STATE BOARD RETREAT
September 11-13, 2017 ~ Skamania Lodge
1311 Skamania Lodge Drive, Stevenson, WA 98648

Monday, September 11 – Retreat

12:00 p.m. Welcome, introductions and lunch
   Location: Meadow Room Patio
   Larry Brown, Chair

12:45 p.m. Board evaluation and goal setting
   Location: Meadow Room
   Facilitated by: Angela Powell

5:00 p.m. Recess for the day

6:00 p.m. Dinner meeting for State Board Members and Executive Director
   Location: Baker Room

Tuesday, September 12 – Retreat

8:00 a.m. Breakfast
   Location: Adams Room

9:00 a.m. Welcome, introductions and retreat overview
   Location: Adams Room
   Larry Brown, Chair

9:20 a.m. Advocacy  Tab A
   Discussion facilitated by: Katie Rose, Arlen Harris and Kim Tanaka

11:20 a.m. Completions  Tab B
   Discussion facilitated by: Lisa Garcia-Hanson and David Prince

12:30 p.m. Lunch

1:00 p.m. Completions continued  Tab B
   Discussion facilitated by: Lisa Garcia-Hanson and David Prince

2:00 p.m. Equity and Diversity  Tab C
   Discussion facilitated by: Ha Nguyen

3:30 p.m. Enrollment  Tab D
   Discussion facilitated by: Darby Kaikkonen and Joyce Hammer
4:30 p.m.  Retreat wrap-up  
Larry Brown, Chair

5:00 p.m.  Recess for the day

5:30 p.m.  Social and Dinner meeting for all participants  
*Location: Baker Room*

**Wednesday, September 13 – Business Meeting**

8:00 a.m.  Breakfast  
*Location: Adams Room*

8:30 a.m.  Welcome and call to order  
*Location: Adams Room*  
Larry Brown, Chair

8:35 a.m.  Adoption of business meeting agenda  
Action

8:40 a.m.  Approval of consent agenda  
Action  Tab 1

- a) State Board Meeting Minutes: June 29, 2017
- b) 2017-18 Resources to Initiate Successful Employment awards  
  Resolution 17-09-49
- c) Centralia College, property acquisition, 214 South Iron Street  
  Resolution 17-09-50
- d) Columbia Basin College, property acquisition, 2901 North 20th Avenue  
  Resolution 17-09-51
- e) Columbia Basin College, Health Science Center phase two increase  
  Resolution 17-09-52
- f) Olympic College, remove Barner structure  
  Resolution 17-09-53
- g) South Puget Sound Community College, Building 28 Transition Studies renovation increase  
  Resolution 17-09-54
- h) South Puget Sound Community College, Lacey 3 building renovation  
  Resolution 17-09-55
- i) Tacoma Community College, parking lot improvements  
  Resolution 17-09-56

8:45 a.m.  ctcLink update  
Discuss  
Mike Scroggins

9:15 a.m.  Student Achievement Initiative Review: Final Report and Recommendations  
Action  Tab 2  
Darby Kaikkonen
10:00 a.m.  **Final 2017-19 Operating Budget Review**  
Cherie Berthon

10:30 a.m.  **Consideration of 2018 Supplemental Operating Budget Request**  
**Resolution 17-09-58**  
Cherie Berthon

11:00 a.m.  **Capital Budget Update**  
Wayne Doty

11:30 a.m.  **2018 Legislative Agenda Priorities**  
Arlen Harris

12:00 p.m.  **Adjournment**

*Updated: August 31, 2017*
Long-Term Advocacy Task Force

**Brief description**

This retreat item asks the State Board to endorse creating a Long-Term Advocacy Task Force as described in the attached work plan (Attachment A). The Washington Association of Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC) endorsed the work plan at its July 2017 retreat. As proposed to the Board, the Task Force would consist of representatives from across the system – State Board members, trustees, presidents, faculty, students and PIOs. The Task Force would develop a strategic, long-term advocacy plan aimed at building an influence infrastructure for our system.

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

This retreat item is consistent with the State Board’s goal to “Build on the system’s strength and successes by increasing communication and partnerships within our system, including faculty, students and staff, and with business, labor, K-12, 4-year institutions and other stakeholders.”

**Background information and analysis**

The national spotlight continues to shine on community and technical colleges. People and organizations realize that most jobs require an education past high school, and appreciate the value of a practical and purposeful education at a lower cost.

As reported by Community College Daily: “A May 2017 survey by New America found that Americans have a strong positive view of community colleges and their importance to the workforce. 83 percent of survey participants said community colleges contribute to a strong U.S. workforce; 82 percent said the colleges are worth the cost; and 80 percent stated that the colleges prepare people to be successful.

“In addition, the survey shows that community colleges have a broad appeal among all levels of income. For example, 68 percent of people in the survey earning less than $35,000 and those making $45,000 to $99,999 annually indicated that they see community colleges as ‘for people in my situation.’ About 58 percent of people earning more than $100,000 felt the same.”

Here in Washington, an October 22, 2012 survey by Doug Gould and Associates found Washington state residents have positive impressions of community and technical colleges. This finding was reiterated in a 2013 survey by the College Promise Coalition.

Within the halls of our state capitol, legislators also praise our community and technical colleges. In 2016, several Democratic senators proposed free tuition at community and technical colleges. Seattle mayoral candidate Jenny Durkan recently proposed free tuition for all Seattle high-school graduates, in effect, expanding the 13th Year Promise Scholarship program offered by South Seattle College.

Despite this positive backdrop, Washington’s community and technical colleges remain vulnerable to budget cuts and stagnant funding. Our colleges and public universities are the go-to places for cuts when the state faces budget gaps. Unlike K-12 education, higher education funding is not protected by the constitution or other legal mandates. And while legislators think favorably about our system, those good thoughts do not necessarily translate into the level of support our system needs. As many have said, “We need to get legislators to move past ‘you’re great’ to ‘you’re indispensable.’”
The goal of any advocacy effort is to create an influence infrastructure that leads to desirable, defined outcomes. Policy makers are more likely to take action if a cause affects a large number of people. The more people and organizations that support the cause, the more likely it is to get attention. Those voices are most powerful when they come from legislators’ home districts.

Our system stepped up its legislative advocacy during the 2017 session. Collectively, State Board staff, presidents, trustees, administrators, faculty, staff and students worked daily with legislators. This included one-on-one meetings, committee testimony, sending letters and speaking with legislators by phone.

The challenge now is to build an advocacy infrastructure that supports our system over the long term, whatever our yearly session asks might be.

WACTC and the Association of College Trustees (ACT) have hosted panel discussions about advocacy. Those discussions featured key influencers in the state Legislature:

- Former Gov. Christine Gregoire
- Former Lt. Gov. Brad Owen
- Current Lt. Gov. Cyrus Habib
- Senator Patty Murray Policy Advisor, Bryce McKibben
- Washington Technology Industry Association Director, Michael Shutzler
- League of Education Voters CEO, Chris Korsmo
- UW Vice President of External Relations, Randy Hodgins
- Washington Roundtable President, Steve Mullen
- OFM Legislative Liaison, Scott Merriman
- Governor’s Office Executive Policy Director, Matt Steuerwalt
- Senators David Frockt, Sharon Brown, Karen Fraser and Barbara Bailey
- Representatives Eric Pettigrew and Hans Zeiger
- Jim Justin Government Consulting President, Jim Justin

All shared a common message: Our system has a powerful voice in every legislative district, but we need to amplify our voice through other people and organizations who can advocate with us, and on our behalf.

Our system is passionate and energetic about advocacy. The proposed Long-Term Advocacy Task Force will turn that enthusiasm into a working plan for our system to execute.

**Potential questions**

- What is the State Board’s vision for system advocacy?
- Given the advocacy experience of many members of the State Board, what advice (opportunities/pitfalls) do you have for moving forward?
- How would the Board want to engage with this effort?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

Board members and retreat participants will have the opportunity to discuss priorities for system-wide advocacy efforts aimed at generating effective support for the community and technical college system.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Laura McDowell, communications director | 360-704-4310 | lmcdowell@sbctc.edu

Sources:
2. Preliminary Survey Highlights, Meg Bostrom of Public Knowledge, October 2012
**Long-Term Strategic Advocacy Work Plan**

**DRAFT 2017-18 Work Plan**

**Objective:** To develop a strategic long-term advocacy and messaging plan for the college system.

**Participants:** Three representatives each from:

- State Board
- WACTC
- ACT
- PIC (Public Information Commission)
- WACTCSA (students)
- Faculty

State board staff will include SBCTC executive director, ACT director, legislative director, communications director, finance representative, student services representative, Julie Walter

**Timeline and outcomes:** Final steering committee recommendations due to State Board in June 2018.

### October

First Task Force meeting

Define Task Force scope of work

- Problem statement
- Goals
- Guiding principles
- Timeline

Define RFP scope of work

- Define objectives and audience
- Agree to scope of work

Issue RFP, responses due after Thanksgiving

Report back to WACTC (Oct. 5-6), State Board (Oct. 25-26) and PIC (Oct. 26-27)

Continue advocacy for 2018 session as recommended by WACTC

Aug. 28, 2017, SBCTC Communications
November

Review other successful advocacy efforts

Discuss SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats)

- What challenges do we face? What is the “landscape” politically, demographically, economically?
- With what group/organizations should we form strategic alliances and how do we motivate them to act?
- Are there any long-term policy asks to frame our system? (examples: BEdA caseload, free tuition) Can they be introduced manageable policy asks that, over time, lead to systemic change?
- How can we measure success?

