funds for improvements to their Gateway Hall.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
State of Washington
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Resolution 14-09-49

A resolution relating to Edmonds Community College’s request to increase local expenditure authority from $3,200,000 up to $6,000,000 for improvements to their Gateway Hall.

WHEREAS, additional improvements are needed for the building entrance, signage, drainage, and complete renovation of the building’s HVAC system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Edmonds Community College to use up to $6,000,000 in local funds to make improvements to their Gateway Hall.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary           Elizabeth Willis, Chair

Tab 5b
Columbia Basin College, Local Expenditure Authority, Social Science Center

**Brief Description**
Columbia Basin College is seeking approval to spend up to $5,700,000 in local funds to expand their Social Science Center project 20082704. The College’s board approved the project on August 22, 2014.

**How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus**
This proposal will strengthen state and local economies by meeting the demands for a well-educated and skilled workforce.

**Background Information and Analysis**
In September 2013, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges released the Washington State Population and Employment Data 2010-2030 report, illustrating the population trends for community college participation through 2030. This report shows the Central and East Region (Columbia Basin College’s region) as the fastest growing region in the state, with an increase of 18 percent through 2030; out pacing the rest of the state by eight percent.

In response to that report, this project will add 21,500 square feet of instructional and office space to the College’s Pasco campus. The additional space will allow for the addition of 10 classrooms and 16 offices to accommodate the forecasted demand in the region. This proactive approach allows the College and the State to plan for the future while realizing efficiencies that would be lost if each project were standing alone. By combining the design of this locally funded addition with the design of the legislatively approved Social Science Center, project 20082704, $162,000 savings are realized in the design fees relative to two stand-alone projects.

**Potential Questions**
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goal of meeting the demands for a well-educated and skilled workforce?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-50, giving Columbia Basin College authority to spend up to $5,700,000 in local funds to expand their Social Science Center.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to Columbia Basin College’s request to spend up to $5,700,000 in local funds to expand their Social Science Center.

WHEREAS, the September 2013 Washington State Population and Employment Data 2010-2030 report shows the Central and East Region (Columbia Basin College’s region) as the fastest growing region in the state, with an increase of 18 percent through 2030; out pacing the rest of the state by eight percent; and

WHEREAS, this project will add 21,500 square feet of instructional and office space to the College’s Pasco campus, allowing for the addition of 10 classrooms and 16 offices to accommodate the forecasted demand in the region; and

WHEREAS, by combining the design of this locally funded addition with the design of the legislatively approved Social Science Center, project 20082704, the state will realize $162,000 savings in the design fees relative to two stand-alone projects;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Columbia Basin College to spend up to $5,700,000 in local funds to expand their Social Science Center.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary              Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Columbia Basin College, 2015-17 COP Request, Health Science Center Building

Brief Description
Columbia Basin College is seeking approval to acquire a Certificate of Participation for $7,000,000 and spend up to $10,000,000 in local funds to design and construct a $17,000,000 Health Science Center. The College’s board approved the project on August 22, 2014.

How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
This proposal is consistent with the State Board’s direction to strategically focus program growth on the largest unmet needs in the community. The proposal will also produce better education that meets the needs of local communities by taking full advantage of cost effective partnerships and leveraging outside resources.

Background Information and Analysis
The Health Science Center Phase Two project will design and construct a 67,000 square foot building in Richland, Washington to accommodate the educational and training needs of the College, the bi-county area, and local industry leaders in the field of medicine, science, and emergency response. In collaboration with the University of Washington and Kadlec Medical Center, the facility will house three new residency programs on the first two floors of the four story building, with the remaining two floors being dedicated for use as instructional space and faculty offices. The proposed project will strengthen ties with the regional healthcare industry and provide necessary experiential and instructional learning facilities for a growing regional healthcare industry. Furthermore, the additional clinical sites will ensure that students have a greater number of local opportunities for clinical rotations and practicums.

The College has currently received a $3,000,000 cash pledge from Kadlec Medical Center to begin construction, as well as a commitment of $7,000,000 to be raised by the college’s foundation through the Housing Trust Fund based on a 20-year lease to Kadlec for use of a portion of the building.

Potential Questions
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goals to:
• Focus program growth on the largest unmet needs in the community?
• Meet local needs by leveraging outside resources?

Recommendation/Preferred Result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-51, giving Columbia Basin College authority to acquire a Certificate of Participation for $7,000,000 and spend up to another $10,000,000 in local funds to design and construct a $17,000,000 Health Science Center.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to Columbia Basin College’s request to acquire a Certificate of Participation for $7,000,000 and spend up to another $10,000,000 in local funds to design and construct at $17,000,000 Health Science Center.

WHEREAS, the College’s Health Science Center Phase Two project will design and construct a 67,000 square foot building in Richland, Washington to accommodate the educational and training needs of the College, the bi-county area, and local industry leaders in the field of medicine, science, and emergency response; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project will strengthen ties with the regional healthcare industry and provide necessary experiential and instructional learning facilities for a growing regional healthcare industry, and the additional clinical sites will ensure that students have a greater number of local opportunities for clinical rotations and practicums; and

WHEREAS, the College has currently received a $3,000,000 cash pledge from Kadlec Medical Center to begin construction, as well as a commitment of $7,000,000 associated with a long-term (20 year) lease agreement;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Columbia Basin College to acquire a Certificate of Participation for $7,000,000 and spend up to another $10,000,000 in local funds to design and construct their Health Science Center.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_________________________  _______________________
Marty Brown, Secretary          Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Centralia College, Acquisition of Vacated Streets for Parking

**Brief Description**
Centralia College seeks to purchase 0.89 acres of two city streets and alleys bisecting College property, which will be used for student parking, and improve campus circulation.

**How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus**
This acquisition and subsequent parking provided will improve student access to education.

**Background Information and Analysis**
The properties the college seeks to acquire are currently public streets and alleys bordered by College owned property. The College master plan calls for the city streets to be vacated and converted to parking and pedestrian circulation. Envisioned program improvements to the property would include modifying the surface for student parking to include ADA approved parking stalls that are not currently available on campus, which meet mandated requirements.

It will cost the College $50,000 in local funds to acquire the vacated properties. Please see the attached map of the property.

**Potential Questions**
Is the acquisition consistent with the State Board's goal of finding more and better ways to reduce barriers and expand opportunities so more Washingtonians can reach higher levels of education?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-52, giving Centralia College authority to use up to $50,000 in local funds to purchase 0.89 acres of two city streets and alleys bisecting College property, which will be used for student parking.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 14-09-52

A resolution relating to Centralia College’s request to use local funds to purchase 0.89 acres of two city streets and alleys bisecting College property, which will be used for student parking.

WHEREAS, the properties the college seeks to acquire are currently public streets and alleys bordered by College owned property; and

WHEREAS, the College master plan calls for the city streets to be vacated and converted to parking; and

WHEREAS, envisioned program improvements to the property would include modifying the surface for student parking to include ADA approved parking stalls that are not currently available on campus, which meet mandated requirements;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Centralia College to use up to $50,000 in local funds to purchase 0.89 acres of two city streets and alleys bisecting College property, which will be used for student parking.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary            Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Yakima Valley Community College, Property Acquisition, 808 South 15th Avenue

Brief Description
Yakima Valley Community College seeks to purchase .13 acres at 808 South 15th Avenue, to be used as a pay-to-park parking lot.

How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
This acquisition and subsequent parking provided will improve student access to education.

Background Information and Analysis
The property is identified in the College’s master plan as a future pay-to-park parking lot. Additional on-campus parking will alleviate parking congestion in surrounding neighborhoods and improve student access. The acquisition cost of $132,000 will be paid using local funds, as approved by the College’s Board of Trustees. The parking lot will be supported by revenue generated from parking fees. Please see Attachment A for a map of the acquired property.

Potential Questions
Is the acquisition consistent with the State Board's goal of finding more and better ways to reduce barriers and expand opportunities so more Washingtonians can reach higher levels of education?

Recommendation/Preferred Result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-53, giving Yakima Valley Community College authority to use local funds to purchase .13 acres at 808 South 15th Avenue, to be used as a pay-to-park parking lot.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
State of Washington
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Resolution 14-09-53

A resolution relating to Yakima Valley Community College’s request to use local funds to purchase .13 acres at 808 South 15th Avenue, to be used as a pay-to-park parking lot.

WHEREAS, the property is identified in the College’s master plan as a future pay-to-park parking lot; and

WHEREAS, additional on-campus parking will alleviate parking congestion in surrounding neighborhoods and improve student access; and

WHEREAS, the acquisition cost of $132,000 will be paid using local funds, as approved by the College’s Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, the parking lot will be supported by revenue generated from parking fees;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Yakima Valley Community College to use up to $132,000 in local funds to purchase .13 acres at 808 South 15th Avenue, to be used as a pay-to-park parking lot.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary          Elizabeth Willis, Chair
As of August 2014

Master Plan Boundary

Additional Properties Bequeathed to the College:
- Single-Family Unit: 1124 S. 16th Ave.
- Retail Eating Facility: 16th Ave. @ Nob Hill Blvd.
- Retail Auto Shop: 501 W. Nob Hill Blvd.
- Single-Family Unit: 1017 S. Pleasant Ave.
- Single-Family Unit: 1019 S. Pleasant Ave.
Bellevue College, Local Expenditure Authority, Upgrade Athletic Fields and Facilities

**Brief Description**
Bellevue College is seeking approval to spend up to $3,500,000 in local funds to upgrade their athletic fields and facilities. Through Board delegated approval, the College’s president approved the project on June 18, 2014.

**How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus**
The project will improve student access and experience and provide operating efficiencies.

**Background Information and Analysis**
The project includes the design and installation of the infrastructure needed to provide power to the fields and new field house, add lighting to the existing baseball field, renovate the existing multi-use athletic field to incorporate artificial turf and lighting, and construct a new field house to support the operations. The changes will improve student access and experience and provide operating efficiencies.

**Potential Questions**
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goals to improve student access and reduce facility maintenance costs?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-54, giving Bellevue College authority to spend up to $3,500,000 in local funds to upgrade their athletic fields and facilities.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbcctc.edu
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 14-09-54

A resolution relating to Bellevue College’s request to spend up to $3,500,000 in local funds to upgrade their athletic fields and facilities.

