June 22  

**Study session agenda**

1 p.m.  
**Welcome and introductions**  
Shaunta Hyde, chair

1:05 p.m.  
**ctcLink update – FirstLink and Wave 1**  
Mike Scroggins  
Discuss

1:30 p.m.  
**ACT report**  
Jon Lane, ACT president-elect  
Discuss

1:45 p.m.  
**WACTC report**  
Jim Richardson, WACTC president  
Discuss

2 p.m.  
**2019-21 capital budget development**  
Wayne Doty  
Discuss  
Tab 1

2:45 p.m.  
**Break**

3 p.m.  
**2017-19 biennial budget development – preliminary recommended policy request**  
Nick Lutes  
Discuss  
[Tab 3]

4:30 p.m.  
**Executive Director report**  
Marty Brown  
Discuss

5 p.m.  
**Adjournment**

5:30 p.m.  
**Dinner meeting**  
Town Toyota Center, 1300 Walla Walla Avenue, Second Floor, Lounge

June 23  

**Regular business meeting agenda**

8 a.m.  
**Breakfast – Location:** Music and Art Center

8:30 a.m.  
**Host College Presentation – Location:** Music and Art Center  
Jim Richardson, President  
Discuss
9:30 a.m.  Call to order and adoption of agenda  Action
Return to Van Tassell Building, Room 5015

9:35 a.m.  Approval of consent agenda  Action  Tab 2
a.  SBCTC meeting minutes, May 5, 2016
b.  2016-17 Inter-agency agreement: Bridge to college transition courses project
   Resolution 16-06-26
   Resolution 16-06-27
   Resolution 16-06-28
   Resolution 16-06-29
   Resolution 16-06-30
f.  Highline College – local expenditure authority for Maintenance and Grounds Building project
   Resolution 16-06-30

9:40 a.m.  Consideration of 2017-19 biennial budget development – preliminary recommended policy request  Action  Tab 3
Resolution 16-06-31
Nick Lutes

9:50 a.m.  2016-17 Basic Education for Adults awards and allocations  Action  Tab 4
Resolution 16-06-32
Cynthia Wilson and Will Durden

10:20 a.m.  2016-17 Federal and state contracted workforce education awards  Action  Tab 5
Resolution 16-06-33
Nancy Dick

10:50 a.m.  Break

10:55 a.m.  Enrollment counting rules  Action  Tab 6
Resolution 16-06-34
Jan Yoshiwara

11:25 a.m.  Chair report  Action
Shaunta Hyde
   •  Election of 2016-17 State Board Chair and Vice Chair
   •  Executive Director Contract and review update
      Resolution 16-06-35

11:35 a.m.  Open public comment  Discuss

11:40 a.m.  Executive Session  Discuss
To review the performance of a public employee

12 p.m.  Adjournment

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

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

The connection between higher education and Washington’s economy is direct and powerful. Students need access to higher education to land well-paying jobs; employers need skilled employees to compete and thrive. Yet higher education is not growing fast enough to meet the needs of Washington. The 2015-16 State Board goals advance our 2023 state education goals that at least 70 percent of Washington adults have a postsecondary credential and 100 percent have a high school degree.

The State Board goals are designed to raise educational attainment, open more doors to college education – particularly for our fast-growing adult population – and build upon our tradition of excellence. Community and technical colleges provide the skill infrastructure our state needs, and the bridge to prosperity that every Washingtonian deserves.

Contribute to Washington’s economic prosperity and skills development by:

- **Promoting student achievement and success:**
  - Improve math achievement.
  - Support curriculum and policy alignment to measure successful transition to higher education without remediation.
  - Increase access to wrap-around student services to raise post-secondary attainment for underrepresented, adults, veterans, and first generation students and increase the percent of basic skills students that move beyond basic skills.
  - Increase student transfers as measured by per-student enrollment and increase the number of applied baccalaureate degrees conferred.
  - Close skill gaps within the workforce to ensure workforce training capacity is sufficient for demand and increase awards in high-demand professional-technical programs.

- **Increasing access to post-secondary education:**
  - Enroll more underrepresented, first generation and adult students, active military, veterans and their dependents and develop means to attract former students needing credits for degrees, certificates, or credentials.
  - Expand educational opportunities, such as eLearning, open educational resources, and competency-based degrees and certificates.
  - Provide incentives to increase the number of people in Basic Education for Adults programs and programs that combine basic skills, English language, academic, and jobs skills training.

- **Building on the system’s strength and successes:**
  - Ensure balance among mission areas: basic skills, workforce, transfer and applied baccalaureate.
  - Advocate for appropriate operating and capital resources through our collaborative processes, including a system-wide approach to improving faculty and staff salaries and adequate financial aid and minimal tuition increases for students.
  - Increase communication and partnerships within the system, including faculty, students and staff, and with business, labor, K-12, four-year institutions and other stakeholders.
  - Make better use of technology and promote efficiencies, including ctcLink.
Turning vision into action

The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges’ goals for 2015-16 seek to raise educational attainment, open more doors to college education – particularly for Washington’s fast-growing adult population – and build upon our tradition of excellence. To turn those goals into action, the State Board has adopted the following policy focus areas. (See companion publication: State Board Goals 2015-16.)

Promoting student achievement and success:
- Review and update Mission Study goals to align with statewide attainment goals and the state’s education and job skills needs.
  - Measure of success = development of relevant data supporting our role and contribution to Washington state’s economy.
- Adopt a systemwide approach to partner on how to increase faculty and staff salaries and to assess and identify an optimal faculty mix.
  - Measure of success = accord ongoing to the Legislature in 2015, with a goal of increasing salaries and seeking funding for converting part-time faculty positions to full-time.
- Increase communication and partnerships across the community and technical college system including faculty, students, and staff, business, labor, K-12, four-year institutions and other stakeholders to further the goals and mission.
  - Measure of success = stakeholder participation in board meetings and the development of: a) legislative agenda and budget proposals; b) communication plans; and c) decisions on policy initiatives impacting colleges.
- Export our system’s best practices in a national context to understand and advance the national dialogue on community and technical colleges.
  - Measure of success = more recognition of our great programs.

Increasing access to post-secondary education:
- Advocate for adequate state funding and minimize tuition increases for students.
  - Measure of success = increased funding resulting in no need for tuition increases.
- Adopt an allocation model that increases student success and ensures access to low-income, basic education, English language, and academic and job skills students.
  - Measure of success = allocation model ready for implementation by the 2016 academic year.

Building on the system’s strength and successes:
- Align curriculum to support successful student transitions from high school to higher education without remediation.
  - Measure of success = agreement on using the Smarter Balanced Assessment for college placement.
- Apply best practices learned from developing and implementing the system’s aerospace training programs to healthcare and other industries.
  - Measure of success = Legislative support and funding for development and implementation of programs similar to the aerospace program.
2019-21 Capital budget development

**Brief description**
In this study session, State Board staff will discuss lessons learned from development of the 2017-19 capital budget request and how they may be applied in the development of the system’s 2019-21 capital budget request. We will also discuss major decision points and activities for the development of the 2019-21 request.

**How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus**
The facilities built and maintained using funds from the capital budget support the State Board’s goals by increasing access to post-secondary education, promoting student achievement and success and building on the system’s strengths and successes.

**Background information and analysis**
In May 2016, the State Board adopted their 2017-19 capital budget request and 2017-27 ten-year plan. The plan anticipated adding three new major projects in 2019-21, for a total request of approximately $518 million.

On June 6, 2016, the Washington Association of Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC) held an academy on the development of the 2019-21 capital budget request. At the academy, WACTC considered some policy questions and charged its commissions and councils to look at several specific aspects of the major project scoring and to make recommendations for improvement this fall. Below are the policy questions, background and the discussion highlights for each item at the academy:

**Should there be preference for a particular type of project?**

Background – For the 2017-19 selection, there was scoring criteria tailored for projects with renovation, replacement and net new area, as well as infrastructure and matching funds. The scoring system allows different weighting of each of these project categories. In the 2015-17 scoring, there was a preference to take care of what we had so the points available to New Area were reduced by 5 percent. There was no preference in the selection for 2017-19.

Discussion – The categories represent the diverse needs of our colleges and all of the categories were used in the proposals for 2017-19. There was no support expressed for preferences in the 2019-21 selection.

**Should we reduce the maximum size of major projects so there can be more of them?**

Background – For many years, the system has limited proposals to 70,000 square feet without getting an exception from the WACTC capital committee. In 2019-21, a 70,000 square foot classroom project is expected to cost about $44M.

Discussion – The proposals for 2017-19 ranged from 16,044 to 70,000 square feet, with an average of 48,076 square feet. There was an exemption granted by WACTC capital to exceed the
70,000 square foot limit that was not used in the requesting college’s proposal. The maximum size is reasonable and other factors, including scoring criteria and college needs, are limiting the size of proposed projects. There was no support expressed for reducing the maximum size in the 2019-21 selection.

**Should we increase the size of minor program projects and have fewer major projects?**

Background – Our 2017-19 request has about $27M for minor program projects. Our current plan is to increase that by 10 percent for 2019-21. Based on that, each college will get an average of $873K to make minor program improvements. If we had one less major project, colleges could have up to $2M in minor program funding.

Discussion – The plan to increase the requested funding for minor program projects by 10 percent is a good balance with the major project funding requests. There may even be some difficulty completing larger minor work projects in a single biennium, as expected by the Legislature. There was no support expressed for increasing the size of minor projects if it meant fewer major projects.

**Should we continue to keep projects in the pipeline even if they do not receive design-phase funding?**

Background – It has been our practice to keep projects in the pipeline until funded for construction. This has led to some project staying in the pipeline for several biennia while waiting for design-phase funding. Removing projects could free up space for more new projects based on the latest competition or allow more projects to be added from a competition without reducing the number spots from a future selection.

Discussion – It is so difficult getting into the pipeline that college staff feel, once accomplished, the project should stay until funded. Knowing a specific project will eventually get funded improves the college’s long term planning. There was unanimous support for the practice of keeping projects in the pipeline until funded for construction.

**Who should be eligible to compete for a new major project in 2019-21?**

Background – The plan has been to allow each college to propose one major project. Considering our recent capital funding levels, it is unlikely we can build all the projects we already have in the pipeline without delays and gaps between design and construction. Even adding three more projects in 2019-21 as planned means 31 colleges will have prepared proposals and not received a project.

Discussion – Everyone should be eligible to submit one project. The colleges that don’t need a major project can choose not to submit a proposal.

During the academy, WACTC expressed interest in exploring alternatives to a competition for selection of major projects for addition to the pipeline. The idea of putting a $35 million major project for every college into the pipeline received broad support. There were concerns voiced about legislative acceptance of the idea and maintaining the quality of the projects. The cost savings from not having to
prepare proposals was considered favorably. One of the objectives for this alternative would be to maintain consistency with college mission and maintain the quality of the projects. After the academy, the WACTC capital committee explored the idea further and plans to have an alternative approach for consideration by December 2016. In the meantime, the committee has committed to continue refining the major project selection criteria.

To this end, WACTC is creating a task force with representatives from the Business Affairs Commission, Instruction Commission, Student Services Commission, Research and Planning Commission and the Operations and Facilities Council to explore issues related to specific major project scoring criteria as listed in Attachment A and to make recommendations for improvement this fall.

**Potential questions**

- Are there other policy questions related to the development of the 2019-21 capital budget request that the State Board would like staff to explore?
- Are there other concerns about major project scoring criteria that the State Board would like staff to address?
- Does the State Board have concerns or ideas for a less-competitive, or non-competitive, method of selecting projects for the capital budget request?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

The system will bring their recommendations for changes to the selection of major projects and related policy considerations to the State Board in January 2017. A timeline for the development of the 2019-21 capital budget request is in Attachment B.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director (360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbcctc.edu
Charges to WACTC’s commissions and councils related to 2019-21 major project selection criteria discussed at the Capital Academy June 2, 2016

Create a task force with representatives from Business Affairs Commission, Instruction Commission, Student Services Commission, Research and Planning Commission, and the Operations and Facilities Council, with assistance from State Board staff, to develop recommendations related to the following issues by December 1, 2016:

**Enrollment Projections** – Review methodology and how the State Board’s baseline projections are presented, to reduce subjectivity in scoring college projections. Include more information about how colleges might affect outcomes. Maybe provide some examples.

**Utilization Reporting** – Review methodology and streamline reporting. Make sure block teaching arrangements, as are common at technical colleges, are fairly represented.

**Unintended Consequences** – Make sure the ongoing maintenance and repair of buildings does not detract from major project scoring in an unintended way.

**Complexity** – Look at changes in process or materials to reduce complexity or improve understanding of the category weighting.

**Relative Difficulty of Each Category** – Review previous scoring results and other data to assure points are equally hard to get in each category.

**Follow New Predesign Format and Content** – Look at changes in structure and content of the Project Request Report (PRR) to keep it aligned with OFM’s new predesign guidelines. This will assure a project funded for design can build on the work in PRR for the predesign.

**Master Plan Cost** – Look at developing a methodology for colleges to easily and consistently estimate the cost over the next ten years for their facility master plan. If submitted with college major project requests, this could be used to illustrate our system’s long term capital funding needs for decision makers.