Select Task Force members to help with vendor selection

After Thanksgiving – RFP responses due

Report back to ACT (Nov. 10) and WACTC (Nov. 30-Dec. 1)

December

Report progress to State Board (Dec. 6-7)

Hold RFP conferences

Select vendor

January

With leadership from consultant, engage system to create a long-term advocacy and messaging plan. Typical elements include:

- Advocacy issue
- Advocacy goal
- Decision-makers and influencers – identify their issues
- Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats (SWOT)
- Advocacy gaps and assets
- Key partners
- Tactics
- Messages
- Measurements of success

Report back to WACTC (Jan. 23-24), ACT (Jan. 23) and PIC (Jan. 24)

Identify nexus with 2018 legislative advocacy

February – March

Continue work on long-term advocacy and messaging plan

Perform end-of-session analysis as it relates to long-term advocacy

Report back to State Board and WACTC and seek input (see meeting calendar)

April

Report back to WACTC (April 26-27)

Continue work on long-term advocacy and messaging plan

Aug. 28, 2017, SBCTC Communications
May

Finalize Task Force recommendations
Report back to State Board (May 2-3), PIC (May 17-18) and WACTC (May 31-June 1)
Submit Task Force recommendations to WACTC before submittal to the State Board

June

Final recommendations to State Board for action (June 27-28)

System Meeting Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>State Board</th>
<th>WACTC</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>PIC</th>
<th>WACTCSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Sept. 11-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Oct. 25-26</td>
<td>Oct. 5-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Nov. 30-Dec. 1</td>
<td>Nov. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Dec. 6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Feb. 7-8</td>
<td>Feb. 15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>March 28-29</td>
<td>March 22-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 26-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>May 2-3</td>
<td>May 31-June 1</td>
<td>May 10-11</td>
<td>May 17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>June 27-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aug. 28, 2017, SBCTC Communications
Completions

Brief description
This interactive session will focus on guided pathways as an approach being utilized by Washington’s community and technical colleges to increase completions and close equity gaps for students. An overview of key system strategies to support guided pathways will be discussed, including data that are being collected, used and analyzed to gauge effectiveness. Pierce College, one of College Spark Washington’s pilot colleges, will share how the implementation of guided pathways has unfolded on their campuses.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
The State Board goals are designed to increase completions and close equity gaps. Six pilot colleges are addressing both of these goals with funding from College Spark Washington and the national American Association of Community Colleges Pathways Institute to fully implement Guided Pathways: Everett, Peninsula, Pierce, Skagit Valley, South Puget Sound, and South Seattle.

Background information and analysis
Guided Pathways is a research-based approach that simplifies choices for students. Courses are grouped to form clear paths through college and into careers, whether students enter those careers directly after graduation or transfer to a university for more study in their chosen fields. Students receive intensive, targeted advising to choose their paths, stay on those paths, learn what they need to know, and graduate. To make these fundamental shifts and increase the number of students successfully completing their degree paths, guided pathways reforms will entail major changes in college practices and culture. Colleges will need to redesign their academic programs and student supports at a scale for all degree-seeking students, rather than increasing programmatic interventions for discrete populations.

The State Board has set up an infrastructure and strategic framework for moving the guided pathways approach forward in the system. The agency intentionally sought out and received grant resources to support these strategic efforts. Funding partners include College Spark Washington, Jobs for the Future, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the University of Texas, Austin, Dana Center for Math Pathways, as well as new state legislative funding.

One of the strategic goals is to offer professional development events to help colleges deepen their knowledge and understanding of the guided pathways approach and how they might implement them at their colleges. These events include general guided pathways workshops, organized around the four design principles of pathways – clarifying the path, getting students on path, keeping students on the path, and ensuring students are learning. There are also more targeted workshops on Math Pathways, Technology for Guided Pathways, as well as guided pathways sessions specifically for faculty at the Assessment Teaching and Learning Conference.

The State Board is partnering with the Community College Research Center (CCRC) of Teachers College at Columbia University to offer the Guided Pathways Essential Practices: Scale of Adoption Self-Assessment. The Scale of Adoption is a tool designed to help colleges assess how far along they are in adopting guided pathways at scale. Administering this tool will help colleges understand how far along they are in scaling each design principle, plan their next steps, and identify technical assistance and supports needed to accelerate guided pathways implementation, and provide information to focus
system efforts on redesign areas needing the most support. The State Board is partnering with Jobs for the Future and other national and regional partners to deliver these supports.

A change leadership infrastructure has been developed that includes establishing of a diverse group of system leaders, called change facilitators, who are trained in change leadership and facilitation concepts and skills. During state guided pathways convening’s, the change facilitators support college teams discussions during team planning sessions, utilizing the change approaches needed to implement guided pathways, and importantly, that colleges keep equity goals at the forefront of their planning efforts. The State Board has also enlisted a cadre of coaches and critical friend evaluators to help colleges with their implementation efforts, by analyzing current work, helping identify areas where colleges may be ‘stuck,’ and offering guidance and advice on the practical steps, as well as the deep change work that needs to be done, to fully scale guided pathways so that we can improve completion outcomes for all students.

Measuring completions is an essential component of Guided Pathways for determining how colleges continuously improve student success and close equity gaps. Interim milestones will be the first student indicators that show change under the new initiative beginning this academic year. Students are measured at the end of their first and second years for earning 15, 30, and 45 college credits as well as for completing college math and English.

The State Board staff has created dashboards for our colleges that show momentum milestones, completions and post-college results. The dashboards include first-time college students, beginning in 2010 to current. These data from the first few years are a baseline from which to track positive momentum and gains. All of the dashboards can be disaggregated by race and ethnicity, gender, age, program choice, and other student and program characteristics.

Baseline results show completion makes a substantial difference in terms of full-time employment for those who do not go on to further education and that the associate degree substantially raises the transfer rate to four-year colleges for those who have that goal. That said, most students leave college with no completion. Furthermore, this shows up in early milestone attainment, as many students leave without having reached even the first milestone. Additional differences exist when the data are disaggregated.

Board members will have an opportunity to discuss the Guided Pathways Initiative and use an interactive Tableau presentation derived from the dashboards that identifies challenges and opportunities revealed in baseline years. Afterwards, the Board will hear from one of the initiative colleges and the work they are doing to implement Guided Pathways.

See Attachment A: Guided Pathways PowerPoint

**Potential questions**

- How will Guided Pathways support the Board’s goals for increasing completions and closing equity gaps?
- What are the challenges and opportunities for redesigning colleges using the Guided Pathways approach?
- How is one college addressing Guided Pathways?
**Recommendation/preferred result**

The Board will gain a greater understanding of guided pathways and see the positive impacts of this approach, why the State Board is encouraging CTCs to consider implementing this approach, and the strategies the State Board has developed and deployed to accelerate guided pathways within the state system. Additionally, the Board will see how one college (Pierce College) is applying this theoretical approach in a very real and concrete way to improve outcomes for their students.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Lisa Garcia-Hanson, student success director
360-704-1022, lgarcia-hanson@sbctc.edu

David Prince, research associate
360-704-4347, dprince@sbctc.ctc.edu
Guided Pathways

State Board Retreat
September 12, 2017

Lisa Garcia-Hanson, Student Success Center Director
David Prince, Policy Research Associate

Agenda

• Why Guided Pathways?

• What is guided pathways and how is it different from past initiatives?

• State Board strategies and activities to implement Guided Pathways

• Guided Pathways implementation in action in Washington
Why Guided Pathways?

Activity

Choose any college from the SBCTC “Explore a College” website https://www.sbctc.edu/our-colleges/explore-colleges/default.aspx
Activity

Pick one scenario and find all the career and degree options in your field of interest and how to get started at your chosen college:

1. You are a first-generation high school senior interested in pursuing a career in law and justice.
2. You are an older single parent, working full-time, interested in a career in education.

Debrief Questions

- Did you get to your goal during the allotted time?
- How did you feel during this exercise?
- What additional challenges might the student profile you assumed face?
What is guided pathways and how is it different from past initiatives?

The Guided Pathways Approach

Guided Pathways is a research-based approach that begins with the end in mind: a career with job skills and credentials of value in the local, regional and state economy. It simplifies choices for students, by offering general pathway onramps to workforce or transfer programs in the student’s chosen field.
The Guided Pathways Approach

Rather than employing discrete interventions for certain target populations, Guided Pathways requires colleges to completely redesign academic and student support programs at scale - for ALL degree-seeking students.

State Board strategies and activities to implement Guided Pathways in our community and technical colleges
• Grant funding to support the State Board and our community and technical colleges
• Professional development events to deepen colleges’ Guided Pathways knowledge and understanding
• CCRC Scale of Adoption Self-Assessment
• Change Leadership Facilitators
• Coaches and critical friend evaluators

Guided Pathways implementation in action in Washington

Many Washington community and technical colleges are implementing guided pathways
Some examples include:
• College Spark Washington and AACC Pathways colleges: Everett Community College, Peninsula College, Pierce College, South Puget Sound Community College, and South Seattle College
• Clark College
• Lake Washington Institute of Technology
• Renton Technical College
• Walla Walla Community College
• Yakima Valley College

Questions?
Equity and Diversity

Brief description
Washington State will not be able to significantly reduce the disparities in postsecondary attainment without explicit equity-guided action. It is our moral and educational imperative as the state’s community and technical college system to intentionally shift this trajectory on behalf of our most underserved and marginalized students. As a system and within the agency, we are uniquely positioned to have the greatest impact in these areas.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
Washington State’s community and technical college’s equity agenda seeks to raise educational attainment, opens more doors to college education – particularly for our fast-growing diverse student populations – and builds upon our tradition of excellence.

Our colleges’ role in advancing the equity agenda also aligns with the following State Board’s Goals:
1) Achieve increased educational attainment for all residents across the state; and
2) Strengthen state and local economies by meeting the demands for a well-educated and skilled workforce.

Additionally, an equity focus parallels the overarching State Board Policy Goals:
1) Promote Student Achievement and Success;
2) Increase Access to Postsecondary Education; and
3) Build on the System’s Strengths and Successes.

Background information and analysis
National evidence shows that the only path to significantly improving higher education completion rates is by increasing the success of all racial, ethnic, and indigenous populations. In order to truly support students who traditionally have faced greater obstacles to accessing and completing higher education, states, higher education systems, and institutions need an explicit equity focus that informs all related efforts. According to the Lumina Foundation, “No state can meet its workforce demands without attention to long-standing equity gaps.” (Improving Postsecondary Attainment: Overcoming Common Challenges to an Equity Agenda in State Policy, 2017), attachment B.