WHEREAS, the project will include the design and installation of the infrastructure needed to provide power to the fields and new field house, add lighting to the existing baseball field, renovate the existing multi-use athletic field to incorporate artificial turf and lighting, and construct a new field house to support the operations; and

WHEREAS, the project will improve student access and experience and provide operating efficiencies; and

WHEREAS, the College has funds available to cover the cost and the College’s president has approved the project;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Bellevue College to spend up to $3,500,000 in local funds to upgrade their athletic fields and facilities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

Marty Brown, Secretary

Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Clark College, Local Expenditure Authority and land acquisition, STEM Building

**Brief Description**
Clark College is seeking approval to spend up to $1,700,000 in local funds and receive surplus federal land from the City of Vancouver to construct their STEM Building, project 20082705.

**How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus**
The project will help Clark College meet the needs of changing local economies by increasing the number of skilled employees in the areas of greatest unmet need. To avoid further scope reductions, the College is taking full advantage of their partnerships and leveraging outside resources.

**Background Information and Analysis**
The project budget was $41,016,000 when the State Board requested $38,487,000 for construction in the 2013-15 biennium. The Legislature reduced the requested construction funding for this project by $4,703,000, or approximately 12 percent. In response to the legislative reduction, the College reduced equipment, exterior covered areas, glazing, the quality of floor finishes, and changed the building structural systems to fit the project within the budget provided. The construction contingency was also reduced to 6.5 percent.

The College opened bids for the project on June 17, 2014. Even after the significant redesign effort, the low bid was almost exactly the same as the original budget request. The single largest unavoidable expense was the extensive asbestos contamination found in the soils. The base bid includes approximately $873,000 for the remaining hazardous material remediation. There were also additional design costs and escalation due to the time it took to redesign the project to fit in the funding provided.

The Office of Financial Management authorized an additional $694,000 from a statewide contingency pool, State Board staff authorized $500,000 from the Hazardous Material Mitigation Pool in accordance with State Board policy, and the College has raised $1,700,000 locally for construction and equipment, to move forward without further scope reductions. The College is requesting authority to spend these local funds on the project. Including the prior legislative appropriations for $36,358,000, the project budget will become $38,558,000, approximately six percent less than the State Board’s 2013-15 request.

A portion of the STEM building and parking will be constructed on land currently owned by the City of Vancouver. The City has offered to give the land for the benefit of the College. Due to a federal restriction on the use of the formerly surplused land, the federal government must approve the transfer and has provided their approval resolution in Attachment A for the State Board to receive the property. The College has committed to use the land and pay any costs associated with the transfer of the land as described in Attachment B.

**Potential Questions**
Is the use of the local funds consistent with the State Board’s direction to take advantage of partnerships and leverage outside resources?
Recommendation/Preferred Result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-55, giving Clark College authority to spend up to $1,700,000 in local funds to construct and equip their $38,558,000 STEM Building, project 20082705, and to receive surplused federal land from the City of Vancouver to support the project.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbcc.edu
A resolution relating to Clark College’s request to spend up to $1,700,000 in local funds to construct and equip their $38,558,000 STEM Building, project 20082705, and to receive surplused federal land.

WHEREAS, the project’s state funding was reduced by the Legislature and the College accordingly redesigned their project scope; and

WHEREAS, even after the significant redesign effort, the low bid was almost exactly the same as the original budget request and the most expensive part was the necessary cleanup of asbestos contamination; and

WHEREAS, the College raised $1,700,000 locally for construction and equipment and requests authority to use these local funds to move forward without further scope reductions; and

WHEREAS, the federal government approved the City’s offer of land to the College;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Clark College to spend up to $1,700,000 in local funds to construct their STEM Building and authorizes the attached resolution to receive surplused federal land in support of the project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

Marty Brown, Secretary

Elizabeth Willis, Chair
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, certain real property formerly owned by the United States of America, located in the County of Clark, State of Washington, was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal government and transferred to the City of Vancouver by the Department of Interior’s Lands to Park program on July 14, 1975. The City of Vancouver no longer has a need for the property for park program purposes and wishes to retransfer the property to the State of Washington for educational purposes. The retransfer will be subject to assignment for disposal for educational purposes by the Secretary of Education, under the provisions of Section 203(k)(1)(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377) (Act), as amended, and rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, more particularly described as follows:

211,266 square feet, or 4.85 acres, located on the west side of Ft. Vancouver Way, south of the intersection with Fourth Plain Boulevard, in the Central Park area of the City of Vancouver. There are currently no buildings on this property; there is a parking lot that was used to serve the former Clark County Public Health building, which was located on an adjacent. Along with the parking lot, the property includes grass and other vegetation.

WHEREAS, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges needs and can utilize said property for educational purposes in accordance with the requirements of said Act and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder of which this Board is fully informed, including commitments regarding use and time within such use shall commence.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, shall make application to the Secretary of Education for, and secure the transfer to it of, the above-mentioned property for said use upon and subject to such exceptions, reservations, terms, covenants, agreements, conditions and restrictions as the Secretary of Education, or his authorized representative may require in connection with the disposal of said property under said Act and rules and regulations issued thereto; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that State Board for Community and Technical Colleges has legal authority and is willing and is in a position financially and otherwise to assume immediate care and maintenance of the property, and that Marty Brown, Executive Director, is hereby authorized, for and on behalf of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges to do and perform any and all acts and things which may be necessary to carry out the foregoing resolution including the preparing, making and filing of plans, applications,
reports and other documents; the execution, acceptance, delivery and recordation of agreements, deeds and other instruments pertaining to the transfer of said property; and the payment of any and all sums necessary on account of the purchase price thereof including fees or costs incurred in connection with the transfer of said property for surveys, title searches, real estate appraisals, recordation of instruments or costs associated with escrow arrangements; together with any payments necessary by virtue of nonuse or deferral of use of the property. If the applicant is unable to place the property into use (or determines that a deferral of use should occur), IT IS UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED that State Board for Community and Technical Colleges will pay to the United States Department of Education for each month of nonuse beginning twelve (12) months after the date of the deed, or thirty-six (36) months where construction or major renovation is contemplated, the sum of 1/360th of the then current fair market value of the property for each month of nonuse.

If submission of the Application for Public Benefit Allowance Acquisition of Surplus Federal Real Property for Educational Purposes is approved, a copy of the application and standard deed conditions will be filed with the permanent minutes of the Board.

State of Washington, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
1300 Quince Street SE
Olympia, WA 98504

I, Elizabeth Willis, hereby certify that I am the Chair, of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and that the foregoing resolution is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the vote of a majority of the members of said State Board for Community and Technical Colleges present at a meeting of said Board on the 10 day of September, 2014, at which a quorum was present.

______________________________
Elizabeth Willis, Chair

(Please note: The official certifying and attesting to the action taken by the governing board in this resolution must NOT be the same individual designated and authorized to represent the applicant organization in the body of the resolution.)
MEMORANDUM

TO: WAYNE DOTY, STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
    STEFANIE FULLER, DEPARTMENT OF ENTERPRISE SERVICES

FROM: BOB WILLIAMSON, VICE PRESIDENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

DATE: AUGUST 19, 2014/BW700

RE: STEM PROPERTY

As requested, I am providing this memo to attest to Clark College’s interest in acquiring the property, known as Parcel C, needed for construction of our new STEM facility. Acquiring this property will first require authorization from the National Park Service to transfer title from the City of Vancouver to the Department of Enterprise Services. The state will then need to submit an application and resolution to the federal Department of Education (DOE) to change the public benefit conveyance on the property from “recreation” to “education”. Without DOE’s approval of this change, the existing recreation covenant will remain on the property and the College will be unable to build the STEM facility as planned.

STEM has been part of the College’s Facilities Master Planning for over a decade. Consistent with DOE restrictions, we intend to use the property to construct a 70,000 square foot, state-of-the-art STEM building with classrooms, labs, and digital learning areas to serve our more than 2,000 STEM FTES.

The College understands that DOE may require payment for the land if it is unused between 12 months after the date of the deed and 36 months after construction is contemplated. Since we expect STEM to be completed in 20 months, we don’t anticipate any payments to DOE will be necessary. However, in the event of unforeseen circumstances, the College is prepared to make such payments as needed.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you.

th
Wenatchee Valley College, Property Acquisitions, 412 North Elliott Avenue and 24 Birch Street North

Brief Description

Wenatchee Valley College seeks to purchase .29 acres at 412 North Elliott Avenue in Wenatchee, Washington and .09 acres at 24 Birch Street North in Omak, Washington. The single-family home on the Elliott Avenue property will be used to house the residence hall on-call advisor and the single-family home on the Birch Street property will create rental income for the College until it is demolished to make room for more classrooms.

How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus

This acquisition and subsequent use for an advisor, parking and classrooms will improve student access to education.

Background Information and Analysis

In order to support student success, an on-call advisor is needed close-by for students living in the residence hall, in order for them to be close enough to see and hear activity. The house currently used for this purpose will be demolished and the space used for parking to address student concerns after the City of Wenatchee removed on-street parking. The City supports development of additional off-street parking for College patrons and will require it with the construction of the replacement building expected to be funded in the 2015-17 and 2017-19 biennia. The cost to acquire this property is estimated to be $140,000 plus related expenses. Local funds will be used for the acquisition and initial preparation of the property and annual maintenance costs will be charged to student housing funds. Please see the property map in the attached excerpt from the College’s facility master plan in Attachment A.

The acquisition of the property at 24 Birch Street North provides options for long-term improvements to the Omak campus. The addition of this property to their existing property on the corner of Apple and Birch Streets gives the College a combined lot size large enough for a modular classroom building that would be flexible in design, allowing for easy adaptation to high-demand training like environmental systems or aerospace. The Omak campus is located in a residential neighborhood, so any expansion depends on acquiring properties as they become available. The cost to acquire the property is estimated to be $125,000 plus closing costs, which would be paid from local funds. Annual maintenance costs will be financed by rental income, until the College is ready to demolish both houses on Birch Street using local funds and replace them with the flexible teaching and learning space. Attachment B shows the proposed acquisition relative to the other Wenatchee Valley buildings in Omak.

Potential Questions

Will these acquisitions improve student access to education?