**Past versus New Growth** – Look at changes in relative weighting of Utilization and Enrollment Projections to give equal opportunity to projects based on past enrollment growth and to projects based on projected growth. Consider splitting past and new growth into two separate categories relative to the additional complexity of the scoring process.

**Scope Changes after Scoring** – Clarify what scope should not be changed after a project is added to the pipeline and what the consequences are for improperly changing the scope.

**Exterior Circulation** – Look at how to include the area of existing exterior circulation in the allowable replacement area so it does not have to be justified as net new area when circulation is moved into the building.
Timeline for development of the 2019-21 capital budget request

WACTC Academy June 2, 2016
   Charges to commissions and councils
   Policy recommendations

WACTC Academy December 1, 2016
   Recommendations for 2019-21 capital budget development

SBCTC January 18, 2017
   Discuss WACTC recommendations for 2019-21 capital budget development
   Adopt major 2019-21 major project criteria

SB Staff March/April 2017
   2019-21 budget development workshops

SB Staff March through November 2017
   Facility condition surveys

Colleges March 2017 through December 2017
   Prepare major project and minor program project proposals

System January through March 2017
   Score major project proposals, if needed

WACTC Capital May 4, 2017
   Recommend major projects for 2019-21

SBCTC May 2018
   Adopt 2019-21 capital budget request

SB Staff June through August 2018
   Finalize major project cost estimates

SB Staff September 2018
   Submit 2019-21 capital budget request to OFM

System October 2018 through May 2019
   Support adoption of the 2019-21 capital budget request
State Board members present
Shaunta Hyde, Elizabeth Chen, Jim Bricker, Anne Fennessy, Larry Brown, Wayne Martin, Jay Reich, Carol Landa-McVicker and Phyllis Gutierrez-Kenney

Call to order and welcome
Chair Shaunta Hyde called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. welcomed those present, and asked for audience introductions.

Adoption of regular meeting agenda
Motion: Moved by Jay Reich and seconded by Carol Landa-McVicker that the State Board adopt its May 5, 2016, regular meeting agenda as presented.

Adoption of consent agenda (Resolution 16-05-09 and 16-05-12 and -25)
Motion: Moved by Elizabeth Chen and seconded by Larry Brown that the State Board adopt the consent agenda for its May 5, 2016, regular meeting as presented:

a. SBCTC meeting minutes, March 24, 2016
b. 2016-17 SBCTC meeting dates and locations Resolution 16-05-09
c. Centralia College, property acquisitions, 114 S King and 123 S Washington Resolution 16-05-10
d. Olympic College, local expenditure, construction of Shelton Weld Shop building Resolution 16-05-11
e. Bellevue college, acquisition of city right of way Resolution 16-05-12
f. Skagit Valley College ground lease to YMCA for development of a childcare and recreational facility on campus Resolution 16-05-25
Host College Presentation

Since its founding in 1926, Skagit Valley College has been respected as a leader in providing access to quality higher education, thereby enhancing economic development, and encouraging cultural enrichment. As a result, learners from diverse backgrounds and populations come to Skagit Valley to expand their opportunities and horizons to better themselves and their communities.

President Tom Keegan highlighted Skagit Valley’s brand new craft brewing program. With the industry of craft brewing expected to grow, demand for knowledgeable brewers has never been higher. Students interested in the brewing and distilling industry, or who want to pursue wider knowledge of the business itself, can now increase their knowledge through the Craft Brewing Academy.

The Craft Beer and Spirits Trade Academy is unique in Washington State. The program provides an overview of the craft brewery/distillery business – from farm to glass. The certificate program is structured to help students learn brew science theory through hands-on experience in the brew laboratory and at local breweries/distilleries. The program includes industry professionals in the classroom, industry tours and several internship experiences at local breweries/distilleries.

Public hearing: revisions WAC 131-36-050, 055, 100 and 250 making rule amendments necessary to align with and meet recent statutory changes to institutional financial aid funds. (Resolution 16-05-13)

The rule amendment is necessary to align with and meet recent statutory changes. Each community and technical college shall deposit a minimum of three and one-half percent of revenues collected from tuition and services and activities fees into the institutional financial aid fund. Moneys in this fund shall be used for student financial aid:

- Long-term loans
- Short-term loans
- Locally administered need-based grants, tuition scholarships and institutional employment programs for needy, resident students

The fund eligibility requirements will be expanded to include needy dual credit enrolled students for tuition, fees, course materials, and transportation and to all students eligible for resident tuition rates under the residency for tuition purposes statute.

The Board held a public hearing on proposed changes to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) rules governing the institutional financial aid fund. After the public hearing, the Board was asked to adopt the proposed rule changes allowing institutional financial aid to be used for dual credit students and certain students eligible for resident tuition.

Motion: Moved by Jim Bricker and seconded by Wayne Martin that the State Board adopt Resolution 16-05-13 approving the WAC revisions for changes to institutional financial aid funds.

Final Consideration of baccalaureate degrees

In September 2014, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges adopted a revised approval process, selection criteria and application materials for community and technical colleges seeking to offer an applied baccalaureate program. The final step in the approval process requires State Board action on the college’s application to offer the proposed applied baccalaureate degree.
These proposals met criteria established by statute and Board policy based on staff review and feedback from peer reviewers from the community and technical college system. The State Board acted on the following:

a. Bellevue College, Computer Science  
   Resolution 16-05-14  
   **Motion:** Moved by Jay Reich and seconded by Anne Fennessy

b. Bellingham Technical College, Engineering Technology  
   Resolution 16-05-15  
   **Motion:** Moved by Wayne Martin and seconded by Larry Brown

c. Centralia College and Grays Harbor College (joint) – Teacher Education: Elementary Education and Special Education  
   Resolution 16-05-16  
   **Motion:** Moved by Jim Bricker and seconded by Elizabeth Chen

d. Clark College, Applied Management  
   Resolution 16-05-17  
   **Motion:** Moved by Larry Brown and seconded by Jim Bricker

e. Columbia Basin College, Dental Hygiene  
   Resolution 16-05-18  
   **Motion:** Moved by Wayne Martin and seconded by Carol Landa-McVicker

f. Columbia Basin College, Information Technology  
   Resolution 16-05-19  
   **Motion:** Moved by Wayne Martin and seconded by Elizabeth Chen

g. Seattle Central College, Information Technology: Networking  
   Resolution 16-05-20  
   **Motion:** Moved by Anne Fennessy and seconded by Jim Bricker

h. Wenatchee Valley College, Engineering Technology  
   Resolution 16-05-21  
   **Motion:** Moved by Wayne Martin and seconded by Jay Reich

---

**Consideration of 2017-19 capital budget request (Resolution 16-05-22)**

State Board staff has worked with college district trustees, presidents and vice-presidents to develop a recommendation for the community and technical college system's 2017-19 capital budget request and 2017-27 ten-year plan. The culmination of that work was presented for the State Board’s review and approval.

The final budget request level will depend on the Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) 2017-19 capital budget instructions related to escalation, contingencies and design fees. State Board staff will work with the colleges to validate the final results based on OFM instructions, estimate re-appropriation amounts and latest sales tax rates, and will identify any reauthorizations needed for previously approved alternatively financed projects. The 2017-19 capital budget request is due to OFM in September 2016.
Motion: Moved by Jay Reich and seconded by Jim Bricker that the State Board adopt Resolution 16-05-22 approving the 2017-19 capital budget request.

Consideration of 2017 initial operating budget and tuition allocation (Resolutions 16-05-23 and -24)

On March 29, 2016, the Legislature passed the 2016 Supplemental Appropriations Act (2ESSB 2376) which was signed by the governor on April 18. The enacted supplemental budget makes modest adjustments to the operational capacity of the system, despite a seemingly large increase in state funding. At this meeting the State Board considered adoption of the initial operating budget allocations to colleges for fiscal year 2017 and approved tuition and fee schedules for the coming academic year.

Motion: Moved by Anne Fennessy and seconded by Elizabeth Chen that the State Board adopt Resolution 16-05-23 approving 2017 initial operating budget.

Motion: Moved by Larry Brown and seconded by Carl Landa-McVicker that the State Board adopt Resolution 16-05-24 approving the 2017 tuition allocation.

ctcLink update

Deputy Executive Director of Information Technology, Mike Scroggins and his staff gave an update on the ctcLink project. They discussed the general ledger process and status and reviewed the dashboard. Going forward the board will continue to receive FirstLink college updates and Wave One college preparation updates.

Legislative update

The State Board was briefed on the outcomes of the 2016 legislative session and interim legislative plans leading up to the 2016 November general election and the 2017 legislative session.

Executive director report

- Summary of approved local capital projects over $1 million
- Parking lot

Chair report

- Update from 2016-17 nominating committee for State Board chair and vice chair

Adjournment/next meeting

There being no further business, the State Board adjourned its regular meeting of May 5, 2016 at 12 p.m. The State Board will hold its next meeting and retreat on September 26-28, 2016.

Attest:

Marty Brown, secretary
Shaunta Hyde, chair
Inter-agency agreement: Bridge to college transition courses project

Brief description
In May 2014, the Washington community and technical college system adopted a statewide agreement offering high school students the opportunity to be placed into college-level coursework based on their scores on the 11th grade Smarter Balanced Assessment. This agreement represents the system’s commitment to improving student college readiness by encouraging high school students to achieve Washington’s new K-12 State Learning Standards for English language arts and mathematics (Common Core State Standards, 2011).

As part of this agreement, the Board has collaborated with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) in the development of college readiness transition courses in math and English, designed for high school seniors who score below college-ready level on the 11th grade assessments. The Board then received a three-year, $3.3 million grant from College Spark Washington to design and implement the courses.

To begin offering these courses at high schools across the state in 2015-16, the Board approved an inter-agency agreement with OSPI in May 2015 to provide direct support to participating school districts. The agreement needs to be amended and extended through June 2017 to reflect the addition of 35 new districts with 64 new high schools and 172 new teachers offering the courses during the 2016-17 school year.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus?
Reducing the level of remediation that high school students need when they enter community and technical colleges is a critical element of broader efforts to address all aspects of SBCTC’s System Direction document: meeting the demands for a skilled workforce, increasing educational attainment for state residents, and using innovative approaches to address these needs. This partnership with OSPI will help to close the statewide skills gap, create new academic opportunities for students, and invest in faculty/staff excellence, all important aspects of SBCTC’s Mission Study.

Background information and analysis
Over the past decade, through the Transition Math Project and most recently the Core to College project, the Board, in partnership with OSPI, has addressed the issue of remediation in a variety of ways, including working with school districts to improve the college readiness of high school students before they leave high school.

Pursuing partnerships like this with K-12 to help students avoid remedial courses completely is a key element in the Board’s strategy to address broader issues related to acceleration and student success, especially in math. This strategy will help more students achieve credentials and degrees of value in a timely fashion. Students who are ready for college-level courses, math in particular, immediately upon entering college are far more likely to go on to earn degrees than students who enter needing multiple pre-college classes.
The goal for these transition courses is to help many of the over 10,000 Washington high school graduates who are currently enrolling directly into community and technical colleges and taking remedial courses get the support and skills they need to avoid those courses completely, while still in high school.

The courses were developed and refined by high school teachers and college faculty under the leadership of the Board and OSPI. In 2015-16, 74 districts, including 114 high schools, offered the math and/or English courses, with 210 teachers teaching an estimated 5,000 students. These teachers participated in professional learning opportunities throughout the year to support them in teaching these new courses, collaborating with area community and technical college faculty to help improve local high school/college partnerships and alignment.

College Spark contracted separately with the Baker Evaluation Research Consulting (BERC) Group to conduct an external evaluation of the Bridge to College courses. BERC will be gathering and reporting on quantitative student-level data from OSPI (data not available until summer 2016). In addition, BERC conducted site visits to 15 Bridge to College schools in spring 2016. These qualitative data will be available formally by mid-summer; preliminary reflections from the BERC Group researchers suggest that for both math and ELA, students seem engaged in hands-on lessons and seem to understand the relevance of the class in preparing them for college coursework. Teachers find the collaborative meetings with other districts, as well as the trainings, valuable, and overall are finding that there is a difference in how they teach in Bridge to College classes, with more group work and a focus on application focus.

**Potential questions**

- How will the grant and inter-agency agreement support districts and teachers in offering high-quality courses that prepare students for success in entry-level college English and math classes?
- What is the role of Board staff in providing oversight and leadership for the implementation of the courses, and how are college faculty involved in the work?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 16-06-26, approving an inter-agency agreement with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction in the amount of $1,425,000.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Bill Moore, director, K-12 partnerships  
360-704-4346, bmoore@sbctc.edu
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 16-06-26

A resolution relating to the partnership with Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction for the college readiness transition courses project

WHEREAS, Washington students, their families, and the state would save money and time by having students be college-ready before graduating from high school; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for a higher education/K-12 partnership to create senior-year pathways to college readiness in math and English for students who need them; and

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges has been awarded a $3.3 million grant from College Spark Washington to lead the work on courses to address this need; and

WHEREAS, to support teachers in their professional learning and implement these courses successfully the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction needs to provide resources directly to school districts;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approve an amended inter-agency agreement with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to support the implementation of the Bridge to College transition courses in 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 June 23, 2016.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ___________________________________
Marty Brown, secretary  Shaunta Hyde, chair
2016-17 Corrections education contract

Brief description
The joint mission of the Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC) and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) is to engage offenders in effective education and training opportunities and facilitate their successful transition to lifelong community membership. The State Board and DOC develop an annual contract that identifies the key features of educational services to be provided by local colleges, sets outcome metrics, and develops appropriate statewide policies and procedures.