It is no different here in Washington State. 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 the same time period. Over the next 20 years, there simply will not be sufficient human resources to meet the overall needs of our state’s workforce if we do not develop and utilize the talents of the collective whole. It is critical that we target our efforts in educating those who have been underrepresented and underserved in our higher education system: people of color (in particular, Latino, African American, and Native American students); low-wage workers; workers who are raising children; immigrants/refugees with limited English; and out of school youth and adults who lack college-level academic skills.

Washington’s community and technical colleges serve the most diverse student population in the state’s higher education system. We have earned an impressive reputation nationally for being nimble, responsive, and innovative in growing our future workforce. Many of our colleges are national leaders in developing trainings and cutting-edge programs while joining forces with stakeholders to support our
most vulnerable students. Instructional programs like I-BEST, HS 21+, and Project I-DEA; collaborative efforts with K-12 partnerships such as the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Open Doors; and funding streams like Opportunity Grant help to ensure that our most underserved population of students – many of whom start college as Basic Education for Adults (BEdA) students – will enter the front doors of our institutions with an equitable chance for success.

Intentional, system-wide initiatives grounded in equity are critical in meeting our state’s current and future workforce needs. The Guided Pathways movement is a prime example. Our community college system also boasts a collective of grassroots efforts spearheaded by passionate, equity-minded campus leaders dedicated to supporting our most vulnerable students. Several of these efforts endeavor to develop a diverse and talented leadership pipeline that reflects the diverse community of students we serve. Some of these initiatives include: Diversifying Faculty Hiring; Faculty of Color Mentoring and Administrators of Color Mentoring programs; and the Social Justice Leadership Institute (attachment C). In conjunction with these initiatives, the Presidents have issued three public declarations of support on the following: Religious Diversity and Safe Campuses; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA).

Washington State’s community and technical colleges need to continue to intentionally prioritize explicit equity-guided actions to best support the needs of our diverse students, staff, and faculty.

See Attachment A: Advancing the Equity Agenda.

**Potential questions**

- What is the potential return-on-investment (ROI) - in terms of economic growth, increased tax revenue, and other measures – of increasing postsecondary access and success for underserved populations?
- How far would closing gaps in achievement (e.g. for Latinos, African Americans, low-income adults without a college education) advance the state towards overall attainment needs?
- Projecting current rates of educational attainment across groups, will the state have the educated workforce it needs in 5, 10, 15 years in the future?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

As an educational and economic imperative, we would like the Board’s ongoing leadership and guidance in supporting an equity policy agenda for our most underserved and underrepresented students.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Ha T. Nguyen, basic education for adults policy associate - diversity, equity, and inclusion 360-704-4322, hnguyen@sbctc.edu
Advancing the Equity Agenda: Washington State’s Educational Imperative

State Board Retreat
September 11-13, 2017

Ha T. Nguyen
Policy Associate, Basic Education for Adults
Interagency Communication & Messaging
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion | Barrier Mitigation

BETTER JOBS, BRIGHTER FUTURES, A STRONGER WASHINGTON
WA State CTC Equity Gaps

- Students of color
- Low-income (Pell eligible)
- Academically underprepared
- First generation
- Adult
- Other populations specific to local community
Understanding the Equity Gap: Data Points

- Participation in higher education
- Completion of key momentum points in college
- Credential completion
- Post college outcomes

Participation in Higher Education
Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation in Higher Education
Household Income

Key momentum points (basis for outcomes-based funding)

SBCTC
WASHINGTON'S COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES
**Post College Outcomes: Employment**

**Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce Degree</th>
<th>All Quarter(s)</th>
<th>All Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Degree</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>35.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate &lt; 1 Yr</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>32.9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate &gt;= 1 Yr</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>11.6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Degree</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>27.0K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**System Overview**

**Employees/Students: Percent of Personnel/Students of Color**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>avg. annual change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified/Support</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Support Students*</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCTC data warehouse.

- The percent of personnel of color has grown slowly in most categories over the past five years.
- There was slightly larger growth in the percent of professional/technical staff of color.
- Most personnel categories are outpaced by the growth in percent of students of color.

*note: the percent students of color reported here may not match the fall quarter report because it excludes Tacoma and Spokane Colleges.
# Washington's Community and Technical Colleges

## Full-time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>avg. annual change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCTC data warehouse

Colleges with highest percent of Full-time Faculty of Color:
- Highline: 34%
- Seattle Central/SVI: 31%
- Seattle South: 31%

## Administrative Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>avg. annual change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SBCTC data warehouse

Colleges with highest percent of Administrative Staff of Color:
- Bellevue: 36%
- Yakima Valley: 29%
- Seattle South: 29%
- Seattle Central/SVI: 28%

Colleges with highest annual growth in Administrative Staff of Color:
- Edmonds: 3.5%
- Renton: 3.3%
- Bates: 3.2%

* Lists only include colleges with at least 10 administrative staff
Discussion Questions

• Are there other elements not mentioned that should be a focus within the equity agenda?

• What information is important to convey to campus leaders and stakeholders to encourage prioritizing the equity agenda?
Diversity of people, perspectives

Inclusion: power, voice, organizational culture

Equity = results from policy, practice, position
IMPROVING POSTSECONDARY ATTAINMENT:

Overcoming Common Challenges
To an Equity Agenda in State Policy

JANUARY 2017
Evidence shows that the only path to significantly improving higher education completion rates in most states is by increasing the success of all racial, ethnic, and indigenous populations. Yet many of the policies and initiatives developed over the past decade to boost postsecondary success can inadvertently do harm to some groups. To truly support students who traditionally have faced greater obstacles to accessing and completing higher education, states, higher education systems, and institutions need an explicit equity focus that informs all related efforts.

What do we mean by equity focus? An equity focus in policy recognizes the need to eliminate disparities in educational outcomes of students from underserved and underrepresented populations. It is deliberately color-conscious, and seeks specifically to eliminate the widening postsecondary gaps for Native American, African American, and Latino students. It prioritizes institutional accountability rather than student deficits, and monitors the impact of all policy on marginalized groups. This perspective is critical because it allows states to see when policies and practices that appear to be beneficial actually are creating or worsening inequality.

In the spring of 2015, Lumina Foundation partnered with the Center for Urban Education (CUE) to develop a Strategy Labs State Policy Academy focused on Addressing Equity Gaps in State Goals for Postsecondary Education Attainment. A core goal of the academy was to increase the number of states with higher education attainment goals that seek to close gaps for underrepresented populations. According to Lumina, “no state can meet its workforce demands without attention to long-standing equity gaps.”

Researchers from CUE began by interviewing state policy leaders in four states that had already embedded equity in their state attainment goals: Colorado, Indiana, Maryland, and Texas. They also reviewed 13 state strategic plans for equity-related language. The purpose was to understand the processes states have used to address equity, how states gain buy-in from key stakeholders, and how states have framed equity within their strategic plans.

The end product of this intensive and collaborative work is a series of three resources that provide guidance to state leaders and policymakers on 1) overcoming common challenges to conversations about equity, 2) embedding equity in state policy, and 3) assessing existing—and future—policies and initiatives.

This guide, Improving Postsecondary Attainment: Overcoming Common Challenges to an Equity Agenda in State Policy, would not have been possible without the support of Lumina Foundation. We hope that it is useful as state leaders work to improve postsecondary attainment in the United States.

Estela Mara Bensimon
Director, Center for Urban Education
Professor of Higher Education, University of Southern California
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Improving Postsecondary Attainment: Overcoming Common Challenges to an Equity Agenda in State Policy describes key strategies and steps that state leaders, policymakers, and higher education officials can take to break down common challenges that frustrate efforts to incorporate equity on state-level postsecondary policy agendas.

Overcoming Common Challenges to an Equity Agenda in State Policy is based on the Center for Urban Education (CUE)’s collaboration in five states where education and policy leaders worked to build and implement equity-focused higher education attainment goals. CUE assisted each state’s team by providing feedback on data reports or presentations, guidance on negotiating data disputes, and advice on discussing race.

For more than a year, CUE documented strategies that worked well and analyzed the common challenges encountered by each state team. Some obstacles were political, such as the ability to define attainment goals for historically underserved racial, ethnic and socioeconomic groups, or garnering buy-in from key stakeholders. Such challenges often stem from a belief that equal opportunity in America is color blind—a mindset that allows policy to be debated, implemented, and evaluated without examining how it may disproportionately harm marginalized groups, such as African Americans, Native Americans and Latinos, first-generation college students, and low-income students.

Additional technical challenges, such as identifying accurate data to guide goal-setting and decision-making, underlie the political challenges and increase the challenge to leading a productive effort to focus on equity.

Those and other barriers, however, can be overcome with the right approaches. This guide addresses three of the most common challenges: leading conversations about race, overcoming data paralysis, and engaging institutions of higher education. Each section includes a detailed description of the problem, examples from previous or existing efforts, and key action-steps that will help equity become incorporated in state higher education policy agendas.

Since 1999, the Center for Urban Education (CUE) has led socially conscious research and developed tools to help institutions of higher education produce equitable student outcomes. Located in the University of Southern California’s Rossier School of Education, CUE is committed to closing racial-ethnic equity gaps and improving student outcomes in higher education. Rather than remediate students, CUE remediates practices, structures, and policies.
1. **LEADING CONVERSATIONS ABOUT RACE.**
Long-term improvements to postsecondary attainment require a shift in the approach to addressing racism, from discussions of personal bias to the structural inequity hindering educational opportunity. This section provides advice on framing conversations about race, and tips for pushing back against resistance.