Recommendation/Preferred Result

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-56, giving Wenatchee Valley College authority to use up to $290,000 in local funds for the acquisition of 412 North Elliott Avenue in Wenatchee, Washington and 24 Birch Street North in Omak, Washington.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
State of Washington
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Resolution 14-09-56

A resolution relating to Wenatchee Valley College’s request to use local funds for the acquisition of .29 acres at 412 North Elliott Avenue in Wenatchee, Washington and .09 acres at 24 Birch Street North in Omak, Washington.

WHEREAS, the College needs more off-street parking at their main campus; and

WHEREAS, the purchase of the property at 412 North Elliott Avenue provides housing for an on-call advisor to be close-by for students living in the main campus residence hall and the house currently used for this purpose can then be demolished and the space used for needed parking; and

WHEREAS, the College’s Omak campus needs flexible modular classroom space and is located in a residential neighborhood, so any expansion depends on acquiring properties as they become available; and

WHEREAS, the College has sufficient local funds to cover both acquisitions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Wenatchee Valley College to use up to $290,000 in local funds for the acquisition of 412 North Elliott Avenue in Wenatchee, Washington and the acquisition of 24 Birch Street North in Omak, Washington.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary

_______________________________
Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Excerpt from Wenatchee Valley College Master Plan adopted December 2013

Building List:
A: Wenatchee Hall
B: Elleroff Science Center
C: Wells Hall
D: Brown Library
E: Smith Gymnasium
F: Van Tassell Center
G: Sexton Hall
H: Central Washington University
I: Bailey Hall
J: Environmental Systems and Refrigeration Technology
K: Industrial Technology
L: Wells House
M: Music and Art Center (MAC)
N: Facilities and Operations
O: Technology
P: National Guard
Q: Residence Hall
Lower Columbia College, Certificate of Participation, Fitness Center/Myklebust Gymnasium

Brief Description
Lower Columbia College is seeking approval for a $3,000,000 Certificate of Participation to renovate the Myklebust Gymnasium, project 30000118, and add a Fitness Center. The project’s total cost will be $8,625,000.

How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
This project will increase student retention and improve access for students with disabilities.

Background Information and Analysis
In June 2005, the Associated Students of Lower Columbia College passed a student initiative to assess all students a fee to finance a remodel of the gymnasium to meet the various needs of the students and instructional programs. The plan addresses the problem areas identified by students and staff, including: a larger and more open and accessible fitness center to meet expanded student and class needs, a larger free weight area, open spaces for students to congregate, office spaces for staff to provide ongoing supervision of the gymnasium, spaces for dance, yoga, Pilates, and other health classes requested by students, but not envisioned when the building was constructed in 1954, and an elevator to allow access to the second floor of the gymnasium for those unable to climb a narrow, steep staircase.

The renovation of the gymnasium and addition of a fitness center will increase the College's ability to offer physical education classes. The Lower Columbia College service district consistently ranks at the bottom statewide in terms of health indicators. This project will allow the College to respond to the current needs of its community. Additionally, this project allows the College to improve ADA accessibility in this older building.

The current gymnasium is 21,500 square feet and the addition will include 12,000 square feet, for a total renovated gymnasium/fitness center square footage of 33,500 square feet. This project was submitted and approved as a matching project for the 2011-13 biennium and construction began in October 2013, with a projected completion date of January 2015. Construction costs have been higher than expected, in part due to problems with the exiting foundation. The College is requesting to finance up to $3,000,000 of the project cost.

Potential Questions
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s direction to enroll more underserved populations? Is the project consistent with the State Board’s goal of achieving increased educational attainment?

Recommendation/Preferred Result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-57, giving Lower Columbia College authority for a $3,000,000 Certification of Participation to supplement the renovation of Myklebust Gymnasium and add a Fitness Center.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
State of Washington
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Resolution 14-09-57

A resolution relating to Lower Columbia College’s request for a $3,000,000 Certification of Participation to renovate the Myklebust Gymnasium and add a Fitness Center.

WHEREAS, the Associated Students of Lower Columbia College passed a student initiative to assess all students a fee to finance a remodel of the gymnasium to meet the various needs of the students and instructional programs; and

WHEREAS, the Lower Columbia College service district (Cowlitz and Wahkiakum Counties) consistently ranks at the bottom statewide in terms of health indicators and this project will allow the College to respond to the current needs of its community; and

WHEREAS, the project was submitted and approved as a matching project for the 2011-13 biennium and construction began in October 2013, with a projected completion date of January 2015;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges adds a $3,000,000 Certificate of Participation to the 2015-17 capital budget request for Lower Columbia College to supplement the renovation of Myklebust Gymnasium and add a Fitness Center.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary                Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Clark College, Certificate of Participation, Culinary Arts Facility Remodel

**Brief Description**
Clark College is seeking approval for an $8,500,000 Certificate of Participation to renovate the Culinary Arts Facility. The financing of capital projects and the acquisition of real property requires legislative approval.

**How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus**
This project will help Clark College meet the needs of their local economy by increasing the number of skilled employees in the areas of greatest unmet need.

**Background Information and Analysis**
During the 2012-13 academic year, a task force found that while Culinary Arts Food and Baking programs are viable programs, the College’s facility is in dire need of updating. The facility is currently substandard in plumbing, electrical, and space allocation. A facilities renovation will significantly increase the curricular scope of the programs, as well as the variety and quality of food service. The College has spent $40,000 on a feasibility study and has a plan to develop the space. The College’s Board of Trustees has approved the project and local resources necessary to support the debt service. The remodel meets several areas of the College’s Strategic Plan, such as responding to workforce needs, expanding access, and enhancing college systems.

**Potential Questions**
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s direction for colleges to provide training in areas with unmet need?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-58, adding an $8,500,000 Certification of Participation to the State Board’s 2015-17 Capital Request to renovate the Culinary Arts Facility.

Policy Manual Change ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, Capital Budget Director
360-704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 14-09-58  

A resolution relating to Clark College’s request for an $8,500,000 Certification of Participation to renovate the Culinary Arts Facility.

WHEREAS, the College’s facility is in dire need of updating, being currently substandard in plumbing, electrical, and space allocation; and

WHEREAS, a facilities renovation will significantly increase the curricular scope of the programs, as well as the variety and quality of food service and responds to workforce needs, expands access, and enhances college systems; and

WHEREAS, the College has spent $40,000 on a feasibility plan and has a plan for development of the space; and

WHEREAS, the College has identified the local resources necessary to support the debt service;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the addition of an $8,500,000 Certification of Participation to the 2015-17 Capital Request for Clark College to renovate the Culinary Arts Facility.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary                Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Consideration of Revised Applied Baccalaureate Approval Process

Brief Description
Due to rapid growth in the number of applied baccalaureate (BAS) degree proposals by colleges across the system, the Board has asked for revisions to the approval process to streamline the process for the Board, the colleges, and SBCTC staff, while maintaining the integrity and rigor of proposal reviews and adherence to criteria set in enabling legislation and Board policy. This agenda item will discuss staff recommendations on revisions to the approval process based on the Board’s discussion at the March Board meeting and subsequent feedback received at the June meeting. SBCTC staff are recommending the revised approval process to the Board for adoption.

How does this link to the System Design, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
Approving applied baccalaureate degree proposals by community and technical colleges is in alignment with the Board’s System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus.

System Direction. Applied baccalaureate degrees address Student Success by increasing educational attainment especially for place bound, working adult students. In addition, these degrees address Economic Demand by meeting demands for a well-educated and skilled workforce and increasing the number of skilled workers in high demand occupations. Many applied baccalaureate degree programs also are designed to be responsive to the business community through less traditional and more flexible course offerings.

Mission Study. Applied baccalaureate degrees contribute to two goals: (a) close the skills gap for technically trained workers and (b) contribute more to the production of baccalaureate degrees. Expansion of applied baccalaureate degrees is specifically identified as a means to increase our contribution.

Policy Focus. The college system is implementing applied bachelor’s degrees as a system level effort under the State Board’s authority to approve degree programs. Washington is known nationally as a state that approached BAS degrees as a system level effort, rather than direct authority provided by the legislature to individual colleges. SBCTC staff continues to research best practices in order to improve statewide coordination and efficiency.

Background Information and Analysis

Proposed changes to the applied baccalaureate degree approval process. At the March meeting, Board members considered a number of options for revising the degree approval process. Given the discussion, the following changes are proposed:

1. Continue the current Statement of Need presentations at Board study sessions. Focus the staff agenda item descriptions and college presentations on student demand, employer demand, wages, and unmet need for the proposed program.
2. Consolidate the Statement of Need and Program Proposal presentations to be scheduled during the October, February, and May Board meetings.
3. Continue the current Program Proposal presentations and Board consideration for possible approval during business meetings. Agenda item descriptions will restate the unmet need for the program, identify Board member questions raised during the Statement of Need discussion, summarize feedback to the college from staff or the peer review committee, and summarize college responses.

4. Program proposals will describe collaboration with similar degree programs offered by other community and technical colleges either on upper division curricula or articulation agreements with their associate degree programs.

5. Colleges that already have implemented and received accreditation through the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) to offer BAS degrees will have a staff review for their program proposal rather than a staff review and peer review. Agenda item descriptions will indicate whether the college is proposing its first applied bachelor’s degree or the current status of approved programs. SBCTC staff will continue to review all college Applied Baccalaureate proposals and make recommendations to the Board.

The Instruction Commission (college vice presidents of instruction) has been asked by WACTC (the presidents) to make recommendations about how to fit BAS programs into the WACTC structure and how to promote collaboration among colleges to increase articulation agreements and avoid unnecessary program duplication. An Instruction Commission subcommittee developed a number of recommendations earlier this spring that were considered by the full Commission on May 8-9, 2014, and provided to WACTC at their meeting May 29-30, 2014. The proposed outcome is a leadership role for the Instruction Commission in developing specific evaluation rubrics for employer and student demand; facilitating collaboration among colleges with similar associate and applied bachelor’s degree programs on degree titles, shared curricula, and articulation agreements; and providing peer training and advising opportunities for new colleges developing and implementing applied bachelor degree programs.

Given this proposed leadership role by the Instruction Commission, staff worked with the Commission to revise the BAS approval process consistent with the Board’s changes listed above.