The State Board contracts with nine community and technical colleges to provide Adult Basic Education, English as a Second Language, college transition, college navigation services, and professional-technical programs including advanced manufacturing, I-BEST, building trades, business management, and entrepreneurship and computer programming. The nine community and technical colleges are:

- Centralia College
- Clark College
- Edmonds Community College
- Grays Harbor College
- Walla Walla Community College
- Peninsula College
- Renton Technical College
- Community Colleges of Spokane
- Tacoma Community College

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
The Corrections Education Contract supports the goals of SBCTC in the following ways:

- Economic Demand: Strengthen state and local economies by meeting the demands for a well-educated and skilled workforce.
  - Incarcerated students gain education credentials (high school equivalency and vocational certificates) and skills which enable them to secure jobs upon release, remain in the community, and contribute to its economic and social fabric.

- Student Success: Achieve increased educational attainment for all residents across the state, particularly underserved populations.
  - Incarcerated students, 45 percent of whom are minorities from underserved populations, achieve high school equivalency and vocational credentials through traditional and I-BEST modes of instruction. Colleges are building a pathway from pre-college through postsecondary education to education in the community with the use of college navigators and college readiness courses.

- Innovation: Use technology, collaboration and innovation to meet the demands of the economy and improve student success.
  - Colleges are piloting the use of tablets to support instruction as well as expanding the use of hybrid instruction.

- Guided Pathways: Ensure a seamless transition of students from pre-college through postsecondary and from prison into college in the community.
  - Corrections programs are implementing programs such as High School 21+ and bundled pre-college/college courses to increase the successful transition of students into postsecondary education.
The contract supports the Washington State Achievement Council’s Roadmap for Washington State’s Educational Attainment Goals to ensure:

- All adults in Washington, ages 25–44, will have a high school diploma or equivalent
- At least 70 percent of Washington adults, ages 25–44, will have a postsecondary credential

**Background information and analysis**

In July 2002, SBCTC first entered into an interagency agreement with DOC to provide educational services to eligible offenders incarcerated in the state’s adult prisons. This partnership continues to grow and strengthen because it leverages resources and meets mission goals of both agencies by advancing the skills and education of incarcerated individuals, an underserved SBCTC constituency, and by providing evidence-based programming to support DOC’s goal of reducing recidivism. In addition, one of the measures outlined in Governor Inslee’s Results Washington is to increase employment of recently released offender’s by ten percent. The community and technical college system is assisting DOC in meeting this measure by offering professional–technical programs and providing navigators to assist incarcerated student releasing to continue on career and educational pathways.

In this current fiscal year, SBCTC received $15,734,125 to produce 3,368 FTEs from DOC. Colleges will award over 500 GED®s this year, more than doubling the number of GED®s awarded in FY15. In addition, students will earn over 1,700 vocational certificates.

The college system will receive $16,820,125 to produce 3,433 FTEs in the mission areas of basic skills, academic transfer, professional-technical training, and offender change. DOC, in consultation with SBCTC staff, determines the programs and FTEs for each correctional facility. In addition, the contract includes funding for the Student Achievement Initiative that will more closely align measurements for corrections students with measurements of other college students.

This year the legislature authorized the use of state funds to provide professional-technical and academic transfer courses leading to Associate of Arts and Applied Associate of Arts degrees. Walla Walla Community College and Tacoma Community College will be piloting state-funded programs leading to these degrees.

**Potential questions**

- How will DOC and SBCTC implement post-secondary education for the 2016-17 fiscal year without undermining existing programs?
- How will colleges implement the Guided Pathways initiative within prison education programs?
- How will SBCTC and colleges bring to scale the transition of incarcerated people from prison to postsecondary education after release?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 16-06-27, approving the 2016-17 agreement with the Department of Corrections for the delivery of adult corrections education services.

Prepared by:  Brian J. Walsh, policy associate
360-704-4358, bwalsh@sbctc.edu
A resolution awarding $16,820,125 of state funds to community and technical colleges for delivery of corrections education.

WHEREAS, the State Board is entering into a contract with the Washington State Department of Corrections for the community and technical college system to provide education and training to eligible offenders incarcerated in state correctional institutions; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges delegates authority to the executive director to sign a contract with the Department of Corrections that totals $16,820,125; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges grants the executive director authority to award state correctional education funds to the individual college districts consistent with Board policy and state law; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges grants the executive director authority to modify the contract with the Department of Corrections as necessary and to make adjustments to the proposed awards if the anticipated program funding changes due to state or federal action; and

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.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges grants the executive director authority for final grant spending authority to designated providers in a manner consistent with this resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on June 23, 2016.

ATTEST:

Marty Brown, secretary

Shaunta Hyde, chair
Shoreline Community College – add alternative financing for student housing project to 2017-19 capital budget request

**Brief description**

Shoreline Community College has completed a feasibility study for the development of student housing on their campus. The study found the college needs between 193 and 265 beds worth of student housing, determined the appropriate rental rates, and identified a location on the campus where it could be located. The college is proposing to ground lease approximately 0.75 acres to a non-profit corporation for up to 32 years for development of a housing facility with approximately 220 beds which the college would then lease back from the developer for a period of up to 30 years and then sublet individual units to their students.

**How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus**

The development of student housing will improve student access to education.

**Background information and analysis**

In recent years the state has not funded athletic or fitness related projects or any enterprise activity like daycare or student housing for the community and technical colleges.

Colleges have used different arrangements to meet their student housing needs. Based on a recent survey of community and technical colleges in Washington state, five colleges own student housing facilities and seven colleges lease student housing facilities. Some colleges simply connect students to housing opportunities in their communities.

Shoreline Community College is proposing to use the rent paid by their students using the housing to pay for the development and operation of a student housing facility on their campus. A non-profit developer will borrow approximately $31,100,000 from the Washington State Housing Finance Commission, construct the facility, and then rent the facility to the college to cover the debt service on the development. The college will sublet the housing to their students at a rate sufficient to cover the master lease and the ongoing maintenance and operations of the facility. The facility will be constructed on land leased to the developer for approximately 32 years. The college has set aside sufficient reserves to cover lower-than-expected-occupancy or higher-than-expected-interest rates.

Per chapter 39.94 of the Revised Code of Washington, a lease over 20 years, or a lease with an option to purchase, is considered a financing agreement and requires approval from the Legislature and the State Finance Committee. Once legislative approval is granted in the capital budget the State Finance Committee will review the contract for approval.

The preferred location for the housing project is on land currently used for parking. The project will include mitigation of the parking impact consistent with the college master plan and city development rules. See preferred locations for ground lease, parking mitigation, and site plan in attachments A and B.
The Shoreline Community College board of trustees is expected to approve this request on June 22, 2016.

**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 16-06-28, adding the use of alternative financing for Shoreline Community College to the State Board’s 2017-19 capital budget request, authorizing its executive director to execute documents necessary to lease land to the developer and to authorize easements and applications necessary for the project.

If approved by the Legislature, the State Board will lease approximately 0.75 acres of the Shoreline Community College campus to a developer for up to 32 years. Additionally, the college will lease the completed housing facility from the developer for up to 30 years. The college will ultimately own the facility.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382 wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to Shoreline Community College’s request to develop student housing on its campus.

WHEREAS, the college has evaluated the need for and feasibility of the development of a student housing facility with approximately 220 beds on their campus using a ground lease to a non-profit developer and a lease-back arrangement of the completed facility; and

WHEREAS, rents from the housing will cover the anticipated debt service and maintenance and operating costs of the facility; and

WHEREAS, the college will have the opportunity to purchase the housing from the developer for the outstanding debt at any time, or receive the property at no cost when the debt is retired by the developer after approximately 30 years; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature must approve financing for capital purposes in the capital budget;

WHEREAS, the Shoreline Community College board of trustees has approved this request;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges adds to their 2017-19 capital budget request the request for alternative financing for Shoreline Community College to enter into a lease for up to 30 years, with an option to purchase, for a student housing facility with approximately 220 beds;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes a ground lease of approximately 0.75 acres for up to 32-years to a non-profit developer for the student housing facility;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the executive director to execute documents necessary for these transactions;

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 June 23, 2016.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ______________________________
Marty Brown, secretary                Shaunta Hyde, chair
Shoreline Community College

Preferred location for Student Housing and Parking Mitigation

Preferred location for parking mitigation

Preferred location for ground lease and student housing
Shoreline Community College
Student Housing Site Plan at Preferred Location

Site Plan prepared by Spectrum Development Solutions
for Shoreline Community College Feasibility Study dated May 19, 2016
South Seattle College – add alternative financing for student wellness and fitness center project to 2017-19 capital budget request

Brief description
South Seattle College has been working with their students to develop their vision for a wellness center on the main campus in west Seattle. The students voted for a fee to support the project. The construction, as well as the ongoing operation and maintenance of the facility will be self-supported by a combination of the new Student Campus Enhancement Fee and use fees. The college is requesting permission to finance the project using a locally supported Certificate of Participation for up to $10 million.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
The student wellness and fitness center will improve student retention and quality of life.

Background information and analysis
In recent years, the state has not funded athletic or fitness related projects or any enterprise activity like daycare or student housing for the community and technical colleges.

South Seattle College is proposing to use student-voted fees and use fees to pay for the development and operation of a student wellness and fitness center on their main campus in west Seattle. The college will borrow approximately $10 million using a Certificate of Participation from the Washington State Treasurer’s lease/purchase program for state agencies.

The facility will be approximately 18,750 square feet. The college has set aside sufficient reserves to cover lower-than-expected-enrollment or higher-than-expected-interest rates.

Per chapter 39.94 of the Revised Code of Washington, all capital financing requires approval from the Legislature and the State Finance Committee. Once legislative approval is granted in the capital budget the State Finance Committee will market and sell the bond.

The college will use the Department of Enterprise Services’ public work process and project management services for this project.

The preferred location for the center is near the existing outdoor sport courts in the southeastern portion of campus behind Olympic Hall and the Brockey Student Center. If necessary, the project will include mitigation of parking impacts consistent with city development rules. See preferred locations for the center in Attachment A.

The Seattle College District board of trustees has approved this request.
Potential questions
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goal to improve student success and retention through increased student engagement?

Recommendation/preferred result
Staff recommends approval of resolution 16-06-29, adding the use of up to a $10 million Certificate of Participation for South Seattle College to the State Board’s 2017-19 capital budget request.

If approved by the Legislature, the college will borrow up to $10 million to develop a wellness and fitness center on the main campus of South Seattle College.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382 wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to South Seattle College’s request to develop a student fitness and wellness center on their main campus in west Seattle.

WHEREAS, the college has been working with their students to develop their vision for a wellness center on the main campus in west Seattle; and

WHEREAS, the students voted for a fee to support the project such that the construction as well as the ongoing operation and maintenance of the facility will be self-supported by a combination of the new Student Campus Enhancement Fee and use fees; and

WHEREAS, the college will use the Department of Enterprise Services’ public work process and project management services for this project; and

WHEREAS, the college is requesting permission to finance the project using a locally supported Certificate of Participation for up to $10 million; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle College District board of trustees has approved this request; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature must approve financing for capital purposes in the capital budget;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges adds to their 2017-19 capital budget request the request for up to a $10 million Certificate of Participation for South Seattle College for development of a student fitness and wellness 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 June 23, 2016.

ATTEST:

_______________________________
Marty Brown, secretary

_______________________________
Shaunta Hyde, chair
South Seattle College
Preferred location for Student Wellness and Fitness Center

Preferred location for student wellness and fitness center
Highline College – local expenditure authority for maintenance and grounds building project

Brief description
Highline College is seeking approval to spend up to an additional $568,000 in local funds to address the cost of increased site work due to import and export of soils for their locally funded project 30001147, for addition and renovation of their maintenance and grounds building 24A. This request is to increase the total local expenditure authority up to $2,803,000.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
Consolidation of maintenance and grounds services will allow the staff to better support campus needs.

Background information and analysis
Consistent with Highline College’s facility master plan, maintenance and grounds departments are being consolidated in building 24A to more efficiently support campus needs.

In resolution 14-12-70 on December 3, 2014, the State Board approved the college’s use of up to $2,235,000 in local funds, including a $1.5 million Certificate of Participation approved by the Legislature, for this project.

The additional funds in this request are needed for increased site work related to soil export and import, as well as other construction overruns in the project.

The Highline College board of trustees has approved this request.

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 16-06-30, giving Highline College authority to spend up to $2,803,000 in local funds to address increased costs related to state project 30001147, the renovation and addition to building 24A for maintenance and grounds support services.

Policy manual change: Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to Highline College’s request to use additional local funds to address increased construction costs in project 30001147 for maintenance and grounds building renovation.