2. **OVERCOMING DATA PARALYSIS.** Various sources offer different data purporting to address the same questions, yet they rarely provide the same answer. The result often is legitimate disagreement about which data are best suited to inform policy decisions. While evaluation of methodologies, sources, data definitions, and other factors are important to ensure the validity of policy goals and strategies, disagreements too often paralyze action. The volume and complexity of data—without a roadmap to identify key points—can also disorient policy leaders. This section includes strategies to focus discussions, and guidance for developing key equity indicators that can help build the foundation for effective policy development.

3. **ENGAGING INSTITUTIONS.** The challenges to implementing an effective equity-focused postsecondary policy agenda continue beyond the development of a strategic plan and the enactment of attainment goals. Policymakers need strategies for cementing an equity focus in state methodology and structures that are viable across short-term political cycles—and in tumultuous policy terrains. This section provides examples of successful practices based on the experiences of states that have sustained an equity focus in policy.

While evaluation of methodologies, sources, data definitions, and other factors are important to ensure the validity of policy goals and strategies, disagreements too often paralyze action.
The United States will not be able to significantly reduce the disparities in postsecondary attainment, even controlling for income and other factors, without explicit discussions about racial inequity. Confronting patterns of educational inequities for African American, Native American, and Latino communities, however, is challenging in any context. The tragic violence between police and communities of color across our communities in the past year have made it riskier—yet also more critical—for policy leaders to engage in open and candid discussions about the effect of structural racism on educational opportunity. Such conversations are often politically volatile, particularly when efforts to embed an equity focus in state policy get conflated with debates about affirmative action—or when some perceive discussion of race as supplanting a focus on the needs of other disadvantaged groups.

Productive conversations require carefully framing equity in terms of structural inequities that negatively affect communities of color. Below are common negative reactions to discussions of race in higher education policy, and ways to rethink the fundamental concerns and sentiments they reflect.

**“WE CAN’T TALK ABOUT RACE IN OUR STATE.”**

When policymakers say “we can’t talk about race here,” they often really mean “we can’t afford the political capital to make race an issue,” or “we tried that once and it didn’t work.” Leaders are naturally sensitive to the political cultures and traditions in their state, and make assumptions (often well-informed) about what topics are preferred, acceptable, or taboo. For example, in a recent study, Valant and Newark (2016) found that Americans are more willing to prioritize achievement gaps based on income than on race, and more willing to support initiatives that remediate poor-wealthy disparities than Black-White or Latina/o-White disparities. While this study shows a preference for income-based solutions, the assumption that “we can’t talk about race here” is often based on additional assumptions about who makes up the policy audience (e.g., a conservative electorate) or about past experiences the state has had in targeting racial/ethnic groups in social policy (e.g., affirmative action or immigration policy).

Additionally, the political sensitivities surrounding race discussions often stem from the tendency to understand racism as personal bias rather than as structural inequities entrenched in social structures that circumscribe educational and economic opportunity. Alicia Dowd and Estela Bensimon (2015) make an important distinction between institutional and structural racism. “Institutional racism refers to seemingly objective standards of academic life that are racialized, because they take their existing form due to historical racial discrimination and contemporary amnesia about race policy” (p. 15). For example, admissions policies, student assessment and placement, faculty
and staff hiring and promotion, pedagogy and curricular content, and degree qualifications. “Structural racism refers to the stratification of educational opportunity among members of different racial and ethnic groups produced by formal systems and structures of education” (p. 15-16). For example, guaranteed transfer policies that advantage full-time students and fail to take into account that students of color will be penalized because they are more likely to be part-time students (Chase et al., 2014). Institutional and policy leaders, because they are not in the habit of asking the “race” question, are often not aware that well-intended practices and policies maintain inequality in opportunity. To be effective, policy leaders need to find ways to intentionally and strategically reframe discussions of race in terms of these inequitable structures and based on a shared vision for the state’s future.

This passage from the 2012 Colorado Department of Higher Education’s state plan, Colorado Competes, serves as an example of how a state acknowledges the systemic nature of inequity: “Colorado has the second-largest degree attainment gap in the country—that is, the gap between the educational attainment of white students and the attainment of the next-largest ethnic group, which in Colorado is Hispanic/Latino. In other words, Colorado’s system performs far better for white students than it does for Hispanics or those from low-income families.”

“ECONOMIC INEQUALITY IS MORE IMPORTANT IN OUR STATE THAN RACIAL INEQUALITY.”

Many policymakers believe that disparities in postsecondary opportunity in the 21st century are tied primarily to socioeconomic class—that race alone is no longer a disadvantaging factor. They hope that developing better strategies for access and degree completion for low-income students will resolve racial disparities. Unfortunately, evidence shows that this is not accurate.

Income-based equity strategies are important, to be sure. Increasing access to financial aid, reducing student-loan burdens, and favoring the use of need-based over merit-based aid helps more students—including many students of color—enter and succeed in higher education. But even across racial and ethnic groups of the same socioeconomic class, disparities for minority groups still exist (Carnevale and Strohl, 2013). For example, using data from the Community College Research Center (CCRC), Carnevale and Strohl (2010) demonstrate that 39 percent of white students in the “bottom SES tier” who start in community colleges go on to earn certificates, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees. For students of color, that figure is below 30 percent, suggesting that there is at least a 9 percentage-point gap between low-SES white students and students of color. Thus, the disparity cannot be explained by SES alone.

Students of color in every socioeconomic group fare worse than their white counterparts. The challenge of framing a discussion about race in postsecondary policy is therefore to emphasize the idea that advancing equity is not about putting race- and class-based disadvantages in competition, but rather addressing different forms of inequity differently in order to achieve a stronger and more
unified state. Policy discourse should recognize that barriers facing poor white communities and those facing communities of color are different and require different policy strategies and separate acknowledgement.

“FOCUSING ON THE SUCCESS OF ALL STUDENTS IS FAIRER.”

Singling out racial groups as beneficiaries of policy raises fears about preferential treatment. However, the urge to claim color-blindness and be generically inclusive ignores the painful history of racial subjugation and stands in the way of efforts to close racial gaps. For instance, the discomfort with naming racial groups as the intended targets for additional resources or benefits is evident in the insistence by some to counter a focus on specific racial and ethnic groups, such as Black and Latino with statements like “I care about all students.” Caring for “all” students would be egalitarian in an ideal world, but in a society with as much inequality as we currently face in the United States, the reality is that focusing attention on those with the greatest needs is a fair and appropriate approach.

This tension can be addressed by providing examples of data that clearly display how inequity in higher education is the result of immense differences in the educational resources available to students of color compared to white students. For example: Nationally, close to three-fourths of Black and Latino K-12 students attend segregated schools. Less than one percent of White students attend 90-100 percent minority schools while about 40 percent of Black and Latino students attend such schools. In contrast, on average, White students attend schools that are comprised of almost 80 percent White students (Frankenberg, Lee, & Orfield, 2003). Allowing equity discussions to focus on interventions that support “all” students without acknowledging these systemic disparities for minorities increases the risk that higher education inequality will not only persist, but continue to grow. In fact, degree attainment among white and Asian students has increased so much faster than for Blacks and Latinos that the gaps in 2015 are bigger than they were in 1995. Such examples have the power to shift discussion about equity from individual racism to real systemic and structural disparities that impact communities of color.

Allowing equity discussions to focus on interventions that support “all” students without acknowledging these systemic disparities for minorities increases the risk that higher education inequality will not only persist, but continue to grow.
TO DO: PREPARE TALKING POINTS TO HELP LEAD DISCUSSIONS ABOUT RACE.

Use data and historical context to help reframe discussions about race in terms of structural inequity.

☐ Before beginning discussions about the need to focus on equity in state policy, clearly define equity to clarify how it is different from equality and diversity, and contextualize it within the state’s history and demographic trends.

☐ Defuse concerns about quotas by defining equity as distinct from policy and legal debates about diversity and affirmative action in higher education admissions.

☐ Identify precedents in existing state policy for targeting groups based on unequal resources—in tax codes, or K-12 school funding equalization, for example.

☐ Defuse the race vs. income debate by highlighting data to illustrate that both disparities exist and both matter, but have different causes and different solutions. (See Ching, 2013, for talking points.)

☐ Draw on the resources of scholars who study race and income inequality to develop talking points that are supported by historical facts on discrimination, segregation, redlining, and unequal public-school funding. (See Ching and Liera, 2016, for talking points.)

☐ Consider proposing an “equity lens” for higher education policy that can make it easier for constituents to see how an equity focus can be operationalized. Without that perspective, conversation can be derailed by abstract notions of preferential treatment. The equity lens/policy review criteria can clarify how and why equity is a priority for the state given its economic and demographic contexts. For example, see the Oregon Education Investment Board’s “Equity Lens” policy.
Effective, equity-focused postsecondary policy must begin with an understanding of how much and for whom higher education access and success must improve. That means that the planning, goal-setting, and policy development processes must be supported by continuous data analysis. For most state policymakers, the challenge in developing effective, equity-focused policy is not a lack of data. In fact, most policymaking organizations are so awash in data that it can be overwhelming and difficult to find a starting point. The challenge is harnessing the right data at the right time and—even more importantly—having a clear sense of what questions to ask.

To support effective, equity-focused planning, data analysis should be guided by a clear set of questions that help planners understand the current state of attainment, equity in attainment, and trends over time.

Questions your state should ask:

- What career fields and occupations in the state have strong labor market demand currently? In five, 10, 15 years? What are the levels of educational attainment required for those jobs? What are the projected shortfalls of adults with those credentials?
- Which populations have the lowest rates of postsecondary attainment historically?
- Which populations are the fastest-growing in the state?
- What are the racial/ethnic and gender patterns of attainment across different disciplinary and certificate pathways? Do pathways differ by race/ethnicity and gender?
- Projecting current rates of educational attainment across groups, will the state have the educated workforce it needs five, 10, 15 years in the future?
- How far would closing gaps in attainment (e.g., for Latinos, African Americans, low-income adults without a college education) advance the state towards overall attainment needs?
- At current rates of educational attainment, will some populations in the state be disproportionately excluded from opportunities in high-wage, high-demand jobs?
- What is the potential return-on-investment—in terms of economic growth, increased tax revenue, and other measures—of increasing postsecondary access and success for underserved populations?
SORTING THROUGH THE DATA

States with strategic plans that include a clear focus on equity have conducted such rigorous data analyses, often with the assistance of state demographers or external organizations. They have demonstrated that conducting rigorous data analyses and investing time in communicating, vetting, and revising interpretations of those analyses will pay off over time. Without knowing specifically what—and who—attainment strategies should address, strategic plans will reflect general goals rather than the necessary frameworks for action supported by robust and defensible state objectives.