**Potential Questions**

- Do the proposed changes to the applied baccalaureate degree approval process align with Board members’ recommendations?
- What direction to staff on next steps does the Board wish to make?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**

Staff recommends State Board action on Resolution 14-09-59, approving the new Applied Baccalaureate Degree Program Approval Process.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Joyce Hammer, Director, Transfer Education
360-704-4338, jhammer@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to updating the Applied Baccalaureate Degree program approval process.

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Higher Education Coordinating Board approved a selection process used for applied baccalaureate degrees in 2010; approved initial revisions to the approval process in February 2013; and

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges wishes to maintain a rigorous yet efficient, streamlined process for approving Applied Baccalaureate Degrees that adheres to detailed core criteria; and

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges requires the process for approving Applied Baccalaureate Degrees to include a strong focus on a statement of need for proposed programs.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves the revised Applied Baccalaureate Degree Program Approval Process (Attachment A).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the governor, legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

Marty Brown, Secretary

Elizabeth Willis, Chair
Applied Baccalaureate Degree
Program Approval Process
Revised September 2014

As part of the 2010 System Design Plan legislation (SSB 6355), applied baccalaureate degrees offered by Washington's community and technical colleges were changed from pilot to regular status. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) approves all proposals for applied baccalaureate degrees submitted by the community and technical colleges. These programs are intended to accomplish the following:

1. Serve professional and technical degree-holding students who have limited access to bachelor degree programs after completing their associate of applied science degree or its equivalent.

2. Provide opportunities for working adults who are place-bound and want to earn a baccalaureate degree.

3. Fill skills and credentials gaps and needs in specific occupations, particularly specific professional and technical fields requiring applied knowledge and skills.

In July 2012, SBCTC retained sole approval authority for applied baccalaureates degrees. The following describes the process for community and technical colleges seeking to acquire state approval to offer applied bachelor’s degree programs. The SBCTC may make future revisions to the selection process and criteria as needed.

Step 1: Institutions notify SBCTC and higher education partners of their intent to offer an applied bachelor degree program by placing the program title and anticipated date of enrollment on the higher education Inter-institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning (ICAPP) Grid.

The grid is used to informally notify higher education partners (colleges, universities, the Washington Student Achievement Council, and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges) of a college’s intent to offer a program. This informal notice allows concerns to be addressed between colleges prior to the official notice to higher education partners.

- Institutions simply send an email to the SBCTC staff responsible for reviewing applied baccalaureate degree program proposals. The body of the email must include the working title of the degree program and the anticipated enrollment date.

- SBCTC staff will place the program information on the ICAPP grid for notice to the higher education community.
SBCTC staff members will provide quarterly updates to State Board members regarding potential upcoming applied baccalaureate programs being considered by colleges.

Step 2: Institutions submit a Statement of Need to SBCTC staff and a brief analysis of the College’s content area strength and capacity for the applied bachelor degree.

((In addition, SBCTC staff will forward the Statement of Need to SBCTC board members and schedule a “conceptual discussion” between board members and the lead administrator of the proposed applied baccalaureate degree program. The conceptual discussion will focus on the role of the applied baccalaureate program related to the mission, vision and goals of the college and the system.))

Institutions can download the cover sheet and document entitled “Statement of Need Criteria” (Forms A and B) from the SBCTC website. Institutions must complete all elements of Forms A and B and then submit the completed forms to SBCTC staff within the specified period of time.

The Statement of Need will be reviewed by SBCTC staff to ensure that all criteria have been met. SBCTC staff will forward feedback regarding the strengths of the plan and areas needing improvement to the college with the goal of strengthening the proposal to ensure required criteria are met. The college may submit revised documents as many times as appropriate.

Once criteria are met, staff from the SBCTC will send out a notice to universities and community and technical colleges officially informing them of the proposed program. Questions or concerns about the proposal must be submitted to the SBCTC within 30 days. Concerns will be forwarded to the submitting college.

Step 3: SBCTC staff forward the Statement of Need to SBCTC board members and schedule a “conceptual discussion” between board members and the lead administrator of the proposed applied baccalaureate degree program.

The conceptual discussion will focus on the unmet need for the program in the region.

The Statement of Need will also address the relationship of the proposal to the institutional role, mission, and program priorities; employer and community unmet need; evidence of the baccalaureate degree building on an existing professional and technical degree program; student demand for the program; and efforts to maximize state resources for place-bound students through collaboration with similar CTC associate degree and applied bachelor’s degree programs and the CTC Centers of Excellence.
Step 4: Institutions submit program approval application to the SBCTC. (Institutions can download the cover sheet and “New Degree Program Proposal” document from the SBCTC website. Institutions must complete all required elements of Forms C and D and submit the completed documents to SBCTC staff within a specified period of time.)

- A committee of higher education representatives will review the application. The committee will be comprised of community and technical college vice presidents of instruction, student services, and finance/business, and others as appropriate. (A representative from the proposing college will be encouraged to attend the review committee meeting to respond to questions and concerns.) The committee will make recommendations to the SBCTC staff.

- A peer review is not required for colleges that are already accredited as bachelor degree granting institutions through the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). SBCTC staff will continue to review all college Applied Baccalaureate proposals and make recommendations to the SBCTC.

- The New Degree Program Proposal should clearly address concerns raised by the State Board during the Statement of Need phase of the process.

- In addition to demonstrating sustainability, rigor, and appropriate student support services, the New Degree Program Proposal should reflect collaboration with CTC’s and neighboring baccalaureate institutions when applicable and foster pathway options among the various institutions.

Step 5: The State Board for Community and Technical College board members will officially vote on the program proposal. A college representative will participate in the Board meeting and provide oral support for the proposal and respond to Board member questions.
Public Hearing: Revisions to WAC 131-28-025 Governing the method of assessing tuition and fee charges for competency based education programs

Brief Description
To facilitate the implementation of competency-based programs at the community and technical colleges, the Board will hold a public hearing on proposed changes to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) rules governing the tuition schedule. (See Attachment A for proposed rule change.) After the public hearing, the Board will be asked to adopt the proposed rule changes allowing tuition to be charged based on the length of the academic term rather than on credits.

How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
The competency based degree initiative is in direct alignment with the System Direction, Mission Study, Strategic Technology Plan and the Board’s Policy Focus.

System Direction: The competency based degree initiative is using Innovation to improve Student Success by increasing access to college degrees for working adults with cost efficiencies through an accelerated curriculum and open educational resources.

Mission Study: Competency based education will serve more working adults, one of the fastest growing demographics in our state over the next 20 years, and increase the number of associate degree holders eligible to transfer into university baccalaureate degree programs.

Strategic Technology Plan: The initiative builds upon the foundation of statewide eLearning tools, the pooled enrollment infrastructure through Washington OnLine, and faculty experiences with open education resources.

Policy Focus: If successful, Washington’s community and technical colleges will be the first system to implement competency-based education as a collaborative, statewide college system effort.

Background Information and Analysis
In May, staff briefed the Board on a new system initiative to deliver courses and programs to students through online, asynchronous, competency-based education programs. Competency-based programs allow each student to progress at an individual pace through course content and to receive academic credit upon demonstrating mastery of course competencies.

In traditional courses, a student is charged tuition based on the number of credits taken each academic quarter. In competency-based programs, by contrast, a student gains access to advisors, instructors, course materials, and assessments for a set period of time by paying a flat tuition rate; the student pays for time rather than for the number of credits taken.

The State Board is responsible for adopting the colleges’ tuition schedule each year. Current administrative rule (Washington Administrative Code, or WAC, 131-28-025) adopted by the Board requires tuition and fees to be charged on a per-credit basis. This WAC needs to be amended so that students in competency-based degree programs can pay tuition based on the length of the term rather than on the number of credits taken. Under the proposed rule, tuition for competency-based degree
programs would be equivalent to tuition charged for a 15 credit load for one quarter, prorated for the length of the competency-based program academic term.

The conceptual framework adopted by WACTC last March (see Attachment B) recommends six-month academic terms for competency-based programs. Under this structure and under the proposed rule changes, a student in a competency-based degree program would pay $2,667 for a six-month academic term; this is double the tuition charge for taking 15 credits for one academic quarter, which lasts about three months. The number of credits a student completes within the six-month term would be determined on an individual basis. The six-month term envisioned in WACTC’s conceptual framework is not set in stone; colleges could determine that a shorter or longer term length is needed for competency-based programs. The proposed rule changes would accommodate different term lengths for competency-based programs while keeping tuition charges aligned with those for traditional courses and programs.

The Washington State Office of the Code Reviser requires all state agencies to file documentation pertaining to proposed changes to a Washington Administrative Code (WAC) providing the public the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed changes. A public hearing also is required prior to approval of changes to a WAC. If approved by the Board, the new WAC becomes effective 31 days after the Board’s official action and the filing of appropriate documentation.

**Potential Questions**

Does the Board wish to revise State Board rules related to the tuition structure to accommodate plans for implementing competency-based degree programs?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14-09-60 approving changes to WAC 131-28-025.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Denise Graham, Deputy Executive Director, Finance Division 360-704-4350, dgraham@sbctc.edu
Jan Yoshiwara, Deputy Executive Director, Education Division 360-704-4353, jyoshiwara@sbctc.edu
A resolution to approve changes to the method of assessing tuition and fee charges established in WAC 131-28-025.

WHEREAS, the State Board adopts the tuition and fee schedule for the college system each year; and

WHEREAS, WAC 131-28-025 requires that tuition charges be based on the number of credits taken; and

WHEREAS, the State Board seeks to encourage and support the competency-based degree initiatives undertaken by the community and technical colleges, where tuition rates are based on the length of the academic term rather than the number of credits taken;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves changes to WAC 131-28-025 allowing tuition charges for competency-based degree programs to be based on the tuition and fee rates charged for a 15 credit load for one quarter, prorated for the length of the competency-based degree program term.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  _________________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary                  Elizabeth Willis, Chair
AMENDATORY SECTION  (Amending WSR 01-22-010, filed 10/26/01, effective 11/26/01)

WAC 131-28-025  Method of assessing tuition and fee charges. Tuition and fees charged to students shall conform to chapter 28B.15 RCW, the legislative budget and policies of the state board and the following:

(1) For credit- and credit equivalent-based programs, tuition, and fees charged to students:
   (a) Shall be based upon the number of credits assigned to such courses as listed in the official and current catalog of the college, or for courses not given such credit designations, the number of credit equivalents as computed by the method for deriving such equivalents established by the state board.
   (b) Shall be assessed on a per-credit basis at uniform rates for resident and for nonresident students, respectively. Partial credits shall be assessed on a proportionate basis. The respective maximums charged to any resident or nonresident student shall not exceed the amount allowed by law.
   (c) Shall be assessed for part-time students, for each credit of registration or its equivalent.
   (d) Shall include an additional operating fee for each credit in excess of eighteen at the tuition fee rate charged to part-time students.
   (5) Shall conform with chapter 28B.15 RCW, the legislative budget and policies of the state board.)