**WHEREAS**, Highline College has experienced increased site work relating to import and export of soils; and

**WHEREAS**, State Board previously authorized the use of up to $2,235,000 in local funds, including a $1.5 million Certificate of Participation approved by the Legislature, for this project; and

**WHEREAS**, there are construction costs in excess of the funds currently authorized for the project; and

**WHEREAS**, the college is improving maintenance and grounds services to better support campus needs; and

**WHEREAS**, the Highline College board of trustees has approved the increased expenditure of local funds;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Highline College to spend up to $2,803,000 in local funds for the maintenance and grounds building renovation project 30001147.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED** on June 23, 2016.

**ATTEST:**

Marty Brown, secretary

Shaunta Hyde, chair
2017-19 Biennial budget development – preliminary recommended policy request

**Brief description**

The State Board will be asked to adopt a resolution identifying the policy investments to be included in the 2017-19 operating budget request for the community and technical college system. The request is due to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) in September 2016. With the adoption of the recommended policy items (see Attachment A - 2015-17 Biennial Budget Request Summary), the State Board will direct staff to refine budget estimates and develop the formal biennial request document to be submitted to OFM. Final consideration and adoption of the State Board’s 2017-19 budget request will occur at the September 2016 retreat.

**How does this link to the State Board goals 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 State Board’s biennial budget request.

**Background information and analysis**

The 2015-17 biennial budget request established SUPPORT as the framework around which our policy level request was built. The outcome of the 2015-17 budget process was mixed. While there was movement to address long-standing issues within our system, such as stagnant wages, the policies were underfunded, requiring our campus leaders to implement reductions in order to accommodate the new mandates.

During the intervening years, the budget needs of the system have not changed dramatically. Budget discussions held between the State Board and system stakeholders, as well as with the college presidents, revealed the needs identified in previous budget requests remain.

The community and technical colleges in the state of Washington are funded well below the average state funding levels, compared to other sectors of education. In fiscal year 2017, the K-12 sector of education will receive approximately $8,788 state dollars for each forecasted FTE to be served. The regional universities in our state will receive approximately $6,527 for each targeted enrollment during 2017. Finally, next year, the research universities in the state will receive $9,560 for each targeted enrollment. In 2017, the community and technical colleges will receive $5,193 for each of the 140,000 state funded enrollments. This gap in funding directly contributes to the challenges faced by the system when trying to increase the educational attainment for thousands of Washingtonians.

The students of the community and technical college system are a reflection of our state’s diverse communities. The average community and technical college student is over 25 years of age, attends part-time, and is likely to be working, raising a child and will require need-based financial aid. This student is likely to be from an ethnically and culturally diverse background with limited college experience.
Over 20 percent are in need of basic skills training or remedial education before they can start college level work.

The ability of the system to support this segment of Washington’s college population is hampered by the continued depression of per student funding for the state’s community and technical colleges. The goal of the state of Washington to have a population where 70 percent have obtained a post-secondary credential depends on increasing the educational attainment for this population.

Without question, the education and skill level goals of Washington will require multiple biennia to achieve, just as the level of support required to increase community and technical college per student funding will require a multi-biennial perspective.

**Recommended policy investments for 2017-19.** The displayed policy investment levels in Attachment A equal a total investment of $141.0 million and by fiscal year 2019, when combined with the maintenance level portion of the budget request, will increase per student funding by over $750 annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Washington Community Colleges and Technical Colleges and their Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase academic, completion, and career planning efforts</strong> - $80,719,000 – Provide assistance to students as they integrate their educational experience and their life experience through traditional and non-traditional guidance methods. Using the Guided Pathways model and programs with proven outcomes to improve student progress and completions, the system will strive to increase first year student retention by 10 percent by the end of the 2017-19 biennium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing in learning and teaching</strong> - $9,216,000 – Funding to be used to address districts that are facing compensation related challenges for faculty, including faculty increments, reliance on adjunct (part-time) faculty and the differential in pay between part-time and full-time faculty members. The funding is requested as flexible so that districts can engage their campuses and identify the most appropriate adjustment for their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand the Opportunity Grant program</strong> - $10,280,000 – Provides additional funding for a program proven to improve student outcomes. Expands the program by 600 students and increases the grant level by 20 percent. (Current program ≈ 3,650 students at $3,200 per grant; Goal 4,250 students, $3,900 per grant.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedicated funding for I-BEST</strong> - $11,250,000 – A national best practice, I-BEST provides an accelerated pathway for Basic Education students to reach a post-secondary credential, contributing toward overall education attainment goals. Requested funding will establish a dedicated funding pool for 900 I-BEST enrollments at $6,000 annually per FTE. (2015 I-BEST enrollments 2,178 FTE.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfunded federal Title IX mandates</strong> - $6,800,000 – Through the issuance of ‘Dear Colleague’ letters that require investigations into complaints of sexual misconduct, regardless of the criminal status of the complaint, the U.S. Department of Education continues to ask colleges to provide procedural remedies for victims of the alleged act. This mandate has led to the need to hire non-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The SBCTC 2015-17 Agency Biennial Budget will include requests at the Maintenance Level to address: I-732 Salary Inflation; Inflation for State funding used to backfill tuition reductions; Maintenance and Operations for new capital facilities; Lease and Local Assessment increases; and, increased costs due to annual inflation. Please see Attachment A – 2017-19 Biennial Budget Request Summary.
instructional staff to address the increased levels of investigation and ensure the adequate review of Title IX complaints.

❖ **Campus and student environment health and safety** - $3,400,000 – As acts of violence continue to plague college campuses across the country, the system is requesting funding to increase campus emergency preparedness for the over 400,000 faculty and students who are on our campuses each year and deserve a safe place to teach and learn. Funding would be used to address campus improvements and equipment needs, as well as the planning and staff efforts required to maintain relevant emergency preparedness across the system.

❖ **Cost of living adjustments for exempt staff** - $9,216,000 – Funding to provide cost of living adjustments for non-faculty, non-collectively bargained community and technical college staff. Equal to 2.4 and 2.3 percent annually for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 respectively. (Faculty and technical college classified staff are covered the I-732 salary increase requested in maintenance level, and collectively-bargained staff are addressed elsewhere in the state budget.)

### Potential questions

- Do the recommended policy investments for the 2017-19 biennium align with the State Board’s priorities for the community and technical college system?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

The State Board directs staff to include requests for the recommended policy investment items in the SBCTC 2017-19 biennial budget request.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Nick Lutes, operating budget director
360-704-1023, nlutes@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to the development of the 2017-19 biennial operating budget development.

WHEREAS, RCW 28B.50.090 authorizes the State Board authority to prepare a single budget 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, even as population growth slows and demographics shift, will require an intense focus on increasing student achievement and completions; and

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approves and directs the State Board staff to prepare the community and technical college system biennial operating budget request as set forth in Attachment A – 2017-19 Biennial Budget Request Summary for final board approval in September 2016.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on June 23, 2016.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________
Marty Brown, secretary           Shaunta Hyde, chair
## 2017-19 SBCTC Agency Request - Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>2015-17 Agency Request</th>
<th>2017-19 Biennial Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Level - State Funding - 2016 Supplemental Enacted budget (starting point)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,406,056,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total thru Carry Forward Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,410,022,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 College Affordability Program - Inflation on Tuition Reduction Backfill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,251,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I-732 Cost of Living Increase for Faculty and Tech College Staff</td>
<td>27,400,000</td>
<td>24,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 System Operating Inflation</td>
<td>22,425,000</td>
<td>7,383,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 State-funded Maintenance and Operations for New Facilities (estimated)</td>
<td>1,376,000</td>
<td>3,698,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Leases &amp; Assessment Increases at Districts(estimated)</td>
<td>3,357,000</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Maintenance Level (ML)</td>
<td>54,558,000</td>
<td>38,462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Increase Academic, Completion, &amp; Career Planning Efforts</td>
<td>17,952,000</td>
<td>80,719,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Invest in Learning and Teaching (non-COLA Related Staff Investments)</td>
<td>10,200,000</td>
<td>9,216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Expanding Opportunity Grant Program</td>
<td>11,150,000</td>
<td>10,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dedicated Funding for I-BEST</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>11,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unfunded Federal Title IX Mandates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Campus and Student Environmental Health and Safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cost of Living Adjustment for Exempt Staff (same as I732)</td>
<td>11,312,000</td>
<td>15,483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Policy Level (PL)</td>
<td>175,947,000</td>
<td>140,548,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent of Policy as % of Total thru CFL                    | 13.8%                  | 10.0%                  |
| Total Budget Increase (PL and ML)                           | 230,505,000            | 179,010,000            |
| Percent of Budget Increase (PL and ML) as % of Total thru CFL | 17.8%                  | 12.7%                  |
| Total Predicted/Proposed Budget Increase                    |                        | 182,976,000            |
| Proposed Total thru Policy Level                            |                        | 1,589,032,000          |
2016-17 Basic Education for Adults awards and allocations

**Brief description**

Recommendations for the distribution of federal funds for Basic Education for Adults to 34 colleges and nine community-based organizations are based on the third year extensions of awards resulting from the 2015-19 five-year, competitive application process. Extension applications detail the third year transition mandates for the move from the federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) to the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) and address the expansion of 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 living-wage employment. Applicants also met assurances to implement the *Washington State Adult Education 5-year Plan – 2014-2019 with Revised WIOA Requirements for Transition State Plan 2015-2016; Pathways to College and Careers for Washington’s Emerging Workforce.*

All providers set higher outcome targets and provided a detailed explanation of the implementation of the Adult Basic Education State Plan’s six overarching goals key to the success of students and agreed to the transition mandates to WIOA over the final year of implementation. Providers provided assurance of specific program improvements and innovations to meet state plans and WIOA requirements that reflect their own data and validated research.

**How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus**

The Washington Basic Education for Adults State Plan including the WIOA transition plan requires that allocation of funds be clearly aligned to goals and policies laid out by the following guiding documents:

- The governor’s Results Washington initiative to increase transition and completions of Adult Basic Education students
- The Washington State Achievement Council’s Roadmap for Washington State’s Educational Attainment Goals to ensure:
  - All adults in Washington, ages 25–44, will have a high school diploma or equivalent
  - At least 70 percent of Washington adults, ages 25–44, will have a postsecondary credential;
- SBCTC’s *System Direction and Mission Study* and *Policy Focus and Dashboard*
- The federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act

**Background information and analysis**

The Washington State Basic Education for Adults State Plan builds on 11 years of innovation that includes the comprehensive I-BEST pathway that is being expanded into the K-12 system and registered apprenticeship programs, High School 21+ that has been successfully implemented in 32 colleges, the Integrated Digital English Acceleration (I-DEA) initiative that has been implemented across the system, and other research-based and evidence-driven practices that move more adults more quickly through rigorous basic education programming to certificates and degrees that will result in living-wage jobs. (Attachment B)
Considering the future workforce challenges facing Washington State, these Basic Education for Adults initiatives are critical in meeting our state’s current and future workforce needs. Primary among these challenges in Washington is the fact that by 2017 nearly three-fourths of available jobs in Washington state will require at least a postsecondary credential. And while our workforce’s need for trained employees with college credentials will increase almost 60 percent by 2030, our state’s population will grow by only ten percent in that same time period. Over the next 20 years there simply will not be enough high school graduates to meet the higher education needs of our state’s workforce. Washington will need to fill the gap with out-of-school youth and working age adults – our Basic Education for Adults students.

**Potential questions**

- How will proposed awards and allocations continue to strengthen the alignment of adult basic education policies, programs, and initiatives with the State Board’s System Direction and Mission Study, the Guided Pathways initiative, and transition to WIOA?
- How will proposed awards and funding under the new allocation model expand innovation and decrease the financial disincentive to serve adult basic education students?
- How will the Guided Pathways initiative and future funding awards and allocations bring to scale Basic Education for Adults’ proven innovations to increase student progression, transition, and completion.