This process, however, is often fraught with challenges: Policy leaders too often find themselves swamped with data, trying to make the case for equity with a thousand Excel spreadsheets—the data equivalent of “death by PowerPoint.” Using data strategically can reinforce an equity narrative, but doing so requires mapping out a clear set of defensible data points that answer critical policy-relevant questions.

Discussion about differences in methodologies, sources, data definitions, and other factors is important to ensure validity of the data that states use to craft policy goals and strategies. But these conversations often fail to produce any significant gain in clarity or defensibility. While data is intended to convey real-world facts, different data from different sources often do not provide the same answer.

STRATEGIES TO STAY ON TRACK

Policymakers need strategies for getting through these discussions and moving forward with the data best suited to inform important policy decisions. Those who have found their way into—and out of—disagreements about the “right” data to use in building an equity-focused postsecondary policy agenda described three common strategies as essential to keeping them on track.

1. **Understand the differences between competing data sources.**

Data disagreements often are politically driven, based on conceptual differences underlying the methodologies and definitions. But these differences are rooted in sometimes simple variances in methodology. Surfacing those small technical factors can resolve the disagreements so that the conceptual questions at stake are clearer.

A good example of a common data challenge for states is understanding and explaining the difference between two sets of projections that show the educational attainment needs for the state’s future workforce. Projections by the Center on Education and the Workforce at Georgetown University have been broadly accepted in the field and adopted as the rationalizing data for ambitious national and state postsecondary attainment goals. However, these projections differ in key ways from those produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), which indicate a much lower need for postsecondary attainment over the same timespan as the Georgetown data. The differences between the two
projections stem from differing assumptions and methods for measuring educational requirements for occupational groups. While the BLS—and many state workforce data experts who use BLS data or follow similar methods—examine the minimum educational requirements for a given occupation, the Center on Education and the Workforce uses a more dynamic analysis of the average level of postsecondary credential required for entry into an occupational group, taking into account wage premiums and other considerations to reflect a more realistic rendering of actual postsecondary requirements for new career entrants. For most state policy planning and goal-setting purposes, then, the Center on Education and the Workforce’s assumptions and methods are both more accurate and more reflective of the economic growth most states aspire to achieve. For more information about the key methodological and conceptual differences between BLS and Georgetown data, contact the Center on Education and the Workforce at cewgeorgetown@georgetown.edu.

2.  **Don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good.**

It is common for data discussions to get bogged down by concerns over perceived flaws. The fact is, data are almost always imperfect, no matter how well-established and routine reporting measures become. There is a lot we simply do not know, or are unable to learn, because we lack the right data systems or measures—particularly when it comes to equity. For example, how many students of color who grew up in conditions of economic adversity are enrolling in college in our state? Or simply, how many students of color from low-income families who start at community college are graduating with a bachelor’s degree?

Most states don’t have statewide data easily available to answer such questions. What we have are enrollment rates by race/ethnicity, graduation rates that often are flawed, and Pell Grant eligibility as a proxy for income. But even with their imperfections, these measures typically provide reasonable approximations of policy-relevant information.

As states move through initial data discussions, it is helpful to point out these limitations transparently at the outset and remind stakeholders that the goal is to achieve the best possible picture of trends and the current state of affairs. Recognizing that all the data we have are imperfect approximations, leaders should not let this reality hinder informed policy decisions.

3.  **Avoid the weeds: Balance accuracy, clarity, and immediate relevance.**

Another common challenge policymaking teams encounter in the use of data is the desire to drill “into the weeds” to explore equity challenges. There are always more ways to disaggregate data and more variables to include in analyses, but often, when we seek more answers from data, we end up with more questions. Why aren’t our students of color graduating? Do they have adequate access to financial aid? Are they taking unnecessary credits? At what points in their academic progress do we lose the most students of color? In many cases, questions should be explored and answered. But during the policy-planning and agenda-building stage, policymaking teams have found that it helps to be intentional about focusing on the immediate key questions. Doing so is necessary to build a clear, actionable agenda that can be easily communicated to the public and other stakeholders.
To that end, policymaking teams tasked with developing goals or strategic plans must from the outset define a limited number of important questions, with answers that are vital to creating a big-picture, equity-focused postsecondary attainment agenda. Then, policymakers need to develop and maintain a regularly updated set of core charts that serve as “vital signs” for equity in postsecondary outcomes. These indicators may become the backbone of a state-level dashboard to measure and report on progress. We describe below some of the indicators states have used for these purposes.

**TO DO: CREATE STATE POSTSECONDARY EQUITY VITAL SIGNS.**

Maintain a set of critical indicators that tell your state’s equity story.

Start by selecting a small set of key indicators that help tell a data-based story about the state’s need for greater postsecondary attainment—and greater equity in attainment. Often the most effective story starts with the state’s future needs and works backward to address the increases in both access and completion that are required to achieve greater attainment. It should focus in on how closing gaps between demographic groups would contribute to those goals.

Based on CUE’s Equity Scorecard, *Vital Signs* are a set of critical equity indicators that provide a foundation for planning and action. (For more info on CUE’s *Vital Signs* and other data tools, see https://cue.usc.edu/tools/data/.) These indicators illustrate the story about the state’s need for greater postsecondary attainment—and equity in attainment.

Indicators that states commonly use to help craft their story:

- **Current participation and attainment rates**
  
  **Current levels of postsecondary attainment, by degree type and level, and by sector, disaggregated by race/ethnicity and age.** What is our state’s current level of educational attainment and are there disparities by race/ethnicity or by age? How many working adults are there in our state without postsecondary education? What are the levels of attainment by
region, county, or metropolitan area? [See Lumina-Stronger Nation, Center on Education and the Workforce, NCHEMS, PolicyLink Equity Atlas]

Trends in postsecondary attainment over time, disaggregated by race/ethnicity and age. Are our rates of postsecondary attainment level increasing over time or staying flat? Are disparities growing or shrinking? Are we on course to meet our goals? [See Lumina-Stronger Nation, NCHEMS]

☐ Demographic changes

Current and projected state demographic composition, by race/ethnicity and age. What is the current demographic composition of our state and counties or regions within the state? How will this change in the next 5, 10, or 20 years? What are the fastest-growing (or declining) demographic groups within our state, and what will our future workforce look like? [See PolicyLink Equity Atlas]

Projections of demographic composition of high school graduates. What does the “pipeline” of students moving through K-12 education in the state look like? What are the fastest growing populations among the students headed toward high school and college? [See WICHE-Knocking at the College Door]

Demographic contexts related to educational attainment: poverty, immigration, military-affiliated populations, and disconnected youth. What other critical demographic trends impacting our state may affect (or be affected by) postsecondary attainment? Are poverty rates rising or declining (and for whom)? What contribution are immigrants making to our state’s population growth? How many military-affiliated adults are there in our state and how many without postsecondary education? How many young people are disconnected from education or employment, and what strategies do we have to re-engage them? [See NCHEMS, PolicyLink Equity Atlas]
Economic and workforce contexts

Current and projected workforce demand and educational needs. What are the fastest-growing occupations in the state? In what fields will the greatest number of new job openings emerge over the next decade? What are the educational requirements for access to those jobs? [See Georgetown Center on Education and the Workforce]

Current unemployment rates. What are the current rates of unemployment among adults in the state? Are there differences in unemployment rates by race/ethnicity? By age group? Are unemployment rates increasing or decreasing over time? Are differences between groups increasing or decreasing over time? [See NCHEMS, PolicyLink Equity Atlas]

Current per capita or median family income in the state. How does median family income differ by region of the state or by race/ethnicity? Are there disparities in wealth or earnings between different populations in the state? Are disparities growing or shrinking over time? [See NCHEMS, PolicyLink Equity Atlas]

Net in-migration and out-migration of educated workers. Does the state import a large number of educated adults to its workforce? Are adults with college education leaving the state to find work elsewhere? [See NCHEMS]

Access, retention, completion, and policy-related indicators of student success

Longitudinal rates of participation (enrolled adults relative to total adult population without a college degree), retention, and completion; disaggregated by sector (2-year and 4-year), by race/ethnicity, gender, geographic location, income, and age group, and distinguishing between certificates and certifications (where possible). How well are institutions serving students? Are there disparities in rates of student success among different groups? [See Lumina-Stronger Nation,
Rates of placement and success in developmental education, time-to-degree, and other policy-relevant indicators related to factors that contribute to disparities in attainment. How are the state’s policies and structures impacting completion and attainment? Where are most students lost? What are the most critical drop-off points or “bottlenecks” for students in the state’s postsecondary system? [See CCA (for participating states/systems), or state/institutional data systems]

Higher education financing and financial aid disbursement. What is the average net cost of college in the state, by sector? How much is distributed in state financial aid annually? How have financial aid allocations changed over time? What share of family income is required to pay for college, by income group? [See NCHEMS, state data systems]

See Selected Data Sources at end of guide, after References
Engaging institutions of higher education is one of the most difficult steps in building an effective postsecondary policy agenda—particularly one that is equity-focused. But the goals and values of an equity-focused agenda must be effectively integrated into the practices and policies of institutions if they are to be viable beyond short-term political cycles. Thus, for policy goals to be met, and for policy measures to be effective, institutional leaders must be given authentic, meaningful opportunities to engage in dialogue and planning about ways to achieve the desired outcomes.