(2) For competency-based degree programs, tuition and fees charged to students:
   (a) Shall be based on the tuition and fee rates charged for a fifteen-credit load for one quarter, prorated for the length of the competency-based degree program term.
   (b) For the purposes of the proration required under (a) of this subsection, a quarter shall be considered to be three months long.
Washington Community and Technical Colleges

Competency-Based Degrees

Work Group Recommendations

Endorsed by WACTC, March 2014

National Trends

- Strong enrollment response to new providers on online competency-based degrees offered by public and private non-profit colleges and universities.
- Recent U.S. Department of Education “Dear Colleague” letter requesting the use of federal financial aid for competency-based courses to further the desire to award aid based on content learned rather than time served.
- The US is falling behind other countries in college degree attainment among young adults. State and national policy makers believe our economic vitality and global competitiveness is tied to the strengths of a well-educated, knowledgeable, and skilled citizenry.
- Being middle-class in the U.S. requires increased educational attainment and degree completion among adults, including working adults. We cannot achieve our degree completion goals simply by focusing on recent high school graduates; we must also engage working adults whose time and place constraints are served best by eLearning.
- The expansion of eLearning nationally creates a competitive risk to our current market of 120,000 eLearning students, or 32,000 FTES, which constitute 20 percent of enrollments in our colleges.

College System Assets

Washington’s college system has a number of strengths that will support implementation of competency-based courses and degrees across the state.

1. Washington’s 34 community and technical colleges share a common information technology infrastructure for student demographic data; transcripts and financial aid; course data; subject disciplines and enrollments; personnel data and employment categories; and financial expenditures and revenues.

2. The college system has statewide transfer agreements with public and private non-profit colleges and universities, including major-specific transfer agreements in business, STEM, health care, and technology. The colleges share common course numbers for 350 of the most common courses offered by the colleges.
3. The colleges share common eLearning tools, including a learning management system, eTutoring and lecture capture systems, as well as dedicated reference librarians.

4. The college system has a well-established infrastructure for sharing courses across colleges. Washington OnLine (WAOL) is a 15-year consortium that allows multiple colleges to pool enrollments in online classes, share funding for online faculty, and facilitate online professional development for faculty and staff.

5. The college system recently completed the Open Course Library, with open source syllabi, instructional materials, and very low cost online textbooks or course packs for 81 of the most commonly enrolled courses in the college system.

Conceptual Framework

Washington’s community and technical college system wants to test the concept of competency-based degrees.

System-wide “proof of concept” effort:
- All colleges will have the opportunity to participate in offering competency-based courses and degrees to their students through a consortium of member colleges.

Phased approach to implementation:

- **Phase 1** – Four colleges with Gates grant support pilot competency based IT certificates starting Fall 2013 or Winter 2014. Learnings will be used to implement competency based degrees in Phases 2 and 3.

- **Phase 2** – One college takes a leadership role in creating an “institute” to conduct a pilot, developing and testing competency based courses for an associate degree. The lead college serves as the administrative and fiscal agent for Phase 2. Phase 2 colleges participate in decisions on administrative processes. The lead college will consider all interested college faculty for participation in curriculum and assessment development.

- **Phase 3** – Competency based courses and degrees may be expanded and implemented statewide by additional interested colleges through pooled enrollments or by offering courses with their own faculty. Participating colleges will adopt the competency based degree and have needed student and business services in place.
Students:

- Eligible students must demonstrate readiness to succeed in college level, online courses.
  - College ready
  - Complete an orientation course prior to starting the program
  - Successfully completed a college level online class, or an assessment demonstrating competency in online learning (such as Smarter Measure)

- The degree program will be structured to allow multiple start dates within a term and student progress towards course competencies throughout all four quarters of the academic year, so that students can complete associate degrees in 18 months or less.
  - Students will enroll in 6 month terms with monthly start dates in the first three months of each term
  - ctcLink can accommodate programs with multiple terms offered by colleges

- Programs will be financial aid eligible consistent with Federal and State financial aid regulations.
  - All courses will be credit based
  - Learning analytics imbedded in Canvas, the colleges’ learning management system, can be used to provide evidence of weekly participation required for federal financial aid
  - Students cannot blend programs with standard (quarter based) and non-standard (6 month) terms for financial aid eligibility
  - Financial aid recipients may be able to complete courses simultaneously rather than sequentially, will be determined for Phase 3

Curriculum:

- All the competency-based courses will be online, asynchronous, and available through pooled enrollments.
  - All colleges are using Canvas as their learning management system
  - Use WAOL infrastructure for pooled enrollments

- The most promising degree to start with is the business transfer associate degree, the highest enrolled transfer degree that can be offered by all 34 community and technical colleges.
  - 18 highest enrolled business transfer degree courses are identified, consistent with requirements of the statewide business Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA) degree
  - These courses will not be redesigned for 6 month terms, but continue at their current credits offered under the quarter system. Course redesign will focus on removing time as a factor in progressing through the content and assessments as well as identifying assessment rubrics for the course competencies
  - Member colleges will adopt the entire competency based degree rather than course by course adoptions
Students will advance through the competencies and courses at their own pace.
- Students will negotiate the number of courses and credits enrolled with a navigator prior to the start of each term
- Course assessment rubrics will include pretests to inform course loads for the student
- Students who complete all courses prior to the end of the term will have access to materials for subsequent courses prior to enrolling in the next term.

Courses will use open source materials, including online and campus learning resources.
- Open course library materials can contribute to some courses
- Curricula will adhere to Quality Matters Standards
- Courses will adhere to all best practices in accessibility for students with disabilities

Faculty will identify the course and program competencies, select learning resources, and design the assessment rubrics with the support of staff expertise in library resources, instructional design, and psychometrics. Faculty will teach the courses and faculty will evaluate student work against competencies using the assessment rubrics.

Students will demonstrate at least 80% mastery of course competencies, and receive grades of A, B or incomplete.
- Incomplete grades for students who don’t achieve competencies and finish a course by the end of term will be consistent with existing college grading policies.

Finance:

- The cost to students will be consistent with quarterly tuition and fee rates charged to state-supported students.
  - Students will pay the equivalent of two quarters full time state supported tuition and fees at the beginning of each 6 month term
  - Costs for books and materials are in addition to tuition and fees

Phase 2 colleges will assume the design costs of the initial degree program and courses as well as the operating costs for piloting the program
- Explore grant or one-time funding for start up costs such as curriculum and assessment design
- Curricula, learning resources and assessment rubrics will be “open” and sharable by other colleges and their faculty
- Costs for initial design of 18 asynchronous online courses and assessments for a business transfer degree and first year start up costs are estimated at $1.4 million. Budget includes faculty, student support and financial aid staff, IT infrastructure, and administration/marketing.

- Business model for consortium in Phase 3
- System level staff for some functions will be considered to create cost efficiencies among consortium members
- Colleges will subcontract with the lead college for shared instruction and services
- Specific costs will be identified for Phase 3 colleges participating in pooled enrollments, pooled services or shared curricula based on actual costs in Phase 2.

- Member colleges will enroll and transcript students in the competency-based degree programs and be able to report enrollments for state support.
  - State supported students will pay the equivalent of standard tuition and fees for full-time students with revenues deposited consistent with regular state tuition and fees
  - Two cost models will be developed in Phase 2, one for state supported enrollments and one for self-supported enrollments.
2015-17 Biennial Budget Development – Approval of Policy Request

Brief Description
The State Board is asked to adopt a resolution approving the policy investments to be included in the 2015-17 operating budget request for the community and technical college system. The Board has worked with stakeholders on the development of the policy items currently under consideration during the winter and spring of 2014. In June, the Board identified the items to be included in the budget request and directed staff to refine and finalize the funding levels for each item. The request is due to the Office of Financial Management in September 2014. Today’s decisions will focus on $182.4 million in proposed policy investments, as well as the impact of the Office of Financial Management’s 15 percent Reduction Exercise.

How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
The State Board is responsible for developing and submitting a budget to the Governor and State Legislature on behalf of the community and technical college system. The biennial budget request is an important vehicle for expressing some of the system’s policy priorities. The ability of the system to meet the principles and goals identified in the System Direction and Mission Study are directly impacted by the outcomes of the biennial budget process, beginning with the Board’s biennial budget request.

Background Information and Analysis
At their June 2014 meeting, the Board received an abstract building the theme for the 2015-17 Biennial Budget request from the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. (See Attachment A - 2015-17 Budget Request Abstract – June 2014.) The theme of the request for 2015-17 is providing support for our students, our academic institutions, and our state educational and workforce goals. The support detailed in the agency budget request should be considered the first step in a multi-biennial approach to reach our state’s long term educational and workforce goals.

As we work to achieve these goals, one of the primary challenges facing the system is the erosion of funding the system has experienced since 2009. As Washington approaches the fifth year since the beginning of the recession, community and technical college funding still falls short of the high-water funding level appropriated by the Legislature in 2009. In 2015-17 the estimated annual state and tuition budget for the system is $964.2 million. This amount is 1.2 percent less than was available at our high-water mark in 2009. When adjusted for inflation, the difference is even more dramatic. When the value of 2009 state funding is adjusted to reflect the (projected) value of 2017 dollars, the system’s loss of purchasing power is almost 15 percent, with the current base equaling 85.7 percent of the appropriation value our system received in 2009. (See Attachments B and C for comparisons.) This impact includes higher tuition levels, which increased 47 percent for students between 2009 and 2014. The share of our budget now funded through tuition has gone from 24 percent in 2009 to 34 percent in 2014. These changes mean students pay more out of pocket for an education that has fewer total resources dedicated to it overall than in 2009.