**Recommendation/preferred result**

In order to fully scale the goals of the state plan, the Board will continue to monitor the effect of the new allocation model to remove the disincentive to basic skills programs, enabling programs to meet the expanding basic skills needs in their communities and successfully scale innovation to meet the requirements of the *Washington State Adult Education 5-year Plan – 2014-2019 with Revised WIOA Requirements for Transition State Plan 2015-2016; Pathways to College and Careers for Washington’s Emerging Workforce.*

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 16-06-32, awarding targeted funds to Basic Education for Adult providers for fiscal year 2016-17 as described in Attachment A.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Jon M. Kerr, director, basic education for adults

jkerr@sbctcc.edu, 360-704-4326
## STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
### Office of Adult Basic Education - FY 17 Grant Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>FY16 Basic Grant</th>
<th>FY17 Basic Grant</th>
<th>FY16 EL Civics</th>
<th>FY17 IEL/Civics</th>
<th>FY16 Total</th>
<th>FY17 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bates Technical College</td>
<td>$151,570</td>
<td>$168,089</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$151,570</td>
<td>$168,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue College</td>
<td>$181,095</td>
<td>$192,912</td>
<td>$45,819</td>
<td>$47,553</td>
<td>$227,814</td>
<td>$240,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham Technical College</td>
<td>$95,406</td>
<td>$94,383</td>
<td>$18,233</td>
<td>$17,065</td>
<td>$113,639</td>
<td>$111,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend Community College</td>
<td>$102,978</td>
<td>$101,431</td>
<td>$19,395</td>
<td>$18,616</td>
<td>$122,373</td>
<td>$120,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia College</td>
<td>$74,463</td>
<td>$80,169</td>
<td>$16,591</td>
<td>$17,871</td>
<td>$91,054</td>
<td>$98,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia College</td>
<td>$126,492</td>
<td>$129,953</td>
<td>$25,744</td>
<td>$26,385</td>
<td>$152,236</td>
<td>$156,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark College</td>
<td>$248,433</td>
<td>$249,917</td>
<td>$52,865</td>
<td>$51,222</td>
<td>$301,298</td>
<td>$301,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park Technical College</td>
<td>$124,417</td>
<td>$126,876</td>
<td>$26,151</td>
<td>$26,392</td>
<td>$150,568</td>
<td>$153,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin College</td>
<td>$168,727</td>
<td>$178,184</td>
<td>$37,982</td>
<td>$39,202</td>
<td>$206,709</td>
<td>$217,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action of Skagit County</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
<td>$29,477</td>
<td>$7,927</td>
<td>$6,908</td>
<td>$42,027</td>
<td>$36,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds Community College</td>
<td>$247,247</td>
<td>$258,899</td>
<td>$60,555</td>
<td>$62,637</td>
<td>$307,802</td>
<td>$321,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Community College</td>
<td>$199,948</td>
<td>$207,107</td>
<td>$46,468</td>
<td>$47,484</td>
<td>$246,416</td>
<td>$254,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor College</td>
<td>$115,011</td>
<td>$122,928</td>
<td>$22,866</td>
<td>$24,061</td>
<td>$137,877</td>
<td>$146,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River College</td>
<td>$249,795</td>
<td>$248,675</td>
<td>$52,548</td>
<td>$51,913</td>
<td>$302,343</td>
<td>$300,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline College</td>
<td>$436,150</td>
<td>$461,275</td>
<td>$104,326</td>
<td>$108,140</td>
<td>$540,476</td>
<td>$569,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopelink</td>
<td>$23,720</td>
<td>$26,779</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>$7,435</td>
<td>$30,820</td>
<td>$34,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Adult Center for Education</td>
<td>$17,113</td>
<td>$12,502</td>
<td>$3,906</td>
<td>$2,937</td>
<td>$21,019</td>
<td>$15,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$182,743</td>
<td>$198,009</td>
<td>$39,784</td>
<td>$42,924</td>
<td>$222,527</td>
<td>$240,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Source</td>
<td>$22,749</td>
<td>$20,147</td>
<td>$5,733</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,482</td>
<td>$20,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Columbia College</td>
<td>$182,922</td>
<td>$200,825</td>
<td>$36,046</td>
<td>$39,141</td>
<td>$218,968</td>
<td>$239,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE WA Rural Resources</td>
<td>$26,981</td>
<td>$25,848</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,981</td>
<td>$25,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Seattle College</td>
<td>$159,099</td>
<td>$164,486</td>
<td>$40,392</td>
<td>$42,393</td>
<td>$199,491</td>
<td>$206,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Indian College</td>
<td>$21,703</td>
<td>$22,138</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,703</td>
<td>$22,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic College</td>
<td>$84,095</td>
<td>$85,267</td>
<td>$16,549</td>
<td>$16,579</td>
<td>$100,644</td>
<td>$101,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula College</td>
<td>$157,090</td>
<td>$156,026</td>
<td>$27,679</td>
<td>$26,907</td>
<td>$184,769</td>
<td>$182,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce College District</td>
<td>$209,209</td>
<td>$210,664</td>
<td>$45,585</td>
<td>$44,106</td>
<td>$254,794</td>
<td>$254,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton Technical College</td>
<td>$338,564</td>
<td>$358,464</td>
<td>$71,148</td>
<td>$73,026</td>
<td>$409,712</td>
<td>$431,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Central College</td>
<td>$247,953</td>
<td>$247,575</td>
<td>$59,009</td>
<td>$58,283</td>
<td>$306,962</td>
<td>$305,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Vocational Institute</td>
<td>$95,282</td>
<td>$97,947</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$95,282</td>
<td>$97,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Community College</td>
<td>$192,126</td>
<td>$203,436</td>
<td>$42,231</td>
<td>$42,983</td>
<td>$234,357</td>
<td>$246,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Valley College</td>
<td>$146,197</td>
<td>$160,575</td>
<td>$28,943</td>
<td>$31,092</td>
<td>$175,140</td>
<td>$191,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Learning</td>
<td>$33,043</td>
<td>$38,471</td>
<td>$7,904</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,947</td>
<td>$38,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Puget Sound Community College</td>
<td>$96,835</td>
<td>$106,884</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$96,835</td>
<td>$106,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Seattle College</td>
<td>$260,368</td>
<td>$260,890</td>
<td>$58,268</td>
<td>$57,150</td>
<td>$318,636</td>
<td>$318,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane District</td>
<td>$501,991</td>
<td>$513,400</td>
<td>$103,550</td>
<td>$102,415</td>
<td>$605,541</td>
<td>$615,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Community College</td>
<td>$143,037</td>
<td>$150,505</td>
<td>$36,714</td>
<td>$36,679</td>
<td>$179,751</td>
<td>$187,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Community House</td>
<td>$60,651</td>
<td>$60,179</td>
<td>$16,784</td>
<td>$17,331</td>
<td>$77,435</td>
<td>$77,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rescue Mission</td>
<td>$49,205</td>
<td>$56,049</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49,205</td>
<td>$56,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla Community College</td>
<td>$113,971</td>
<td>$113,555</td>
<td>$23,328</td>
<td>$22,828</td>
<td>$137,299</td>
<td>$136,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee Valley College</td>
<td>$85,381</td>
<td>$92,579</td>
<td>$18,037</td>
<td>$18,979</td>
<td>$103,418</td>
<td>$111,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom Community College</td>
<td>$90,901</td>
<td>$100,213</td>
<td>$16,784</td>
<td>$17,331</td>
<td>$107,685</td>
<td>$117,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima Valley College</td>
<td>$230,424</td>
<td>$227,663</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>$44,027</td>
<td>$274,768</td>
<td>$271,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL:** $6,330,085 $6,561,351 $1,288,301 $1,293,327 $7,618,386 $7,854,678

**SBCTC 1** $1,342,743 $1,914,721 $273,274 $262,612 $1,616,017 $2,177,333

**GRAND TOTAL:** $7,672,828 $8,476,072 $1,561,575 $1,555,939 $9,234,403 $10,032,011

1 These funds will be held at SBCTC and will be used for programs, leadership and administration. Funds will be awarded based upon RFP, application, special projects and contracts.
State of Washington
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Resolution 16-06-32

A resolution awarding $10,032,011 of federal adult and family literacy funds.

WHEREAS, the State Board has the authority to award federal adult and family literacy funds; and

WHEREAS, the requirements set forth in the request for proposals align with the State Board’s System Direction and the Board-approved plan for Basic Education for Adults; and

WHEREAS, individual applicants have fulfilled the requirements set forth in the request for application; and

WHEREAS, each application has gone through a state level application and review process and has been recommended to the State Board for funding;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges awards a total of $10,032,011 of federal funds as outlined in Attachment A; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges grants the executive director authority to make adjustments to the proposed awards if the anticipated program funding changes due to state or federal action; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges grants the executive director authority to spend carryover funds and grant final spending authority to designated providers in a manner consistent with the State Plan for Basic Education for Adults, the terms of the Requests for Application, and this resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on June 23, 2016.

ATTEST:

Marty Brown, secretary
Shaunta Hyde, chair
Pathways to College and Careers for Washington’s Emerging Workforce

Accelerated Pathways, Increased Opportunities
WIOA Transition

State Board Meeting, June 23, 2016
Will Durden, policy associate, I-BEST
Jon M. Kerr, director
Basic Education for Adults
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
BETTER JOBS, BRIGHTER FUTURES, A STRONGER WASHINGTON

HS 21+ DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Enrolled</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>4,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomas Awarded</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Gains Earned (CASAS)</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SAI Points Earned</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>7,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAI Points Earned Per Student</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Level Gains</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 Programs Up and Running!
GED® PASS RATES
AS OF MARCH 8, 2016

• Washington State Pass Rate: 90%
• National Pass Rate: 76%

I-DEA DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Point</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Enrolled</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Gains Earned (CASAS)</td>
<td>211 (59.7%)</td>
<td>466 (62.2%)</td>
<td>677 (57.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SAI Points Earned</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>2,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAI Points Earned Per Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Level Gains</td>
<td>256 (49%)</td>
<td>382 (51%)</td>
<td>638 (54%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 Programs Up and Running!
### I-BEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Enrolled</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>11,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>5,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees &amp; Certificates</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>5,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Gains Earned (CASAS Test)</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>4,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Performance (SAI) Points Earned</td>
<td>14,368</td>
<td>15,367</td>
<td>15,717</td>
<td>50,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Points Earned Per Student</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Level Gains</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>2,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE GUIDED PATHWAY FUNDED

- On-Ramps to I-BEST ($25/quarter)
  - Dual Credit
  - Adult Education
  - OSA
  - College Readiness
  - Career Specific

- I-BEST Quarter 1 (Opportunity Grant & State Award Grant)
  - Tuition
  - Books
  - Fees/Supplies

- I-BEST to 2 Year Degree (Ability to Benefit & State Award Grant)
  - High School Diploma

- Baccalaureate Degree (Ability to Benefit & State Award Grant)
WASHINGTON’S COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

QUESTIONS?

I realized that it's best for me to go back to school to have a better future and career and have a benefit where I can be stable.

Carla.

SBCTC

[Image of people and activities related to community college experiences]
2016-17 Federal and state contracted workforce education awards

Brief description
Colleges fund workforce education programs in multiple ways, including the use of general enrollment funding and state and federal targeted funding. The Board approved at the May 2016 meeting state targeted funding for fiscal year 2016-17. What follows is proposed targeted federal and state contracted funding for:
- Carl D. Perkins Grant
- WorkFirst
- Basic Food Employment and Training
- Early Achievers Grant

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
The federal workforce education programs continue to align with the System Direction by successfully implementing its goals specific to meeting the needs of the economy, student success and increasing access for underserved populations.

Background information and analysis
The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) awards federal workforce training funds to 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 increase their educational attainment. Specific programs also address the System Direction’s strategic objectives as described below:

Carl D. Perkins Federal Grant – $10,944,451
Action authorizes FY2017 Carl D. Perkins awards to 33 community and technical colleges to improve outcomes for students by supporting and strengthening career and technical education programs.

The federal Perkins program provides funding for career and technical education programs with an emphasis on accountability, innovation, secondary to postsecondary pathways, and coordination with business and industry. This funding aligns with all three major priorities of the Board as outlined in the System Direction, “strengthening state and local economies by meeting the demands for a well-educated and skilled workforce,” “achieving increased educational attainment for all residents across the state,” and “using technology, collaboration and innovation to meet the demands of the economy and improving student success.”

The Perkins program, last authorized in 2006, was scheduled for congressional reauthorization July 1, 2013, but is operating under a continuing resolution.

The Carl D. Perkins Act sets aside one percent of State Leadership funds to serve individuals in state institutions, such as state correctional institutions or institutions that serve individuals with disabilities.

WorkFirst – $14,601,000
Action authorizes 2016-17 WorkFirst awards to 33 community and technical colleges, four community-based organizations, and one private career school to provide education and training to students
receiving WorkFirst Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) assistance. This funding level is estimated to be maintained approximately at the 2015-16 funding level. Washington State began WorkFirst, the state’s Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, in August 1997 in response to the 1996 federal welfare reform legislation.

A bipartisan legislative task force provides oversight to the WorkFirst program and operation of TANF. Program agency partners consist of the Office of Financial Management, Department of Social and Health Services, Employment Security Department, SBCTC, Department of Commerce, and Department of Early Learning.

Funding for the WorkFirst program is provided through state funds and the federal TANF block grant. The Department of Social and Health Services contracts with SBCTC to provide education and training services to prepare WorkFirst parents for work and job placement. SBCTC subsequently awards block grants to 33 community and technical colleges plus community-based organizations and private career schools to deliver education and job skills training services.

In FY15, WorkFirst served 3,292 students (2,892.5 FTE) who attained a total 12,577 SAI points (3.82 points per student). To date in FY16, excluding spring, WorkFirst served 2,744 students (2,444.4 FTE) who attained a total 7,457 SAI points (2.72 points per student).

SBCTC staff is working with colleges, community-based organizations, and private WorkFirst providers to align their 2017 grant deliverables with the core concepts of the WorkFirst program and focus resources on providing evidence-based strategies to support student success.

**Basic Food Employment and Training (BFET) – $11,884,645**

Action authorizes 2016-17 funding to be awarded to all 34 community and technical colleges. These colleges assist Basic Food recipients to gain the skills necessary for higher wages, better jobs and further advancement. The intent of the program is to expand access to training opportunities for Basic Food recipients that assist in developing skilled workers to help meet the demands of future economic trends and support the attainment of a livable wage.