Research consistently shows that the values and priorities embedded in policy (e.g., outcomes-based funding) rarely diffuse into institutional practice in ways that bring about real change. In states with higher education coordinating boards that don’t have funding-related authority, moreover, the ability to engage institutional actors in working toward policy goals relies entirely upon strategies to build a commitment to change that aligns with—rather than runs counter to—the institutions’ many incentives and missions.

There are ways for policymakers to effectively engage institutional leaders, and vice versa, in collaborative discussions and strategies for pursuing agreed-upon goals. This is especially true with respect to equity, though discussions about equity also present unique challenges (see section one). Such strategies require state policymakers to design policy by starting with a focus on student impact, and then carefully considering the conditions the policy creates for institutional actors as the intermediaries.

For example, a policy such as outcomes-based funding imagines that the link between appropriations and outcomes will push institutions to change practices in order to improve student experiences. But if not carefully designed, such policies may incentivize institutions to limit access and narrow opportunity for the most marginalized students. Outcomes-based funding policy that is thoughtfully designed with student impact in mind balances access and completion measures, and includes equity “safeguards” that prevent or disincentivize institutions from exacerbating inequities in pursuit of stronger completion outcomes.

Another strategy for policy development and design strategy involves creating a shared framework and set of goals for equity, using data to build a common baseline for understanding historical inequities and workforce needs. The framework and goals also help to create conditions in which institutions are expected and enabled to develop unique equity interventions from the ground up. California Community Colleges’ Student Equity Policy (SEP) exemplifies this strategy: The SEP, instituted in 1993, requires California’s community colleges to develop “student equity plans” to address disparities in student access and success among racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups. In 2014, the state
allocated $225 million to fund implementation of the SEP, providing funds to help colleges develop their own local interventions.

The Colorado Equity in Excellence project is another example of a policy strategy designed to create a shared framework in which institutional actors are empowered to develop local equity interventions. The Equity in Excellence project started with state policy leaders and institutional leaders joining in collaborative data analysis of inequities in postsecondary attainment statewide. Policymakers (with the support of the Center for Urban Education and WICHE) then translated statewide equity data on postsecondary outcomes to the institutional level—showing for each participating institution where their particular gaps existed, and how they could contribute to closing the statewide gaps. At the institutional level, teams of practitioners were then engaged around those “local” data and asked to dig even deeper into institutional practices and policies that might contribute to those gaps (i.e. development education placement and delivery, teaching in gateway courses, equity in support for transfer, etc.). Read more about the Equity in Excellence initiative in Change Magazine, “Moving the Attainment Agenda from Policy to Action” or Developing Agency for Equity-Minded Change (Witham, Chase, Bensimon, Hanson, & Longanecker, 2015; Felix, Bensimon, Hanson, Gray & Klingsmith, 2015).

**TO DO:** DESIGN POLICY THAT FOCUSES ON STUDENT IMPACT AND EMPOWERS INSTITUTIONS TO ADDRESS INEQUITY LOCALLY.

*Establish a clear definition of what equity means for the state.*

States that have effectively engaged institutions in addressing inequities in postsecondary outcomes have established clear definitions of what equity means at the state level. It may seem counterintuitive to establish a statewide definition when the goal is to encourage institutions to address equity at the local level. But state or system policy leaders play a critical role in establishing the guiding principles. Without a shared “North Star,” equity may be interpreted in a variety of ways by institutions (e.g., increasing diversity, equity in completion but not access, or vice versa.). A common definition avoids disparate and diffused efforts that don’t contribute coherently to statewide improvement.

Tips to guide the process:

- Understand the institutions’ existing incentives, missions, and challenges.
- Use data to understand where students with lower rates of attainment are being served in the state currently and where they are not.

- Drill down with additional data to understand which certificates and degrees have value for specific groups; engage with institutions and Workforce Development (unemployment insurance, wage data systems) to conduct institution-level data analysis that makes attainment goals meaningful for institutions and contextualizes equity goals within specific programs and fields.

- Ensure that any accountability frameworks (1) make institutions compete against themselves, not each other; and (2) ensure that access and completion are high priorities in order to avoid giving institutions incentives to limit access.

- Start with data: Translate goals to the institutional level, then ask institutional leaders to reflect on how those goals align with their own institutional priorities (don't prescribe goals from the top down). Help institutions understand how they can contribute to the state's big-picture needs.

- Create opportunities for institutional leaders, faculty leaders, and others to explore promising practices related to equity; in other words, help institutions understand—and get credit for—the good work they're doing, and intentionally facilitate the sharing of that knowledge across institutions and sectors.

- Build urgency for scale and acceleration of promising strategies; use small pockets of money to incentivize equity innovation; hold convenings; award bonus funding to institutions that make equity improvements.

- Enlist the support of regional foundations to target funding for scholarships or other grants to institutions that demonstrate strong outcomes for students with the largest attainment disparities.
REFERENCES


SELECTED DATA SOURCES

**Lumina Foundation: Stronger Nation through Higher Education.** Provides current- and trend-data on postsecondary attainment at the national, state and county levels, as well as for the 100 most populous metropolitan regions. http://www.luminafoundation.org/stronger_nation

**WICHE: Knocking at the College Door.** Provides projections of high school graduates by race/ethnicity through 2028. http://www.wiche.edu/knocking-8th

**PolicyLink National Equity Atlas.** Provides data and downloadable graphic illustrations for a comprehensive set of equity indicators at the state, regional and national level, including demographic change, income inequality and unemployment, educational attainment and job requirements, poverty and GDP gains related to racial equity. http://nationalequityatlas.org/indicators

**Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce: Provides state and national projections of educational attainment required to meet future workforce needs.** https://cew.georgetown.edu/

**Complete College America: Provides state or system-reported data on critical completion indicators including developmental education progress and credit accumulation rates.** http://completecollege.org/college-completion-data/
Since 1999, the Center for Urban Education (CUE) has led socially conscious research and developed tools to help institutions of higher education produce equitable student outcomes. Located in the University of Southern California’s Rossier School of Education, CUE is committed to closing racial-ethnic equity gaps and improving student outcomes in higher education. Rather than remediate students, CUE remediates practices, structures, and policies.
Faculty of Color Mentorship

This mentorship program for Faculty of Color is a cross-institutional effort to expand the system’s ability to retain and provide support for faculty of color moving through the tenure-track process.

This program is not intended to replace mentoring programs for faculty of color on individual campuses. It is designed to give faculty members of color opportunities to build early relationships with other faculty of color, experience support from a faculty member of color from a different institution and provide cohort support among faculty of color working through the tenure processes at their institutions.

Professional development topics and activities include faculty of color identity development in the classroom, navigating barriers and challenges unique to faculty members of color in higher education, reflection of interpersonal connections with colleagues across race and ethnicity, mentor/mentee training and expectations. Quarterly convenings for mentors and mentees are planned for the pilot cohort in 2016-17.

Although the project is for current faculty of color, utilizing a mentor program can positively impact future recruitment and hiring of diverse faculty and have larger impacts related to improving the cultural climate of our institutions.

Diversify Faculty Hiring

The goal of this effort is to expand colleges’ capacity to recruit and hire a more diverse faculty by:

- identifying diversity-equity-inclusion competencies that can be part of faculty positions that serve increasingly diverse student populations;
- exploring collaborative recruitment efforts on behalf of multiple colleges for a range of faculty positions;
- identifying effective practices used in the system and offering training and professional development for college faculty and staff involved in faculty hiring.

This work is going forward under the guidance of the Instruction Commission and its Equity and Inclusion Committee. This year, the focus will be to:

1. Work on developing a common competency profile for instruction related to diversity, equity and inclusion.
2. Work on developing knowledge, skills, and abilities helpful for faculty that align with academic clusters or metamajors.

The intent is to provide tools for colleges to utilize in job announcements and to pool efforts on recruitment and staff training for those who wish to participate. A group of instruction vice presidents and human resources directors has volunteered to begin work on identifying diversity-equity-inclusion competencies for inclusion in job announcements.
Bias Response Training

The Student Services Commission received a letter from the Multicultural Student Services Directors Council addressed to WACTC offering support and clarification on best practices preparing for and responding to bias incidents on campus. The letter offers support from the Multicultural Student Services Directors and makes the following recommendations consistent with nationally recognized law-enforcement and anti-bias groups:

1. A well-trained Bias Response team should be operational on campus before incidents occur.
2. The Bias Response team should be composed of representatives from multiple departments involved in disciplinary as well as therapeutic responses, including vice president for student services, security, office of diversity and equity or multicultural services, Title IX coordinator, counseling, instruction, human resources, college relations, and student life.
3. The bias incident must be acknowledged by the college so that campus community members as well as immediate victims feel heard and to avoid loss of safety and trust in the institution. Harm can spread quickly to people who identify with the targeted group, and to people who identify as members of other targeted groups.
4. Bias incidents should be reported with as much transparency as possible.
5. Bias incidents must be handled in a timely way. A campus has a greater chance of growing closer as a supportive community if bias is handled swiftly and effectively.

The Commission reviewed the letter at its recent summer commission meeting and offered the following responses:

- WSSSC members endorse the content of the letter along with the five recommendations contain within.
- WSSSC members will initiate a conversation at the cabinet level regarding Behavioral Incident Response Teams.
- WSSSC members will work with MSSDC members to identify specific best practices appropriate for their campus.
- WSSSC members stand ready to support this work and any other recommendations WACTC may have.
Enrollment

Brief description
The Washington Association of Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC) has authorized a Strategic Enrollment Taskforce be formed to build a stronger enrollment base for community and technical colleges. Over a two-year period, the WACTC Strategic Enrollment Taskforce will identify state level and institutional strategies that will improve access and retention system-wide and incorporate those strategies into an adopted Strategic Enrollment Workplan. Roles for the State Board, WACTC, and its commissions/councils and institutions will be identified with the WACTC Educational Services committee providing oversight and determining any final recommendations. Strategic partners, including but not limited to K-12 and workforce will be identified and engaged in the work.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
The State Board goals are “designed to raise education attainment, open more doors to education (particularly for our fast-growing adult population), and build upon our tradition of excellence.” The Strategic Enrollment Taskforce will focus on ways to increase outreach, onboarding, retention, and completion, not only increasing enrollment in the community and technical colleges sector but improving the educational skills and credentials for students, particularly underrepresented populations entering the workforce. The following three goals are addressed through the implementation of the Strategic Enrollment Taskforce:

• **Promoting student achievement and success** by increasing access to wrap-around student services to raise post-secondary attainment for underrepresented, adults, veterans, and first generation students.