While the Great Recession impacted funding for all state services, our system accommodated the reductions while dealing with the counter-cyclical impact the recession had on our enrollments.
Between 2009 and 2014, community and technical colleges exceeded targeted enrollment levels by 11 percent, on average. Current enrollment levels are gradually coming back to a new normal; however, the State’s future demographic and population growth trends are changing. Over the next twenty years we can expect modest to flat growth overall, with growth occurring in demographic groups that require extra attention, guidance, and support as they strive to increase their educational attainment (e.g., in older, more ethnically diverse, and less educated populations).

2015-17 Budget Request

Maintenance Level Request
(See Attachment D – 2015-17 Biennial Budget Request Comprehensive Summary)

The agency budget request will contain four requests to address system fiscal needs to support our current level of service, or Maintenance Level. This portion of the budget is currently $55.0 million and provides funding for:

1. Cost of living adjustments required by Initiative 732
2. Two percent inflation funding for non-salary related budget base
3. Maintenance and Operations funding for new capital facilities opening in 2015-17
4. Increases to Lease and Assessment agreements.

Policy Budget Request
(See Attachment D – 2015-17 Biennial Budget Request Comprehensive Summary)

At the June 2013 meeting, the State Board approved Resolution 14-06-45 directing State Board staff to prepare the 2015-17 biennial budget (see Attachment E - 2015-17 Biennial Budget Request Comprehensive Summary – Policy Request). While the general theme for the request is support, the discreet items focus attention on various aspects of the system’s mission with emphasis on investments that support students in developing momentum in their academic careers, which increases the probability that they will achieve a credential or degree.

To support Basic Education for Adults, the request proposes funding Basic Education students as a forecasted caseload, similar to the funding protocol for K-12 students. As well, the Basic Education proposal includes annual 15 percent increases to per student funding until parity with the K-12 basic education funding rate is reached, and a projected increase in caseloads for the biennium. In addition, the budget requests dedicated funding for 1,250 I-BEST enrollments, the nationally recognized program combining basic skills and workforce programming. To reach statewide education goals, it is essential to increase educational gains for the portion of the population with less than a high school credential, which is currently estimated to be 1.0 million Washingtonians.

To support the retention of first year students, the budget request proposes increasing staffing efforts in Academic, Completion, and Career Counseling. Currently only 64 percent of first year students move into their second year of college work. The request would provide four additional counselors to each district (on average) to implement strategies that engage first year students and assist in an examination of their education and career goals. It is estimated that implementing strategies to increase interaction between students and the college can increase retention by five percent. In addition, the budget request
expands access to and increases funding for the **Opportunity Grant program**. A proven workforce support model, students receiving Opportunity Grant generally experience an 82 to 84 percent retention rate between year one and year two. The budget also requests funding to implement new math pathway models based on research-based principles to improve the movement of students from pre-college to college level math and proposes the **expansion of the MESA program** to an additional 16 campuses. The MESA programs provide one-stop access to support for traditionally under-represented students pursuing STEM related degrees and credentials.

To support our employees, the budget requests a **cost of living adjustment for all employees** who aren’t eligible for the COLA required by Initiative 732. As the primary resource for providing post-secondary education, it is important to recognize the efforts of our employees, and to provide them support, by recognizing the need to increase wages after five years of salary stagnation. The request assumes a two percent increase for each fiscal year of the biennium.

Finally, to support the State’s education and workforce goals, the budget request proposes to **increase the share of college funding based on performance** to five percent of state appropriations. The additional funding would be distributed to colleges based the annual outcomes of the Student Achievement Initiative, which tracks student momentum and achievement as they move through various milestones in their academic journey (e.g., *accumulate 45 college credits or degree/credential completion*). As we work to achieve our statewide education goals, increasing the amount of funding an institution receives based on academic achievement helps align the distribution of state funding with desired academic outcomes. Finally, to support the current and future workforce needs of the State, a budget request is included to establish a **flexible pool of resources** to be used to address new workforce programs and to keep existing programs up to date with the latest industry changes. This type of investment allows the system to respond flexibly to changes in workforce demand.

**OFM 15% Reduction Exercise**

The environment in which the 2015-17 budget will be developed is a complicated one. The revenue picture for the state continues to move in a positive direction, with a projected $2.4 billion in additional resources available in 2015-17. This additional revenue is offset by the pressure of $3.4 billion in new expenditures projected for the coming biennium, not including the $1.0 to $2.0 billion in new funding for K-12 driven by the *McCleary Decision*. As a prelude to addressing these challenges, the Office of Financial Management (OFM) has instructed each agency to outline what they would do if presented with a 15 percent reduction in state funding. This description is to be followed by a prioritization of what each agency would ‘buy-back.’

A 15 percent reduction would equal a cut of approximately $97.5 million annually. A reduction of this magnitude would translate into a reduction of approximately 21,000 enrollments (FTE), or about 42,000 individuals who would not have access to a post-secondary education.

This summer district and State Board staff discussed how districts would implement a reduction of this size. The discussion revealed a pattern where the mission areas with the least favorable **instructional cost to tuition revenue ratio** would be disproportionately reduced. Because the community and technical college system has become more dependent on tuition, districts would find it difficult to maintain those programs with moderate instructional costs that generate low to no tuition (Basic Education for Adults)
or with high instructional cost programs with normal tuition (Workforce). By reducing these programs, colleges would be able to maximize the amount of tuition collected per state dollar spent, which is used to maximize campus offerings. As seen in Table 1, this results in deeper reductions in Basic Skills and Workforce enrollments than to Academic enrollments.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 Actual Enrollment Distribution</th>
<th>Estimated Distribution of Reduction</th>
<th>Cut to Estimated mission target as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precollege</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To fully appreciate the fiscal impact of a 15 percent reduction in state funding, lost tuition must also be considered. After accounting for the type of enrollment lost, it is estimated that tuition collections in the first year would be reduced by approximately $70 million, leaving the overall impact to the system as a 17 percent loss of state and tuition funding. Finally, the impact of 21,000 fewer FTE enrollments would have an impact throughout higher education. Community and technical college transfer students make up a large share of students accepted by our four year partners, especially the comprehensive regional universities and research branch campuses, where 34 percent to 84 percent of their graduates were once community and technical college students. The magnitude of this level of change would have a significant impact on the ability of the state to reach education goals.

The second portion of the OFM exercise is to identify and prioritize what the community and technical college system would ‘buy-back’ if provided the opportunity. Given the colleges’ increased dependence on tuition revenues, workforce and academic courses and programs would be prioritized over Basic Skills courses. This prioritization is not a reflection of the relative importance of the mission areas; rather, it is the recognition of the colleges’ increased dependence on revenue-generating students to maintain the financial health of the institutions.

**Potential Questions**

Do the Recommended Policy Investments for the 2015-17 biennium align with the Board’s priorities for the community and technical college system?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**

The Board is asked to adopt Resolution 14-09-61 approving the SBCTC 2015-17 Operating Budget request, for submittal to the Office of Financial Management, based on items contained in in Attachment D, 2015-17 Biennial Budget Request Comprehensive Summary.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Nicholas Lutes, Operating Budget Director
360-704-4382, nlutes@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to the 2015-17 biennial operating budget development.

WHEREAS, RCW 28B.50.090 authorizes the State Board authority to prepare a single budget request for the support of the state system of community and technical colleges; and

WHEREAS, the State Board has determined that meeting the State's educational goals and workforce needs as population growth slows and demographics shift will require an intense focus on increasing student retention, achievement, and completions; and

WHEREAS, the State Board has determined that the policy investments listed on Attachment D will result in increased student retention, achievement, and completions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Director to submit to the Governor a 2015-17 Operating Budget request for an estimated $182.4 million for policy level items as identified in Attachment D.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director shall make any necessary adjustments to the policy level request and system maintenance level request (as identified in Attachment D), as necessary to meet changing conditions, or make technical adjustments, consistent with the Board’s direction.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Executive Director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s Policy Manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the Governor, Legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 10, 2014.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ______________________________
Marty Brown, Secretary            Elizabeth Willis, Chair
2015-17 Budget Request Abstract - June 2014

Last year, the Washington Student Achievement Council examined and provided recommendations on long term post-secondary education goals for the State of Washington (Washington Student Achievement Council, 2013). The goals are straightforward: By 2023 all adults in Washington between the ages of 25 and 44 will have a high school diploma or equivalent and at least 70 percent of the same age group will have a post-secondary credential (p. 35).

The Washington Legislature affirmed these goals in 2014 with the passage of ESSB 2626. By placing the goals in statute, the Legislature has created a formal degree/credential milestone for higher education.

A comparison of current educational attainment to the goal of 70 percent of adults having a post-secondary credential reveals that only 49 percent of Washington residents have a post-secondary certificate, credential, or degree (p. 2). Current annual degree and credentialing output across all of higher education needs to increase by over 40 percent to reach the state’s education goals by 2023. As our system is responsible for approximately 50 percent of current degree and credentialing output statewide, our share of the additional degree/credential output required to meet the long term goal is over 11,000 credentialed students annually.

Ongoing analysis of Washington’s job market and the supply of potential employees, as conducted in the joint report A Skilled and Educated Workforce (Daryl Monear, Bloomer, Wilson, et al., October 2013), supports the need to generate a workforce with the proper levels of post-secondary education. The most recent update of the joint report explains that the most sought after credentials by Washington employers are vocational certificates and associates degrees (Daryl Monear, Bloomer, Wilson, et al., p. 6). Analyses of high demand occupations requiring mid-level knowledge and skills indicate that current annual certificate/degree production will need to increase by 55 percent between 2016 and 2020 to meet employer demand. This projected increased need for educated employees and the newly established goal of 70 percent of the 25-44 year old population educated at or beyond a two-year post-secondary credential supports the rationale for increasing output efforts in our higher education system.

Any push to increase the rate of educational attainment in our state is going to face a demographic challenge. Between 1991 and 2001, the number of 15 to 19 year olds grew by 45 percent. The growth in this traditional college-age group spurred the enrollment growth the higher education system experienced over the same time period. Over the next twenty years, the state’s projected growth in the 15 to 19 year old demographic will be much slower, at just eight percent.