The BFET program began as a pilot in October 2005 through the Department of Social and Health Services. All 34 community and technical colleges now offer BFET services to eligible students. BFET resources help support employment and training services for Basic Food eligible, low-income individuals. Fifty percent of any allowable expense incurred by a college will be reimbursed by the Food and Nutrition Service within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Each August, Washington State submits a plan to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services encompassing all Basic Food Employment and Training services. The colleges participate in an annual grant application process. Budget amounts are developed by anticipated local capacity and the availability of non-federal eligible match resources.

Funds will provide resources to pay tuition, books, fees, and support services necessary for participation in a professional-technical education and training program.
In FY15, BFET served 11,731 students (6,325.4 FTE) who attained total 25,440 SAI points (2.17 points per student). To date in FY16, excluding spring, BFET served 9,487 students (4,533.2 FTE) who attained a total of 16,580 SAI points (1.75 points per student).

Food and Nutrition Services has audited our program several times in recent years, each with great results. Washington continues to be highlighted nationally as a model program worth replicating and was also instrumental in helping to advocate for federal resources facilitating the expansion of program services.

**Early Achievers Grant – $3,100,000**

Action authorizes FY2017 Early Achievers Grant awards to 28 community and technical colleges providing financial assistance to employed students enrolled in Early Childhood Education programs. In 2015 the Early Start Act was signed into law. The Early Start Act focuses on improving access to high-quality early learning care in Washington as a key pathway to improving outcomes for young children and promoting strong school readiness. Part of the funding is being used to support the Early Achievers Grant – a student financial aid program. The purpose of the funding is to provide financial assistance for professionals teaching and caring for young children from birth to age eight as they pursue postsecondary credentials.

A consortium of interested community and technical colleges developed 14 common courses and seven stackable certificates culminating in a one-year certificate and progression to an Associate’s degree in Early Childhood Education. In July 2012, the Early Achievers Grant Program began as a pilot, serving students working in child care and early education programs. Funding was provided through the federal Race-to-the-Top Early Learning Challenge Grant. The Early Achievers Grant program is very similar to the statewide Opportunity Grant program. Seven colleges participated in the pilot. Since 2012, the number of participating colleges has steadily grown to 28.

Each spring the colleges participate in a competitive grant application process. Funding for each college is based on the number of eligible child care, Head Start, Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program and family care providers the colleges identify in each of their service districts. Colleges must also describe program capacity, student intake and monitoring processes, and wrap-around support services.

Funds provide resources to pay tuition, fees, textbooks and student wrap-around services necessary for participation in an Early Childhood Education program. Funding is also provided to support college Points-of-Contact that provide a single access point for grant recipients, their employers and other organizations involved in the field. The Point-of-Contact provides a one-stop approach to support students from intake, admission and academic advising through monitoring progress and providing assistance for struggling students to completion of credentials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Achievers Grant Data</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student headcount</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,509 (duplicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cert. (12 credits)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. of Specialization (20 credits)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-year Cert. (47-52 credits)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential questions

- What has been the general focus of federal funding to our system?
- How will the increased focus on workforce and economic development affect our mission?

Recommendation/preferred result

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 16-06-33, awarding federal Workforce Education targeted funds to community and technical colleges for fiscal year 2017 as described in Attachment A.

Policy Manual change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Nancy Dick, director, workforce education
360-704-4333, Ndick@sbcetc.edu
A resolution allocating and awarding $40,530,096 of federal and state contracted workforce training funds to the community and technical colleges. (See Attachment A)

WHEREAS, the State Board has the authority to allocate and award federal job training funds; and

WHEREAS, community and technical colleges have fulfilled the application requirements set forth for Carl D. Perkins, WorkFirst, Basic Food Employment and Training, and Early Achievers Grants; and

WHEREAS, each Carl D. Perkins, WorkFirst, Basic Food Employment and Training, and Early Achievers Grants application has gone through a state level review process and has been recommended by their respective advisory committee to the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges for funding;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges awards a total of $40,530,096 for FY2017, as detailed in Attachment A, consisting of:
1. $10,944,451 for Carl D. Perkins Grant
2. $14,601,000 for WorkFirst
3. $11,884,645 for Basic Food Employment and Training
4. $3,100,000 for Early Achievers Grants

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 June 23, 2016.

ATTEST:

Marty Brown, secretary
Shaunta Hyde, chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FY16 Carl Perkins</th>
<th>FY17 Carl Perkins</th>
<th>FY16 WorkFirst</th>
<th>FY17 WorkFirst</th>
<th>FY16 Basic Food Employment &amp; Training</th>
<th>FY17 Basic Food Employment &amp; Training</th>
<th>FY16 Early Achievers</th>
<th>FY17 Early Achievers</th>
<th>FY16 TOTAL</th>
<th>FY17 TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>$248,893</td>
<td>$228,250</td>
<td>$550,778</td>
<td>$561,140</td>
<td>$204,660</td>
<td>$161,085</td>
<td>$246,950</td>
<td>$265,600</td>
<td>$1,251,281</td>
<td>$1,216,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>$292,741</td>
<td>$256,844</td>
<td>$280,505</td>
<td>$231,726</td>
<td>1,614,732</td>
<td>$888,076</td>
<td>$130,400</td>
<td>$66,400</td>
<td>$2,318,378</td>
<td>$1,443,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>$386,196</td>
<td>$400,339</td>
<td>$165,280</td>
<td>$174,187</td>
<td>499,843</td>
<td>$524,834</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,051,319</td>
<td>$1,099,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend</td>
<td>$151,106</td>
<td>$156,933</td>
<td>$179,763</td>
<td>$165,919</td>
<td>399,425</td>
<td>$354,187</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
<td>$66,400</td>
<td>$760,694</td>
<td>$743,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>60,773</td>
<td>$47,124</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,773</td>
<td>$47,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia</td>
<td>$204,803</td>
<td>$211,541</td>
<td>$500,299</td>
<td>$485,112</td>
<td>389,541</td>
<td>$287,508</td>
<td>$42,600</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
<td>$1,137,243</td>
<td>$1,017,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>$607,288</td>
<td>$551,149</td>
<td>$636,473</td>
<td>$579,940</td>
<td>365,862</td>
<td>$388,171</td>
<td>$60,050</td>
<td>$66,400</td>
<td>$1,669,673</td>
<td>$1,585,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>$438,781</td>
<td>$473,602</td>
<td>$642,964</td>
<td>$620,232</td>
<td>506,602</td>
<td>$612,760</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,588,347</td>
<td>$1,706,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Basin</td>
<td>$281,246</td>
<td>$279,209</td>
<td>$224,913</td>
<td>$204,673</td>
<td>226,553</td>
<td>$250,086</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$732,712</td>
<td>$825,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>$250,030</td>
<td>$249,426</td>
<td>$477,982</td>
<td>$496,569</td>
<td>704,599</td>
<td>$562,240</td>
<td>$204,500</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>$1,637,111</td>
<td>$1,432,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>$293,541</td>
<td>$301,355</td>
<td>$501,899</td>
<td>$494,940</td>
<td>380,437</td>
<td>$343,969</td>
<td>$91,400</td>
<td>$66,400</td>
<td>$1,267,277</td>
<td>$1,206,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>$190,438</td>
<td>$197,020</td>
<td>$398,657</td>
<td>$433,346</td>
<td>240,804</td>
<td>$219,645</td>
<td>$218,950</td>
<td>$157,700</td>
<td>$871,399</td>
<td>$916,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River</td>
<td>$308,738</td>
<td>$302,674</td>
<td>$710,876</td>
<td>$686,482</td>
<td>531,212</td>
<td>$467,199</td>
<td>$157,700</td>
<td>$800,309</td>
<td>$1,769,776</td>
<td>$1,614,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>$264,907</td>
<td>$278,605</td>
<td>$805,980</td>
<td>$831,384</td>
<td>232,735</td>
<td>$207,016</td>
<td>$80,600</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$1,384,222</td>
<td>$1,408,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington</td>
<td>$286,675</td>
<td>$259,683</td>
<td>$105,185</td>
<td>$97,578</td>
<td>314,849</td>
<td>$304,988</td>
<td>$93,600</td>
<td>$157,700</td>
<td>$800,309</td>
<td>$819,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Columbia</td>
<td>$313,052</td>
<td>$316,519</td>
<td>$830,405</td>
<td>$841,038</td>
<td>219,031</td>
<td>$251,479</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$1,436,588</td>
<td>$1,500,736</td>
<td>$1,500,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>$392,820</td>
<td>$386,706</td>
<td>$687,485</td>
<td>$677,729</td>
<td>372,192</td>
<td>$288,588</td>
<td>$161,700</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>$1,614,197</td>
<td>$1,477,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>$178,509</td>
<td>$163,290</td>
<td>$291,241</td>
<td>$242,148</td>
<td>230,046</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
<td>$16,600</td>
<td>$732,996</td>
<td>$607,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>$459,747</td>
<td>$486,158</td>
<td>$339,195</td>
<td>$322,405</td>
<td>220,523</td>
<td>$175,049</td>
<td>$379,100</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>$1,398,565</td>
<td>$1,398,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>$243,055</td>
<td>$253,255</td>
<td>$365,228</td>
<td>$383,420</td>
<td>302,698</td>
<td>$172,798</td>
<td>$67,300</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
<td>$978,281</td>
<td>$842,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle District</td>
<td>$638,235</td>
<td>$636,471</td>
<td>$879,237</td>
<td>$889,560</td>
<td>3,308,313</td>
<td>$2,513,124</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
<td>$257,300</td>
<td>$4,926,285</td>
<td>$4,296,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>$213,877</td>
<td>$205,409</td>
<td>$250,355</td>
<td>$256,956</td>
<td>420,407</td>
<td>$319,532</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
<td>$884,639</td>
<td>$815,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Skagit Valley</td>
<td>South Puget Sound</td>
<td>Spokane District</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>Wenatchee Valley</td>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>Yakima Valley</td>
<td>SBCTC</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$375,422</td>
<td>$171,614</td>
<td>$997,463</td>
<td>$409,005</td>
<td>$383,994</td>
<td>$232,266</td>
<td>$199,261</td>
<td>$447,246</td>
<td>$1,133,742</td>
<td>$10,944,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$387,019</td>
<td>$367,403</td>
<td>$1,532,619</td>
<td>$625,508</td>
<td>$245,409</td>
<td>$200,238</td>
<td>$157,240</td>
<td>$752,970</td>
<td>$657,894</td>
<td>$14,751,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$378,676</td>
<td>$333,123</td>
<td>$1,592,118</td>
<td>$668,842</td>
<td>$227,435</td>
<td>$194,092</td>
<td>$145,772</td>
<td>$723,253</td>
<td>$661,205</td>
<td>$14,601,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$360,260</td>
<td>254,990</td>
<td>539,429</td>
<td>299,084</td>
<td>272,716</td>
<td>113,175</td>
<td>173,810</td>
<td>185,516</td>
<td>470,947</td>
<td>$14,415,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$359,648</td>
<td>$136,634</td>
<td>$481,713</td>
<td>$299,669</td>
<td>$223,249</td>
<td>$155,330</td>
<td>$196,361</td>
<td>$175,611</td>
<td>$331,572</td>
<td>$11,884,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$64,700</td>
<td>$176,950</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$109,680</td>
<td>$97,100</td>
<td>$141,700</td>
<td>$146,950</td>
<td>$131,520</td>
<td>$3,027,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$41,500</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>$190,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$66,400</td>
<td>$91,300</td>
<td>$116,200</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>$120,300</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,191,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,530,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
The amount available on the SBCTC line will be used for programs, special projects, and administration. Funds will be awarded based upon RFPs, applications, etc.
Enrollment counting rules

Brief description
Implementation of the new allocation formula that uses college enrollment levels as one of the factors for distributing state operating funds to the colleges is putting more attention on consistent enrollment counting and reporting among colleges, especially for basic skills and skill gap courses weighted in the new formula. In March 2015, WACTC requested that State Board staff convene a system work group to examine enrollment counting in the college system. Earlier this year the Board received progress reports from the work group. In April, WACTC approved the enrollment counting work group’s recommendations and is recommending them to the Board for adoption as system policy.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
Enrollment counting policies and procedures were reexamined and revisions proposed to support implementation of the new allocation formula adopted by the Board in September 2015. In addition, the proposed policies embrace emerging instructional and student success practices at the colleges, including multiple modes of instruction, the growth of technology supported and competency based learning, and support for work based learning.

Background information and analysis
The enrollment counting work group was composed of college business officers, instruction vice presidents, student services vice presidents, research directors, registrars, deans for basic skills and workforce education, and State Board staff from the Education, Finance, and Information Technology divisions. Work group members are listed in Attachment A. The work group met regularly from May 2015 through March 2016 with progress reports and feedback opportunities from system groups.

The enrollment counting work group identified the following principles to guide their work:
- Promote consistent and equitable enrollment reporting among colleges.
- Are understandable and straightforward so that they can be implemented by colleges without workarounds.
- Written policies are updated and maintained.
- Address how enrollments are generated through multiple modes of instruction including, but not limited to, online and hybrid courses, competency based education, prior learning assessment, and adult basic education.
- Are created with consideration of external regulatory requirements.
- Reflect all mission areas and funding mechanisms.
- Result in verifiable enrollments that are reported to SBCTC and audited for accuracy.