• **Increasing access to post-secondary education** by enrolling 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.

• **Building on the system’s strength and successes** by increasing communication and partnerships within the system, including faculty, students, and staff, and with business, labor, K12, four-year institutions, and other stakeholders.

Background information and analysis
In July of 2009, President Barack Obama presented the American Graduation Initiative, which is designed to strengthen America’s position in the world economy through workforce education and skill development. The President challenged the country to once again become the world’s leader in college graduates by setting a goal of five million additional community college graduates by 2020. This public call for action by the highest office in the country places a substantial onus on community colleges to strengthen their operations and address what has historically been a low graduation rate. Washington state has set similar goals through the Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC) RoadMap to achieve a 70 percent postsecondary attainment rate for adults.\(^1\) To meet this goal requires 380,000 new credential holders by 2023.\(^2\) The key strategies to accomplish this goal include closing the achievement gap for underrepresented students, improving upon postsecondary recruitment, retention, and completion, and affordability.

The community and technical college system is well-positioned to play a major role in meeting this goal, but has similar challenges as other institutions across the nation with respect to retention and completion.
In addition, enrollment in the colleges has declined 21 percent in the past 15 years while tuition has doubled. Interestingly, full-time equivalent enrollments (FTES) have increased approximately seven percent in the same time period. This suggests a change in the population of adults who are coming to college now than at a time when enrollment was significantly higher. The number of high school graduates is flat and more of the recent graduates (traditional-aged students) are attending four-year institutions. The trends are clear that in order to meet the state’s goals, it will require recruiting and engaging students who have not historically participated in higher education. The system is dedicated to addressing the challenges ahead in order to meet the state goals and current conditions suggest this is a prime time to engage in a thoughtful strategic enrollment management process.

The vast literature on retention has resulted in themes that point to common risk factors of attrition. These include being academically underprepared for college level work, not entering college directly after high school, attending college part-time, being a single parent, being financially independent, caring for children at home, working more than 30 hours per week, and being a first-generation college student. Part-time students, for example, who are most prevalent in the community college setting (65 percent of all state funded students in 2016 in Washington), typically take longer to complete, are less engaged, and spend more time caring for dependents and working full time. In the college system, the year-to-year retention rate for part-time students is 38 percent compared to 53 percent for full-time, and their completion rate after four years is just 20 percent compared to 33 percent for full-time. Degree completion rates are considerably lower for low-income and students of color. In our colleges, the completion rate after four years for historically underrepresented students of color is 22 percent compared to 29 percent for white and Asian students. Historically underrepresented students who are less prepared for college, single parents, etc., are at an even greater risk and need the most intentional student supports. Closing the achievement gap for underrepresented students is a key strategy for the attainment goals and will need to be a focus point within a strategic enrollment management plan.

A concept which has been heavily studied as a variable affecting retention is student engagement. This is multi-faceted and includes connection to the campus environment, collaborative learning experiences, and student-faculty interaction. The student integration model clearly describes this concept in that “student persistence is a function of dynamic relationships between the individual and other factors in the college and the home community. Increased levels of academic and social integration are presumed to lead to greater commitment to the institution and to the goal of graduation.” Other research has identified similar themes around connection and commitment and that feelings of isolation can affect a student’s ability to enroll, fit into, and stay in the higher education community. This is critical information that the task force will need to consider with regards to strategies for not only enrolling more students but keeping them connected and engaged long enough to complete a degree.

See Attachments A, B: Strategic Enrollment Taskforce Documents
Potential questions

- How can our community and technical college system increase the number of students pursuing and completing a postsecondary credential by leveraging evidence-based strategies around outreach, onboarding, retention and completion?
- Integral to the work of the taskforce, how can underserved student populations be better served and equity gaps closed for all students around enrollment and completion?
- In what ways will the Strategic Enrollment Taskforce strengthen partnerships with K12, universities, and employers and what role will these partnerships play in increasing college enrollment?

Recommendation/preferred result

State Board staff will provide a brief overview of the WACTC Strategic Enrollment Taskforce, draft a Workplan including guiding principles, and a timeline of anticipated outcomes. Periodic updates will be provided to the Board on the taskforce’s progress over the 2017-2018 academic year and additionally during the second year as Workplan recommendations are implemented.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by:
Joyce Hammer, director of transfer education
360-704-4338, jhammer@sbctc.edu

Joe Holliday, director of student services
360-704-4334, jholliday@sbctc.edu

Darby Kaikkonen, policy research director
360-704-1019, dkaikkonen@sbctc.edu

1 http://www.wsac.wa.gov/strategic-action-plan
3 Education Research and Data Center High school feedback reports http://www.ereddata.wa.gov/hsfb.aspx
7 SA cohorts dashboard, 2017, retention and completion after 4 years by full/part time status
8 SA cohorts dashboard, 2017, highest achievement by 4th year
9 Kuh et al, 2007, pg. 14
WACTC Strategic Enrollment Taskforce

Problem Statement:

We are not sufficiently meeting the state’s need for a skilled labor force, nor are we on track to produce the number of credentials called for in the Washington Roadmap for higher education attainment. Enrollment in our community and technical colleges has been declining for several years. Comparisons with previous economic cycles shows that an improving economy only partially accounts for present enrollment losses.

Goals for the Taskforce:

Over a two-year period, the Taskforce will identify state level and institutional strategies to employ to build a stronger enrollment foundation system-wide, and incorporate those strategies into a Strategic Enrollment Plan. Roles for the State Board, WACTC and its commissions/councils, and institutions will be clearly delineated. Strategic partners will be identified and engaged in the work.

Participants:

WACTC and WACTC commissions: Instruction, Student Services, Research and Planning, Public Information, Business Affairs, and Information Technology

SBCTC staff in Education, Communications, Finance, and IT

Guiding Principles:

- We need to increase the overall number of students pursuing and completing a postsecondary credential, while not increasing competition between colleges in our system
- Outreach, onboarding, retention and completion are key elements
- Equity – increasing enrollment and completion of students from underserved populations – is integral to the work of the Taskforce
- Our work will strengthen partnerships with K12, universities, and employers
- The Plan will include system level and college level strategies, and will have clear prioritization

Updated August 21, 2017
Strategic Enrollment Management
State Board Retreat
September 12, 2017

Darby Kaikkonen, Policy Research Director

Agenda

• Enrollment trends and populations of focus
• Retention and completion challenges
• SEM taskforce
State education attainment goals will require more college participation.

- Recent estimates are that 5 in 10 Washington 25-44 year olds have a college degree, with 7 in 10 having had some college participation.

- Reaching 70 percent college attainment will likely require 8 or 9 in 10 adults having some college participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>college degree</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>no college</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All Washington 25-44 year olds (each □ = 200,000 people)

---

Addressing equity gaps in college completion will also require significant attention to participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>college degree</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>no college</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family status</th>
<th>couple with children</th>
<th>couple without children</th>
<th>single with children</th>
<th>single without children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all Washington 25-44 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>employed</th>
<th>unemployed</th>
<th>not in labor force</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal income</th>
<th>less than $25,000 a year</th>
<th>$25,001 - $50,000 a year</th>
<th>$50,001 - $75,000 a year</th>
<th>$75,001 - $100,000 a year</th>
<th>more than $100,000 a year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic region</th>
<th>Northwest</th>
<th>King County</th>
<th>South Sound</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>Central &amp; East</th>
<th>Spokane County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race &amp; ethnicity</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Some other race</th>
<th>Two or more races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English speaking ability</th>
<th>speaks only English</th>
<th>speaks English &quot;very well&quot;</th>
<th>speaks English less than &quot;very well&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Enrollment continues to decline:

- Total headcount is at a 25-year low and has dropped drastically since peak enrollment during the recession. However, FTES have increased the last 15 years.
- Tuition has doubled in the past 15 years.
- The drop appears primarily driven by more people going to work instead of going to college, but unemployment rate changes does not explain all of the change.
- Overall declines in enrollment have continued longer than expected due to flat population growth among young adults and slow, steady increases in young adults attending public universities.
- Adult basic education students (approximately 21,000 students) have not transitioned to college-level enrollments at a significant rate.
Many young adults and recent high school graduates are not going to college:
- The two-year colleges have lost a small percentage of high school graduates who are now going directly to four-year colleges.
- But the larger concern is the 40 percent of high school graduates not enrolling in college.

### Percent of high school graduates going directly to college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% going to college</th>
<th>% enrolling at 2 year</th>
<th>% enrolling at 4 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adult basic education students are a key target population for enrollment in college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Earned at least 6 college credits</th>
<th>Earned at least 15 college credits</th>
<th>Earned at least 30 college credits</th>
<th>Earned at least 45 college credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adult basic education students are a key target population for enrollment in college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earned at least 6 college credits</th>
<th>Earned at least 15 college credits</th>
<th>Earned at least 30 college credits</th>
<th>Earned at least 45 college credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19% 18% 17%</td>
<td>15% 14% 13%</td>
<td>10% 10% 9%</td>
<td>8% 8% 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Non-Asian Student of Color</th>
<th>Asian or White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall to Winter Retention Year 1 Rate</td>
<td>Fall to Spring Retention Year 1 Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest Achievement by the 4th Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Non-Asian Student of Color</th>
<th>Asian or White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer w/o Degree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Certificate</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left with Gains</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Gains</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Highest Achievement by Year 4
CTC Strategic Enrollment Taskforce

- WACTC, WACTC commissions, SBCTC staff
- Focus on meeting state goals for credentials and enrollment trends
- Development of workplan for 2017-2019

Guiding Principles

- Focus to increase number of students pursuing and completing a postsecondary credential
- Competition between CTCs minimized
- Outreach, onboarding, retention, and completion key
- Equity is integral to work
- Partnerships with K12, universities, and employers strengthened
- Workplan will include system level and college level strategies
Questions?
STATE BOARD MEETING  
Meeting Minutes  
State Board Office ~ Olympia, WA  
Thursday, June 29, 2017  

Shaunta Hyde, chair ● Larry Brown, vice chair  
Anne Fennessy ● Wayne Martin ● Elizabeth Chen  
Jay Reich ● Carol Landa-McVicker ● Phyllis Gutierrez-Kenney ● Fred Whang  
Marty Brown, executive director ● Beth Gordon, executive assistant  

State Board members present  
Shaunta Hyde, Larry Brown, Anne Fennessy, Elizabeth Chen, Fred Whang, 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 8:30 a.m. welcomed those present, and asked for audience introductions.  