This change in state demographics creates a scenario of slow overall enrollment growth for the community and technical college system over the next twenty years. Over time, the average age for our students will increase. Further, the growth that is anticipated over the next twenty years

---

1 SBCTC Staff calculation, based on current OFM population projections and WaSAC degree/credential output levels.
2 Occupations in Manufacturing, Production; Protective Services; Selected Health Occupations in Shortage; Science Technology. Daryl Monear, Ph.D.; Bloomer, Tina; Wilson, Ph.D., Bryan; et al., October 2013, p. 17.
3 Mid-level workforce supply includes two-year degree graduates, as well as completers of long-term certificates and apprenticeships from CTCs and Private Career Schools, and students who have attempted at least 45 credit hours with a 2.0 GPA at a public four-year college but did not complete. (p. 16)
is projected to occur in our most ethnically diverse communities. To successfully complete a
degree or credential, an older student with a diverse ethnic heritage must overcome many
complex circumstances. Issues related to familial status, transportation and geographic
limitations, flexibility to accommodate employment, as well as cultural barriers contribute to
overall lower retention and completion rates for these students.

In conclusion, to reach the education attainment goals set by the Legislature, we cannot rely, as
we have in the past, on younger populations to gradually become educated and replace aging
non-educated populations, thereby increasing the rate of educational attainment. The growth in
the number of young people is not sufficient to reach statewide goals. The pathway to reaching
statewide education goals within the projected student population environment is to increase our
system’s student retention and completion rates. The methods for increasing retention and
completions among existing students can vary, but ultimately they reduce down to a simple
concept: SUPPORT.

Supporting Washington’s…

...Economic future, by supporting Washington’s
...Educational Goals, by supporting Washington’s
...Educational achievement, by supporting Washington’s
...Traditionally under-served populations enrolled in CTC’s, by supporting
...Existing and emerging services that promote student progression and completion.

Just as the education and skill level goals of Washington are multi-biennial projections, the fiscal
level of support required to climb this ladder will require a multi-biennial perspective. After
multiple meetings to develop themes and investment strategies, the following policy requests are
recommended for inclusion in the 2015-17 State Board for Community and Technical Colleges’
budget request.
Available Resources: CTC State and Tuition Funding FY 2009, 2013-15 Biennia and 2015-17 Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (Dollars in Thousands)</th>
<th>State Tuition Percentage</th>
<th>Level of Resource Deficit when compared to 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>$976,208</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$942,752</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>$949,956</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$964,227</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>$964,227</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of FY 2009 High Water Budget Level of $976,208:
- 96.6%
- 97.3%
- 98.8%
- 98.8%

Available Resources:
- CTC State and Tuition Funding
- FY 2009, 2013-15 Biennia and 2015-17 Base

Dollars in Thousands:
- Total: $976,208
- State Tuition: $942,752
- Total: $949,956
- Total: $964,227
- Total: $964,227
Inflation Adjusted CTC State and Tuition Funding: FY 2009, 2013-15 and 2015-17 Biennia
(base year = 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>$851,851</td>
<td>$652,004</td>
<td>$646,256</td>
<td>$650,934</td>
<td>$639,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of FY 2009 High Water Spending Power of $1,125,000</strong></td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td>$273,380</td>
<td>$342,677</td>
<td>$335,742</td>
<td>$330,625</td>
<td>$324,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of FY 2009 High Water Spending Power of $1,125,000</strong></td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2015-17 Biennial Budget Request Comprehensive Summary - Maintenance Level and 15% Exercise

**Attachment D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Level (ML)</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>2015-17 Biennial Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Level (ML)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I - 732 Cost of Living Adjustment</td>
<td>Required COLA for Tech College classified and system faculty = 2.2% Yr1 and 2.1% Yr2</td>
<td>9,200,000</td>
<td>18,200,000</td>
<td>27,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Operating Inflation</td>
<td>Approximate cost for annual inflation on campuses at 2.0% per year</td>
<td>7,475,000</td>
<td>14,950,000</td>
<td>22,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td>M&amp;O for new facilities coming online per Capital plan plus requested COP authority</td>
<td>472,000</td>
<td>1,404,000</td>
<td>1,876,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases and Assessments</td>
<td>Scheduled increases in lease and local assessment costs (e.g., fire district assessment)</td>
<td>1,693,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>3,590,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Request (PL)</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>2015-17 Biennial Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education for Adults</td>
<td>Fund actual ABE/ESL enrollments; increase available funding per student with an annual 15% increase to ABE funding (with goal of moving to K12 Basic Ed Rate), and; assume growth in enrollments by 2,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) over two years.</td>
<td>11,169,000</td>
<td>24,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Student Achievement</td>
<td>Performance funding for districts would move to 5.0% of Appropriated Funding.</td>
<td>28,823,000</td>
<td>28,823,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase System Employee's Compensation</td>
<td>Non-I-732 staff at I-732 annual rates ($19.2m) (see Attachment D) and 0.8% of salary base for state share of Faculty Increments ($9.9m)</td>
<td>9,768,000</td>
<td>19,388,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Academic, Completion, and Career Counseling Efforts</td>
<td>Increase student support focusing on strategies that improve spring to fall retention for first year students. Strategies include mandatory orientations and career assessments with quick, thorough follow-up. The retention rate improvement goal for first year students would be 4.5% by end of 2017 (current = 64.5%).</td>
<td>9,251,000</td>
<td>9,251,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicate funding for I-BEST</td>
<td>Dedicated funding for 1,250 enrollments at $6,000 per FTE</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand and Increase Opportunity Grant</td>
<td>Increase the workforce support program by 600 students and increase grant by 25%. The retention rate for students receiving a an Opportunity Grant was 84% in 2013.</td>
<td>5,702,000</td>
<td>5,703,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Success in Math</td>
<td>Request will: 1) Support colleges implementing New Pathways model built on research-based principles for pre-college math, with the assistance of the Dana Center at the University of Texas, and; 2) Support the expansion of the MESA program into 14 new districts.</td>
<td>5,032,000</td>
<td>5,032,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Program Demand and Improvement</td>
<td>Establish a pool of funding to respond to future workforce program needs that exceed current offerings or standards. Funding is for one-time costs associated to a new workforce program or updating existing programs to updated standards.</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by SBCTC Operating Budget Office
Math Acceleration Strategic Plan Update

Brief Description
At the May meeting, Board members approved a proposal to develop a strategic plan for math acceleration and success in the community and technical college system. The proposed plan will build on college and system level work done to date, identify metrics for measuring and evaluating progress, and consult with national experts in math improvement to provide guidance and feedback in building and implementing the strategic plan for math. This discussion provides a progress report on the work, including a brief overview of the first meeting of the system task force charged with developing this plan.

How does this link to the System Direction, Mission Study, and Policy Focus
Improvements in pre-college education, especially in mathematics, are critical to addressing all aspects of SBCTC’s System Direction: meeting the demands for a skilled workforce, increasing student success and educational attainment for residents, and using innovative approaches to address these needs. These improvements are helping to close the statewide skills gap, increase degree completion, and invest in faculty/staff excellence, all important aspects of SBCTC’s Mission Study.

Background Information and Analysis
Math is a principle hurdle for students to complete degrees and certificates. If the college system is to increase its contribution to the Washington Student Achievement Council’s (WSAC) Road Map goals for 100 percent of adults to have a high school diploma and 70 percent of adults to have a college credential, math achievement must be improved.

Washington community and technical colleges, like many two-year colleges across the nation, have focused significant attention in recent years on improving student success and completion in pre-college education programs, especially in mathematics. The specific reform approaches most frequently used have focused on reducing the length of remedial programs through “acceleration” models, including new curricular structures and new content pathways; instructional approaches emphasizing real-world contexts in the learning; and placement reforms incorporating multiple measures to the process of placing students into appropriate courses. The innovations in pre-college education have been so extensive, both at the local college and system levels, that there is a critical need now to understand more clearly how these innovations have worked and create a strategic plan for scaling the successes.

The SBCTC Student Achievement Initiative includes successful attainment of college readiness in math and completion of a college level math course as key metrics for the Board’s performance funding system. In Washington State, 57 percent of the roughly 20,000 students entering the community and technical college system directly from high school enrolled in at least one pre-college course in 2010-11, 51 percent in math compared to only 19 percent in writing (SBCTC, Research Report 12-2, December 2012, Role of Pre-College (Developmental and Remedial) Education). Hispanics and African Americans were substantially more likely than all other students to be enrolled in these classes. While pre-college education within community and technical colleges serves as a critical access point for many students into post-secondary education, fewer than half of those students referred to pre-college education complete the recommended courses, and fewer still enroll in, let alone complete, the college-level courses they need to pursue their college degrees.
SBCTC and the colleges have implemented a number of efforts to improve math achievement, including curriculum redesign, incorporating technology and online resources, faculty development, multiple course placement tools, placement reciprocity among the colleges, acceleration models, negotiating with universities to broaden math pathways for transfer students, and curriculum and placement work with local high schools. Every one percent reduction in remediation effort at community and technical colleges allows an estimated $1.2 million to be redeployed to serve students in college level classes.

To address these issues, the Board approved in May a system task force to develop a clear vision and strategic plan for math acceleration and success. The overall goals for the work are to:

- Increase successful completion of pre-college and college level mathematics classes.
- Reduce the share of recent high school graduates requiring pre-college math courses.
- Develop a common set of metrics for evaluating progress towards improving student success in pre-college and college level mathematics.

The task force (Attachment A) held its first meeting in August to discuss its charge and timeline, review system data on math success (Attachment B), examine current efforts, state policies and evidence of success in pre-college math programs both across the state and the nation (Attachment C). In addition to supporting the existing and ongoing partnerships with K-12 to help recent high school graduates avoid pre-college courses completely, the group generally agreed that any recommendations to the system should not define a “one size fits all” solution but should reinforce good work already underway at the colleges and build some coherence and scale in the work across the system through a clear focus on goals and principles. Subsequent meetings will explore promising approaches to defining those principles, identify specific evaluation metrics addressing the overall goals, and develop a draft framework that can be reviewed by a panel of national advisors, system groups, and WACTC prior to being presented to the Board in December.

**Potential Questions**

- What issues does the Board wish to see addressed in a comprehensive system-wide strategic plan for addressing math acceleration and success? (Attachment D)
- What’s a reasonable expectation for what the task force should produce this fall in time for supporting the 2015-17 budget request?

**Recommendation/Preferred Result**

Board members will have an opportunity to provide input on the strategic plan for math acceleration and success and provide direction to staff on next steps.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒
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Key Points from a System Overview

• System level data can provide a high level view of performance and achievement.