With input from system groups, the work group considered the following issues:
- Enrollments reportable for state FTES
- Conversion of contact hours to credits and FTES
- When students count for state FTES reporting
- Length of degree programs
Proposed recommendations:

The following is a summary of proposed enrollment counting policies related to fund source, credit definitions and student counts. The proposed language is provided in Attachment B.

Overview:
1. Proposed enrollment counting policies are divided into fund source, definitions for credits, and student counts.
2. Terms are defined and used consistently across the policy areas.
3. Special rules for basic skills are eliminated. Basic skills enrollments are treated like transfer and workforce education enrollments and integrated into overall enrollment policies.

Fund source:
1. Clarify criteria for determining the funding status of classes and students and include in the SBCTC Policy Manual.
2. Require state-funded classes to have syllabi on file by the census date of the class, beginning July 2017.
3. Seek a change in statute to allow students enrolled in state-funded classes for credit and using the following waivers to count as state-funded enrollments: long-term unemployed or underemployed; residents 60 years of age or older; state employees and educational employees.

Credit definitions:
1. Federal and accreditation definitions are used as starting point.
2. Definitions assume three hours student effort per week per credit.
3. Change categories from Lecture, Lab, Worksite and Other to Theory, Guided Practice, and Field-Based Experience with revised definitions that reflect current modes of instruction.
4. Combine work-based learning categories (Worksite and Other) with Field-Based Experience.
5. Add instructional modalities including online, hybrid, flipped classrooms, and competency based classes.

Student counts:
1. Clarify definitions, including continuous and sequential classes, census dates, tuition payment, drops and withdrawals.
2. Update credits versus enrollment language.

Implementation recommendations:
1. SBCTC will audit college enrollments for consistency with enrollment rules.
2. New policies are effective summer quarter 2017 if approved.
3. Training on enrollment policies will be provided to college staff in 2016-17.
4. Annual trainings will be provided in subsequent years.
Remaining issues:
1. Common courses with different credits values reported among colleges. It is proposed that common courses have common credit values. It is recommended that the Instruction Commission and Articulation and Transfer Council examine the data and recommend policy to WACTC and SBCTC by spring 2018.
2. Associate degrees with high credit requirements. The work group found significant variations in credit requirements among colleges for similar degree programs. It is recommended that the Instruction Commission and Workforce Education Council examine the trends and report findings.

Potential questions
• Do the proposed enrollment counting rules align with current educational practices at the colleges?
• Will the proposed enrollment counting rules improve clarity of the Board’s policies and procedures related to reporting enrollments to SBCTC?
• Is there an appropriate plan in place for training and accountability for enrollment reporting?

Recommendation/preferred result
Board members will have an opportunity to discuss the enrollment counting recommendations with work group members Denise Graham, SBCTC deputy executive director for finance, Carli Schiffner, vice president of instruction at Wenatchee Valley College, and Jan Yoshiwara, SBCTC deputy executive director for education services. Staff recommends approval of Resolution 16-06-34, adopting revisions to enrollment counting rules and procedures.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Jan Yoshiwara, deputy executive director, education services
360 704-4353, jyoshiwara@sbctc.edu
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 16-06-34

A resolution relating to enrollment counting policies and procedures

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approved an allocation formula in September, 2015 to distribute operating funds to colleges in part based on state funded enrollments, and

WHEREAS, the college presidents requested that a system work group examine current enrollment counting policies and recommend revisions if needed to support consistent enrollment reporting among colleges, and

WHEREAS, WACTC approved the proposed policy and procedure revisions and are recommending them to the Board for adoption and inclusion in the Board’s Policy manual,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges approve the proposed enrollment counting policies and procedures contained in Tab 7 and Attachment B, and direct staff to proceed with implementation as outlined, and

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 June 23, 2016

ATTEST:

Marty Brown, Secretary
Shaunta Hyde, Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Counting Work Group</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admission &amp; Registration Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>Campus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne White</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Ashpole</td>
<td>South Puget Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Singletary</td>
<td>Whatcom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Affairs Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Ashby</td>
<td>South Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Bean</td>
<td>Green River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Woodmansee</td>
<td>Bates Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council for Basic Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Cantrell</td>
<td>Green River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi Novotny</td>
<td>Renton Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Ward</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carli Schiffner</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Minkler</td>
<td>Spokane Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Loveday</td>
<td>Clover Park Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research &amp; Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanda Diehl</td>
<td>Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Kenesson</td>
<td>Olympic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Parton</td>
<td>Big Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Services Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Belden</td>
<td>Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Mohrbacher</td>
<td>Big Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marci Myer</td>
<td>North Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce Education Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Hatfield</td>
<td>Olympic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Rogers</td>
<td>Bates Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Fey</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBCTC staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Yoshiwara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Prince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Graham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Dupree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Holliday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ginther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Kerr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Hammer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Hodgson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Scroggins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Dick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Lutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Copeland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determining the Funding Status of Classes and Students

I. Definitions

The following definitions apply to terms used in this document.

- **State funds**: includes state funds appropriated to the SBCTC and allocated to college districts, and revenues/expenditures from the operating fee portion of tuition.

- **Tuition**: as used in this document refers to the operating, building, and services and activities (S&A) fees charged to each state funded enrollment (some students may qualify for a waiver). The State Board adopts the tuition schedule each year for all state-funded students. Operating fee revenues are deposited into the college's local Operating Fee and Institutional Financial Aid accounts, and into the statewide Innovation Account. Building fee revenues are deposited into the statewide Building Fee Account. S&A fee revenues are deposited into the college's local S&A Account.

- **Fee in lieu of tuition**: refers to the class fee paid on enrollments reported as contract (including International Contract) and self-support. Colleges retain all of the revenue from these fees.

- **Course**: A course is the general description contained in the course catalog.

- **Class**: A class is a specific section or modality offering of a course. Students enroll in classes, and therefore funding status attaches to classes, not courses.

- **Direct** and **indirect** costs: Direct instructional costs are costs that can be directly identified with a particular class, such as faculty salary. Indirect costs are costs that cannot be identified specifically with a particular class. Indirect costs are typically within functional areas such as general and departmental administration, staff support, operations and maintenance, library, etc.

II. Overview

Enrollments can be counted as state-funded only if they are in state-funded classes. State funded classes are those funded in whole or in part with state funds. Students in state-funded classes might be recorded as state enrollments or as contract enrollments (e.g., Running Start, High School Re-Engagement, and International Contract). Tuition must be charged on all enrollments recorded as state. (Note that some students charged tuition will qualify for waivers.)

Contract classes are funded solely through grants or through contracts with a separate entity. All students in classes fully funded by grants or contracts are recorded as contract enrollments. (Basic Education for Adults classes funded with federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act funds are the exception; such enrollments are reported as state-funded.) Revenues from grants and contracts are recorded in Fund 145 (Grants and Contracts).

Self-support classes are funded solely through fees paid by students in the class. All students in self-support classes are recorded as self-support enrollments. Students in self-support classes pay a fee in lieu of tuition, and the college retains all of the revenue from the fee in Fund 148 (Dedicated Local).
III. State funded classes and enrollments

In order to be recorded as state-funded, an enrollment must be in a class funded in whole or in part with state funds, but not all students in state-funded classes can be recorded as state-funded enrollments.

A. Determining whether a class is state-funded

1. Classes totally or partially supported by state funds must meet all of the following criteria:
   a. The class must be part of a course approved through the college’s formal curriculum process. A class syllabus must be on file by the census date of the class that describes the class’s student outcomes, and includes a class outline/calendar, major assignments, a list of textbooks and/or instructional materials, and student evaluation criteria.
   b. The class must be taught by instructors with appropriate academic background and training, appointed by the college, whether paid or volunteer, and must be officially assigned to that instructor. Instructors must meet the minimum personnel standards established by the local college. These standards must meet or exceed those set by the SBCTC (see RCW 28B.50.090(7)(a); WAC 131-16-080).
   c. The class must be part of a course with a descriptive title to reflect the course content and to support transferability (where applicable).
   d. The class must be open to the public for those who meet any program and/or course conditions.
   e. Tuition must be charged or waived under an existing statute and in accordance with the college’s board-approved policies. (See exceptions below by type of student.)

2. If the above conditions are met, the class funding source can be one of the following types:
   a. State-funded: A class is considered state funded if the above conditions are met and direct instructional costs are paid with state funds only.
   b. If direct and indirect costs of the class are funded with both state and grant funds, some or all of the enrollments in the class might be considered state-funded enrollments as follows:
      (1) Supplemental funding: If the college spends at least as much state funding on the direct and indirect costs of the class as the college spends on other state-funded classes on average, all of the enrollments (except certain international enrollments and Running Start enrollments, see below) in the class can be recorded as state. The class funding type is called “supplemental funding” (see RCW 28B.50.140(17), WAC 131-32-010, Policy Manual 5.100).
      (2) Shared funding: If the college spends less state funding on the direct and indirect costs of the class than the college spends on other state-funded classes on average, enrollments in the class can be recorded as state in the same proportion as state funds are to total funds spent on the direct and indirect costs of the class. The class funding type is called “shared funding.” (RCW 28B.50.140(17), WAC 131-32-020, Policy Manual 5.100) As in other classes funded in whole or in part with state funds, Running Start students and certain international students in such courses must be recorded as contract (see below).
B. Determining type of student FTE/headcount in state-funded classes

1. State Enrollments: Most students in state-funded classes must be recorded as state enrollments with the exceptions noted below. All students recorded as state enrollments must be charged tuition (some may be eligible for a waiver).

2. The following types of students in state-funded classes cannot be reported as state enrollments.
   a. International Contract. International students in state-funded classes can be recorded as state enrollments within certain limits established by the State Board. (See Policy Manual 5.110 for limits.) All other international students (except those qualifying for residency) in state-funded classes must be recorded as International Contract. Students recorded as International Contract pay a fee in lieu of tuition at the non-resident tuition rate, and the fee is deposited into Fund 145 (grants and contracts). “International Contract” is a type of contract enrollment.

b. Running Start. Running Start students must be recorded as contract enrollments, even though they enroll in state-funded classes. State funding for Running Start students is not provided directly in the community and technical college state budget. Instead, the legislature funds Running Start students through the K-12 appropriation; local K-12 districts receive the funding from the state and reimburse colleges for each Running Start student based on the student’s college credit load. The reimbursement is deposited in Fund 145 (Grants and Contracts).

   Note: A portion of a Running Start student’s credits may be recorded as state if the student’s credit load exceeds the limits described in Policy Manual 5.90.30. The Running Start student must pay tuition for the credits recorded as state-funded unless qualifying for a waiver.

c. High school re-engagement. Similar to Running Start students, students enrolled in high school re-engagement programs (e.g., OSPI funded high school programs, Open Doors, Gateway to College, and Drop Out Retrieval) must be recorded as contract enrollments, even though they may be enrolled in state-funded classes. Funding for students in high school re-engagement programs is provided to colleges from K-12 district high schools.

d. Students enrolled in state-funded classes and using the following waivers cannot be recorded as state enrollments:
   (1) Waiver for long-term unemployed or underemployed persons (RCW 28B.15.522)
   (2) Waiver for residents 60 years of age or older (RCW 28B.15.540)
   (3) Waiver for state employees and educational employees (RCW 28B.15.558)

IV. Contract classes and enrollments

All enrollments in classes funded wholly by grants or contracts are reported as contract funded enrollments. The grant or contract must cover the direct and indirect costs of the class. (RCW 28B.50.140(16); WAC 131-28-027)

Classes created for high school students and funded through grants from the K-12 system, such as College in the High School and some Gateway to College classes, are contract classes and the enrollments are counted as contract.

Enrollments in classes funded in part by grants/contracts and in part with state funds might qualify to be counted as state funded enrollments (see II.A.2.b above).

Additionally, certain enrollments in state-funded classes must be recorded as contract enrollments (see II.A.2.b. above).
V. Self-support classes and enrollments

All enrollments in self-support classes are counted as self-support. Students counted as self-support pay a fee in lieu of tuition, and the fee must be sufficient to cover the direct and indirect costs of the class. All revenues from the fee are retained by the college and deposited into Fund 148 (Dedicated Local Account). (WAC 131-28-029)

Leisure and hobby classes must be provided as self-support. Leisure and hobby classes do not meet the criteria for state-funded classes as outlined in III.A.1.

Additionally, colleges may offer for-credit classes and degree programs as self-support if the college determines it could not otherwise offer the class or program within state funds.
DEFINITIONS FOR THEORY, GUIDED PRACTICE, AND FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCE

The policies in this section are based on U.S. Department of Education credit hour definitions and referenced by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

1. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

2. At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

Credit Values and Credit Equivalents

The following definitions have been established to guide instructional practice, with each definition equating to a minimum of three weekly hours of student effort per credit.

- **THEORY**: Students are engaged with faculty and class members in learning theoretical material and/or engaging in activities to apply the theory leading to mastery of course outcomes. Modes of instructional delivery could include but are not limited to: lecture, small group discussion, guided conversation, demonstration, case studies, role playing, problem based inquiry, and collaborative activities. Instruction may be a mix of presentation, facilitation and guided activities evidenced by frequent ongoing communication between instructor and students. Such activities could take place in a variety of instructional modalities. One credit is generated by one weekly contact hour of instruction or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time. Generally requires out-of-class student effort, typically two hours per class hour.