• Students who complete college math are overall less diverse and more likely to be higher Socioeconomic status (SES) than students enrolled in pre-college math.

• About one in five current or former pre-college math students successfully complete college math each year.

• The completion rate is substantially lower for students who start at the lower levels of pre-math. These students are typically from the lowest SES backgrounds and also have higher representation from Hispanics, black/African Americans and native Americans.

• Half of high school graduates who immediately attend a CTC will enroll in a pre-college math class in their first year. About two-thirds will by the 2nd year.

• Coming to college math ready results in less time to degree and faster college credit accumulation.

• Nine in ten transfer students who earn their baccalaureate degree transferred with college math.

Tab 9, Attachment B
Current and Former Pre-College Math Students Successfully Completing College Math (Earning an SAI Quant Point) Within Two Years of Last Pre-College Enrollment

Little to no overall change

- 2010-11: 19%
- 2011-12: 19%
- 2012-13: 20%

Tab 9, Attachment B

3
Math is required to earn a degree or certificate one year or longer. However, not all programs require college math to meet this requirement.

Short certificates less than one year typically do not require any math. However, a student needs math if they want to progress beyond this. If they put their math off too long, they will not be able to graduate on time or will not be able to complete a longer certificate or degree at all. If they do not prepare, are we helping them in a pathway?

(How) should the workgroup consider workforce math in the work plan?
Lower Columbia College’s pre-college reform efforts included developing 3/2-credit modules instead of the more traditional 5-credit courses. Decreasing the withdrawal rates in pre-college math was a major factor in this decision. Although overall success rates have declined (which was expected given the reduction of the pathway from 20 to 15 credits), the withdrawal rate has steadily improved. The decrease in withdrawal rates, along with efforts to streamline the curriculum, have contributed to an increase in the proportion of students earning the quant point by the end of the second year.
In the years leading up to Lower Columbia College’s entry into Achieving the Dream, success of male students in pre-college math was identified as a concern, particularly at the lower levels (historical trends indicate that the gap between males and females narrows as students approach college level math).

Although some interventions were put in place, male success in pre-college was once again identified as an issue when LCC joined the ATD network in 2011. Although the interventions appear to be succeeding in terms of getting more students to the quant point by the end of the 2nd year, the increase has been somewhat less for male students than for the overall student population.
Math faculty at Lower Columbia College have worked extensively with K-12 partners on curriculum alignment in order to better prepare students for entry into college.

Math transcript/placement agreements are now in place with every high school in the district. Additionally, placement tests and math “boot camps” (refresher courses in math) are also regularly offered in the high schools.

The net result is a 20% drop over the last five years in the proportion of recent high school graduates who are underprepared in math.

This fall, LCC will begin distributing a booklet entitled “Preparing for College Math: A Roadmap for Success” to middle and high school students.
Seattle Central faculty worked with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to launch Statway, a shortened non-STEM pre-college math sequence starting 3 levels below college level, culminating in a UW-accepted college level statistics course in the third quarter.

South Seattle began offering Statway in fall 2013.

Completion rates*
Baseline (2007-2010): 22%

Students in Statway:
2011-12: 58%  
2012-13: 65%  
2013-14 winter starts still in progress

*Chart shows students who passed the college level course within 2 years, while the completion rates shown are limited to those passing the college level course in 3rd quarter.
The Seattle Colleges have been investigating whether acceleration can be accomplished using self-paced methods. The three colleges offered modular competency based math courses that use computer platforms in which students can complete one or more pre-college math courses in a single quarter, based on their initial course topic diagnostic.

Results have been encouraging but mixed. While 36% of the students accelerated, and 33% passed at the level indicated by the initial diagnostic, a small group (10%) completed a course one level below the diagnostically indicated and 22% did not pass at all.

A work group of math faculty from the three Seattle Colleges is working on an improvement project related to this approach.
Thinking about Developmental Math

1. Math is a hurdle for the majority of community college students.
2. Most students deemed “unready” in math will never graduate.
3. The tests used to determine readiness are not accurate enough to predict whether students can succeed in college-level math courses.
4. The math sequence required by most colleges is irrelevant for many students’ career aspirations.

*Changing Equations: How Community Colleges are Re-Thinking College Readiness in Math,* Pamela Burdman, September, 2013, Learning Works

“Despite the low success rates for remedial students, those who attempt to reform developmental education often feel their efforts are thwarted by administrators or faculty who seem dead set against change. These innovators tend to dismiss objections to developmental education reform as springing from shortsightedness or obstinacy. In fact, skeptics frequently have legitimate concerns that, if addressed, can lead to more successful reforms. To delineate the conflicting motivations that shape developmental education reform efforts, CCRC researchers developed an “opposing forces” framework. This framework explicates three sets of tensions:

- system-wide consistency versus institutional autonomy
- efficient versus effective assessment,
- supporting student progression versus maintaining academic standards

that often work at cross-purposes and stymie efforts to create a more effective remedial system.”

*Designing Meaningful Developmental Reform,* CCRC Research Overview, February 2013

---

**Principle 1.** Completion of a set of gateway courses for a program of study is a critical measure of success toward college completion.

**Principle 2.** The content in required gateway courses should align with a student’s academic program of study — particularly in math.

**Principle 3.** Enrollment in a gateway college-level course should be the default placement for many more students.

**Principle 4.** Additional academic support should be integrated with gateway college-level course content — as a co-requisite, not a pre-requisite.

**Principle 5.** Students who are significantly underprepared for college-level academic work need accelerated routes into programs of study.

**Principle 6.** Multiple measures should be used to provide guidance in the placement of students in gateway courses and programs of study.

**Principle 7.** Students should enter a meta-major when they enroll in college and start a program of study in their first year, in order to maximize their prospects of earning a college degree.

*Transforming Remedial Education: A Joint Statement,* Dana Center, Complete College America, ECS, Jobs for the Future, December 2012
Creating a strong accelerated learning environment involves:

1. Starting with the assumption that students are capable of meeting high-level academic challenges
2. Engaging students in experiences that develop the most high-priority college skills and ways of thinking, and providing high levels of support to help students meet these challenges
3. Attending to the affective issues that get in the way of students’ learning and success
4. Understanding that mastery doesn’t happen all at once and maintaining a “growth-mindset” orientation in our feedback to students:
   a. Seeing and celebrating the good in what each student is doing along the way – the emerging skills, ideas, ways of thinking – while directing them toward the next area to work on
   b. Viewing mistakes as a necessary part of learning and a way for you to understand and address the reasons behind student difficulty
5. Facilitating an ongoing conversation with students about what they are learning, why they are learning it, where the process breaks down for them, and how they can successfully approach it

   *Toward a Pedagogy of Accelerated Learning*, Katie Hern and Myra Snell, June 2011
   (for details, see California Acceleration Project, [http://cap.3csn.org/](http://cap.3csn.org/))

**Avoidance**
- Transition courses
- Dual-enrollment

**Diagnosis & Placement**
- Use of Smarter Balanced 11th grade assessment in placement
- Multiple measures and transcript-based placement grids
- Directed self-placement
- Placement test preparation and retesting opportunities

**Curricular Interventions**
- Differentiated math pathways
- Co-requisite instruction (paired college-level, developmental)
- Accelerated (“fast-track”) courses
- Modular, self-paced approaches (“bucket model,” “emporium” model)

**Student Supports**
- Paired courses focused on college readiness attributes
- Embedded advising, tutoring

*Developmental Strategies for College Readiness and Success*
Math Acceleration and Success Strategic Planning Task Force

August 2014 Meeting Summary

Task force goals:
- Increase successful completion of pre-college and college level mathematics classes.
- Reduce the share of recent high school graduates requiring pre-college level math courses.
- Develop a common set of metrics for evaluating progress towards improving student success in pre-college and college level mathematics.

Short-term goal for task force:
Develop background report and framework for strategic plan to use as resource for 2015-17 biennial budget request to Legislature in 2015 session.

Long-term timetable for developing strategic plan:
To be determined

Key task force activities:
- Review and interpret system and local data on student success in pre-college and college math (see handout)
- Understand more clearly the range of interventions underway across the system and the country in terms of pre-college math programs, then address the gaps (see handout)
- Identify what we know and what we need to know to make substantial and sustained progress in improving student success in getting to and through college math

Examples of college strategies referenced in meeting:
- “co-requisite” course, combining intermediate algebra with Math in Society
- changes in placement tests and processes (e.g., shift to MyMathTest, ALEKS)
- provide algebra-intensive pathway (3rd course) for STEM students—all other pre-college students take 2 quarters, then statistics or Math in Society
- partnerships with K-12 to build transcript-based placement grids and develop greater curricular alignment, clarifying for K-12 teachers and students what we’ll be expecting of them at college entry

Themes from group discussion on what should be included in the plan:

1. Identify goals and provide adaptable template and incentives for addressing the goals.

2. Define significant successes to date, especially for under-served student populations, identifying key elements of what makes them successful and for which students under what circumstances.
   - Provide means for colleges to learn from each other’s efforts
   - Promote partnerships among colleges
   - Avoid a prescriptive, “one-size-fits-all” approach
3. Engage and support faculty on teaching innovations with a clear focus on student learning and engaging students in mathematical reasoning and college success attributes.

4. Focus on meaningful math pathways and helping students develop a clear sense of purpose for the math they’re taking.
   - Clarify workforce program math requirements and challenges
   - Address student transition from adult basic education courses to college-level

5. Emphasize policies and explicit partnerships with K-12 and baccalaureate institutions, on curricular alignment, placement, and transfer.

6. Incorporate role of student services: placement, testing prep, advising.

7. Maintain a longer view of addressing the myriad issues related to pre-college and college math success.

**Significant questions identified by group:**

1. How do we develop something unique to Washington that gets used, not just produced and shelved?
2. How does competency-based education connect to this work?
3. What are the differences in the issues between academic/transfer and workforce math expectations and needs?
4. How do we take a systemic approach and still maintain institutional flexibility and autonomy?
5. How do we learn from each other more effectively and efficiently in order to accelerate our progress together?
6. How do we incorporate both system-level and local college metrics that will help us identify specific problems and best practices with respect to pre-college math programs?
7. What will it take for us to be able to truly scale from the scattered examples of successful innovations across the system?