- **GUIDED PRACTICE**: Students are actively engaged in practicing and mastering skills under the supervision of the instructor. This category of instruction could include but are not limited to labs, studios, shops, clinical experiences, computer-mediated learning, hands-on projects, or other skill building activities. Instruction may be individualized or group-focused and include skills assessment. Such activities could take place in a variety of instructional modalities. One credit is generated by two weekly contact hours of instruction or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time. May also include out-of-class student effort, typically one hour per two class hours.

- **FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCE**: Students are engaged in autonomous study or related work activity under the intermittent supervision of the instructor. This mode includes working with or under the direction of professional practitioners and may include preceptorships, co-ops, internships, or service learning activities. Verification of learning outcomes is documented by college faculty in collaboration with professional practitioners. One credit is generated by a minimum of three weekly contact hours of supervised learning experience. Whereas, three weekly contact hours is the minimum programs can determine that additional hours are needed for the student learning needs. However, only one credit will be generated for enrollment counting purposes.
Instructional Modalities

Contact hours in online, hybrid, and competency-based classes may vary from more traditional face-to-face classes. Students should demonstrate equivalent learning outcomes regardless of instructional modality.

Traditional (face-to-face) classes

Students and instructors meet together for a certain number of hours, in a classroom and on a regular weekly schedule.

Online classes

Online classes consist entirely of online elements with no face-to-face component. Some online classes require students to interact with each other, the faculty and content at specific times, while others are entirely self-paced.

Hybrid classes

Hybrid classes combine face-to-face classroom time with online instruction. Students in a hybrid class come to campus at scheduled times and meet face-to-face with instructors and fellow students. Many class activities are conducted online, including class work assignments, discussions, and group projects.

Flipped classes

The flipped classroom reverses the traditional educational arrangement by delivering instructional content outside of the classroom, often online. Students spend classroom time actively engaging in concepts to clarify and apply the knowledge, under the guidance of the instructor.

Competency-Based Education

Competency-based education allows students to advance based on their proven mastery of a subject rather than classroom time.
When Do Students Count

ENROLLMENT REPORTING

Reporting Class Effort and Student Enrollment

To meet state and federal reporting requirements and to support state policy initiatives, the SBCTC requires that colleges:

A. At a minimum, provide specific class and student data (see RCW 28B.50.020; Required Data Elements; Terms and Definitions).
B. Establish written procedures that are uniformly applied (see Special Provisions).
C. Accurately code and report required data and not overstate their enrollments (see Enrollment Reporting Discrepancies).

Enrollment audits will be conducted to review procedures, enrollment practices, and data that affect how enrollment is reported and credits are counted.

Reporting Student Enrollments – College Responsibility

All colleges are required to develop and adopt campus procedures to ensure that internal access and control, monitoring of enrollment activity and documentation of operational enrollment practices are maintained as described in the policies.

Enrollment Reporting

The enrollment reporting methodology used by the community and technical college system shall be consistent with other public higher educational institutions in the state. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Student Achievement Council, the Office of Financial Management, and the Washington State Legislature rely on this methodology and the State Auditor’s office monitors for compliance. This reporting methodology has an Enrollment Census Date that is intended to allow colleges to count enrollments for funding on a predetermined date even if the student does not complete the class.

Students Reportable for Enrollment

Students, who register for a class prior to the census date and do not subsequently drop prior to the census date, count for enrollment reporting. Note:

A. Students who have not paid, waived, have a payment plan established, or a guarantee from a third-party payer (L&I, DVR, VA, state or federal aid, or similar) for tuition and/or fees by the census date are not reportable for enrollment reporting. An exception to this is a student, including but not limited to registered apprentices, who attends a class prior to the census date and registers prior to completion of the class, may count for enrollment reporting if special provisions for post census date registrations have been followed.
B. Some student specific provisions can affect the reporting of students in classes funded by state dollars (see Reporting Enrollment).
C. Colleges must follow guidelines for scheduling and reporting enrollments in Basic Skills classes (see Reporting Enrollment).
D. Colleges must follow guidelines for coding and reporting Applied Baccalaureate classes (see Reporting Enrollment).

Enrollment Reporting Discrepancies

Enrollment information is a fundamental element in budget allocations. Therefore, it is necessary that the information reported by community and technical colleges is accurate and consistent. To ensure accuracy and consistency, the following progressive actions may be taken when enrollment reporting does not comply with the RCW, WAC and/or SBCTC policies, procedures, or reporting requirements.

A. A district will be notified in writing of a reporting discrepancy. The notice will indicate that reporting practices will continue to be examined at specified intervals until verification of compliance with the appropriate procedures.

B. If subsequent examination does not reflect compliance it will be the discretion of the Executive Director of the State Board to take any one or combination of the following actions:
   - Continued in-depth examination of district reporting practices until further notice.
   - Appoint a team composed of State Board staff and/or system representatives to assist the district in complying with the reporting procedures.
   - A retroactive adjustment to the improperly reported enrollment and funding to reflect proper enrollment reporting.
   - Permanent or temporary reduction or redistribution of student FTES.

Quarterly Reportable Enrollment

Student enrollments must be counted and reported only for the quarter in which they were registered and transcripted.

Enrollment Census Date

The census date of a class represents the timeframe within which students must register and have paid for a class in order to count for enrollment reporting. The intent of this policy is to recognize that there is a base cost in providing a class that is constant after a period of time regardless of the number of students that withdraw from a class or continue to completion of that class.

Determining the Quarter Census Date for Sequential Classes

Non-summer quarters are typically 10 or 11 weeks in length. The quarter census date is the 10th instructional day after the quarter begins. For sequential classes that begin within the first few days of the start of the quarter and run for the duration of the quarter, the 10th instructional day of the quarter is the census date. Summer quarter typically is shorter than 10 or 11 weeks. The quarter census date is based on the number of weeks in the quarter. If the quarter is nine weeks, the census date is the ninth instructional day. If the quarter is eight weeks, the census date is the eighth instructional day, etc. For sequential classes that begin within the first few days of the start of summer quarter and run for the duration of the quarter the number of weeks in the quarter determines their census date.
Determining the Class Census Date for Short Sequential Classes

Sequential classes that do not meet the criteria described in "Determining the Quarter Census Date for Sequential Classes" (above) use a census date based on the length of the class. The census date is determined by calculating 20 percent of the instructional days of the class. For example, if a class runs five weeks spanning 25 instructional days, 20 percent of the instructional days are five. The census date of this class would be the fifth instructional day after the beginning of the class. If a class runs seven weeks spanning 35 instructional days, 20 percent of the instructional days are seven. The census date of this class would be the seventh instructional day after the beginning of the class, etc. Standard rounding rules apply if applicable.

Determining the Census Date for Continuous Classes

Continuous enrollment classes are open-entry, variable credit classes permitting students to begin instruction at any time during a quarter. For continuous classes the census date occurs either on the last day of the class or the last day of the quarter in which that class began, whichever comes first. This census date is the same for all students enrolled in this class and generates prorated credit based on the day of entry.

Determining Instructional Days

Instructional days are identified in the official college calendar.

Special Provisions

The registrar is responsible for and must approve changes to student records that affect enrollment counting. The registration office of each college shall maintain documentation pursuant to adopted college procedures to support these changes. Upon request, the registration office shall produce both specific enrollment documentation and associated college procedures.

Post Census Date Registrations – Extenuating Circumstances

Under Special Provisions, a registrar may allow a Post Census Date Registration for enrollment counting purposes if the registrar deems extenuating circumstances exist and the associated documentation is maintained as per college procedures. An extenuating circumstance should not be inconsistent with students reportable for enrollment and quarterly reportable enrollment. The registration dates in the computer system should be adjusted to reflect the actual student attendance dates as reflected in the associated documentation. The registrar may be requested to produce this documentation in the event of an enrollment audit.

Post Census Date Registrations – Logistical and Programmatic Circumstances

Under Special Provisions, such as but not limited to apprenticeships, a registrar may allow Post Census Date Registrations for enrollment counting purposes if the registrar deems it necessary to accommodate geographical or logistical circumstances such as associated with off-campus operations. The registration dates in the computer system should be adjusted to reflect the actual student registration dates on the forms. The registrar may be requested to produce these forms as documentation in the event of an enrollment audit.
Post Census Date Registrations – Administrative Circumstances

Under Special Provisions, a registrar may allow Post Census Date Registrations for enrollment counting purposes if the registrar deems it necessary to correct an error or errors associated with a student's enrollment. The registrar may be requested to explain excessive corrections in the event of an enrollment audit.
Definitions

Adds

A student initiated addition of a class(es) registration that occurs prior to the census date credits are reportable.

Census Date

The census date of a class represents the timeframe within which students must register and tuition and fees have been paid, waived, or have a payment plan established in order to count for enrollment reporting.

Computer System Transaction Log

This is an electronic record of all enrollment transaction.

Continuous Classes

Continuous enrollment classes are open-entry permitting students to begin instruction at any time during a quarter. The enrollment census date for a continuous enrollment class is the last instructional day of the class.

I. Code all continuous classes as "continuous"

II. Set up all continuous classes as variable credit, enrolling students on a prorated basis. For example, a 1-5 variable credit class in a 10-week quarter would be as follows.
   - Register week 1 or 2 = 5 credits
   - Register week 3 or 4 = 4 credits
   - Register week 5 or 6 = 3 credits
   - Register week 7 or 8 = 2 credits
   - Register week 9 or 10 = 1 credits

Drops

Drop: A drop that occurs prior to the census date. Credits are not reportable.

Administrative Drop: A student may be dropped from a class(es) who never attends, or ceases to attend any class in which the student is enrolled upon recommendation of the faculty member of the class. Administrative drops made prior to the census date are not reportable for credits toward enrollment counts.
**Enrollment Activity**

Enrollment transactions that affect credit reporting and enrollment totals; e.g., “student adds,” “student withdrawals,” and “student drops” from classes.

**Instructional Calendar**

Each college has an instructional calendar that indicates the college’s official quarterly start and end dates for the current academic year.

**Net Enrollment**

Net enrollment is the number of registered students and their associated class data as prescribed by the counting methodology less enrollments that did not meet the counting intent.

**Non-Typical Class**

Any class is considered non-typical if it is not sequential or does not start in the first five days of a quarter or does not have a 10th instructional day. Examples: 1) One and/or two-day classes, workshops, and seminars; 2) Classes that begin prior to the first day of the next quarter; 3) Classes that occur in-between quarters; 4) Continuous open entry/open exit classes.

**Quarterly Reporting Date**

This is the date when enrollment information is recorded in the Student Information System. This process constitutes the college’s official quarterly enrollment report to the SBCTC. The SBCTC will notify colleges of the quarterly reporting periods prior to the beginning of the academic year.

**Sequential Classes**

Sequential classes are classes where instruction begins and ends on specific days within a quarter. Enrollments are generally added at the beginning of the class. The majority of sequential classes begins within the first five instructional days of a quarter and shares the same census date. Note: Sequential classes that begin before or after the first five instructional days of a quarter are referred to as non-typical and have their own census date.

I. Code all sequential classes as “sequential”

II. Set up all classes with multiple sections prorated based on the number of weeks in a quarter. Each section will have its own start day. The counting method will be the tenth instructional day of each section. For example, an ABE five credit, Basic Education class, in a 10-week quarter would be as follows:

- Register in week 1 or 2 = 5 credits
- Register in week 3 or 4 = 4 credits
- Register in week 5 or 6 = 3 credits
- Register in week 7 or 8 = 2 credits
- Register in week 9 or 10 = 1 credits
Short Sequential Classes

Short sequential classes are classes where instruction begins and ends on specific days within a quarter. Short sequential classes use a census date based on the length of the class. The census date is determined by calculating 20 percent of the instructional days of the class. For example, if a class runs five weeks spanning 25 instructional days, 20 percent of the instructional days are five. The census date of this class would be the fifth instruction day after the beginning of the class.

Withdrawals

Withdrawals from a class(es) are requests originated by the student that occur after the census date and credits are reportable for enrollment.

A student also may be withdrawn from a class by administrative action as a result of emergency or disciplinary procedures.

Continuous and Sequential Scheduling and Enrollment

A clear distinction should be made between “sequential” and “continuous” classes. Colleges will use one of the two following methods for reporting purposes for each class.

A. Method I - Continuous classes
   I. Code all continuous classes as “continuous”
   II. Set up all continuous classes as variable credit, enrolling students on a prorated basis. For example, a 1-5 variable credit, class in a 10-week quarter would be as follows.
      o Register week 1 or 2 = 5 credits
      o Register week 3 or 4 = 4 credits
      o Register week 5 or 6 = 3 credits
      o Register week 7 or 8 = 2 credits
      o Register week 9 or 10 = 1 credits

B. Method II - Sequential classes
   I. Code all sequential classes as “sequential”
   II. Set up all classes with multiple sections prorated based on the number of weeks in a quarter. Each section will have its own start day. The counting method will be the tenth instructional day of each section. For example, a 5 credit, class, in a 10-week quarter would be as follows:
      o Register in week 1 or 2 = 5 credits
      o Register in week 3 or 4 = 4 credits
      o Register in week 5 or 6 = 3 credits
      o Register in week 7 or 8 = 2 credits
      o Register in week 9 or 10 = 1 credits