Adoption of regular meeting agenda  
Motion: Moved by Larry Brown and seconded by Carol Landa-McVicker and unanimously approved by the Board that the State Board adopt its June 29, 2017, regular meeting agenda as amended adding one item to the consent agenda for the sale of the Bellevue State Board Office Building.  

Adoption of consent agenda (Resolution 17-06-37 through 17-06-42)  
Motion: Moved by Jay Reich and seconded by Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney and unanimously approved by the Board that the State Board adopt the consent agenda for its June 29, 2017, regular meeting as presented:  

a. SBCTC meeting minutes, May 11, 2017  
b. 2017-18 corrections education awards  
   Resolution 17-06-37  
c. Centralia College property acquisitions, 401 and 405 South Oak Street  
   Resolution 17-06-38  
d. Skagit Valley College property disposal, Downtown center  
   Resolution 17-06-39  
e. Green River College local expenditure authority, Occupational Education, building improvements  
   Resolution 17-06-40  
f. Renton Technical College local expenditure authority, increase for Automotive Complex Renovation  
   Resolution 17-06-41  
g. Panopto lecture capture contract extension  
   Resolution 17-06-42
Washington Round Table Presentation
Steve Mullin, President and Brian Jeffries, Partnership for Learning Policy Director presented. The Washington Round Table is a nonprofit organization comprised of senior executives of major private sector employees in Washington State. Roundtable member’s work together to effect positive change on public policy issues that they believe are most important to supporting state economic vitality and fostering opportunity for all Washingtonians.

Steve and Brian presented on pathways to great jobs in Washington State. The job market Washington students will enter in the coming years will be full of exciting opportunities. Washington State boasts the seventh-fastest growing economy in the nation. Our anchor employers are leaders in information and communications technology, aerospace, online commerce, and precision manufacturing. Traditional stronghold sectors – such as trade, natural resources, agriculture, manufacturing, and services – provide a vibrant and diverse employment mix.

Consideration of FY 2018 operating budget allocations and enrollment rules (Resolution 17-06-43)
Both the House and the Senate passed operating budget proposals for the 2017-19 biennium. As of this writing, they have not yet produced a final 2017-19 biennium operating budget.

In anticipation of legislative action, staff recommends that the State Board adopt an initial fiscal year (FY) 2018 operating budget allocation based on maintenance-level funding that is the same in the House and Senate budgets. Staff further recommends that the State Board delegate authority to the executive director to update and distribute the allocation once a final budget is enacted. With the State Board’s approval, those updates will be based on the methods described in FY 2018 Budget Allocation Decision Points.

The State Board is also asked to adopt enrollment allocations for the 2017-18 academic year. Finally, the State Board will be asked to approve guidance provided to the districts on the use of annual salary turnover savings to fund faculty increments. These actions are requested to maintain operational continuity for the system.

Motion: Moved by Larry Brown, seconded by Jay Reich, and unanimously approved by the State Board the FY 2018 operating budget allocations and enrollment rules.

Consideration of 2017-18 tuition and fee schedule (Resolution 17-06-44)
The State Board has responsibility for adopting tuition and fees for the community and technical colleges. This includes operating fees, building fees, the maximum allowable student activity fees as well as the tuition for upper division courses in the system’s applied baccalaureate programs. The current House proposal does not provide for tuition increases in either the lower or upper division schedules. Consistent with the College Affordability Program, the Senate tuition policy allows for tuition to increase by an inflation factor of 2.2 percent in 2017-18.

Motion: Moved by Larry Brown, seconded by Jay Reich, and unanimously approved by the State Board the 2017-18 tuition and fee schedule.

Consideration of 2017-19 capital budget allocations and 2018 supplemental request (Resolution 17-06-45)
This analysis and resolution was written prior to adoption of 2017-19 capital budget by the Legislature. If legislative action is taken or being considered prior to the June 28-29, 2017 State Board meeting this information will be updated.

At this time, neither the House nor Senate budgets fully fund the State Board’s 2017-19 capital request. In this item, the State Board will be asked to adopt a resolution delegating authority to the executive director to:

- Allocate capital funding after a final budget is enacted, consistent with the State Board’s 2017-19 priorities,
• Request adjustments to existing project budgets to reflect possible additional costs caused by late legislative adoption of a capital budget; and,
• Seek new financing authority for five locally supported projects.

Motion: Moved by Anne Fennessy, seconded by Fred Whang, and unanimously approved by the State Board the 2017-19 capital budget allocations and 2018 supplemental request.

Consideration of 2017-18 basic education for adults’ federal awards and allocations (Resolution 17-06-46)
In order to fully scale the goals of Title II under the Talent and Prosperity for All plan and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Board will continue to monitor the effect of the allocation model and new SAI metrics 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 Title II Talent and Prosperity for All plan with full implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act requirements.

Motion: Moved by Jay Reich, seconded by Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, and unanimously approved by the State Board the 2017-18 basic education for adults’ federal awards and allocations.

Consideration of 2017-18 federal and state contracted workforce education awards (Resolution 17-06-47)
Colleges fund workforce education programs in multiple ways, including the use of general enrollment funding and state and federal targeted funding. Each June the Board approves the state targeted funding for the next fiscal year. What follows is proposed targeted federal and state contracted funding for fiscal year 2017-18 for:
• Carl D. Perkins Grant
• WorkFirst
• Basic Food Employment and Training
• Early Achievers Grant

Motion: Moved by Elizabeth Chen, seconded by Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, and unanimously approved by the State Board the 2017-18 federal and state contracted workforce education awards.

Workforce priority enrollments regional analysis progress report
In May 2016, the State Board approved allocations under a new funding model which included priority enrollments. One of the categories is courses addressing the mid-level skills gap based on a statewide report co-produced by the Washington Student Achievement Council, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, and SBCTC. At that time, the Board requested further examination of a regional analysis for workforce priority enrollments. Presidents expressed a similar interest. An early estimate provided by a potential vendor was deemed cost-prohibitive, but subsequent research identified less costly options. A system group was convened which has met regularly, selected a vendor, established parameters, and is awaiting the resulting data. Following evaluation, the work group will make a recommendation to WACTC on whether a regional approach is superior to a statewide one, and WACTC will subsequently make a recommendation to the Board.

Chair report
• Appointment of 2017-18 SBCTC Chair and Vice Chair
In accordance with current State Board bylaws, the election of officers is to be held by June of each year. In the absence of the Chair, his or her duties will be assumed by the Vice Chair who acts as the Chair Pro Tempore. The Vice Chair may serve as the successor to the Chair. Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney gave the nominating
committee report and submitted the nomination of Larry Brown for the position of State Board chair and Anne Fennessy for the position of State Board vice chair for 2017-18.

**Motion:** Moved by Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney and seconded by Shaunta Hyde and unanimously approved by the Board to appoint Larry Brown as State Board chair for 2017-18.

**Motion:** Moved by Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney and seconded by Shaunta Hyde and unanimously approved by the Board to appoint Anne Fennessy as State Board vice chair for 2017-18.

- **Approval of Executive Director contract (Resolution 17-06-48)**
  John Boesenberg gave a brief report of the resolution and contract as presented.

**Motion:** Moved by Larry Brown, seconded by Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, and unanimously approved by the Board that the State Board adopt Resolution 17-06-48 offering an employment contract to Jan Yoshiwara as Executive Director.

**Adjournment/next meeting**
There being no further business, the State Board adjourned its regular meeting of June 29, 2017 at 12 p.m. The State Board will hold its next meeting on September 11-13, 2017 at Skamania Lodge.

Attest:

______________________________  ________________________________
Jan Yoshiwara, secretary        Larry Brown, chair
2017-18 Resources to Initiate Successful Employment awards

Brief description
Resources to Initiate Successful Employment (RISE) is a three-year pilot designed to enhance the state’s highly successful and nationally recognized Basic Food Employment and Training (BFET) program. 2017-18 will be the third and final year of the pilot. It has focused on how comprehensive case management and work-based learning can further move Basic Food recipients who are attending a community or technical college toward employment that will provide economic stability and self-sufficiency. North Seattle College and Highline College pioneered the pilot during 2015-16. South Seattle College was added in 2016-17. RISE is a federally-funded program, contracted through the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus?
The RISE pilot aligns closely with the following State Board goals:

1. Promote Student Achievement and Success
   a. 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 who move beyond basic skills.
   b. Close skill gaps within the workforce to ensure workforce training is sufficient for demand and increase awards in high-demand professional-technical programs.

2. Increase Access to Post-Secondary Education
   a. Enroll more underrepresented, first-generation and adult students, veterans needing degrees, certificates, or credentials.
   b. 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.

Background information and analysis
The State Board awards federal workforce training funds to the community and technical colleges to support programs operated for entry-level training, skills upgrade, or retraining for the state’s workforce. RISE addresses the system direction’s strategic objectives as described below:

Resolution 17-09-49 authorizes 2017-18 funding to be awarded to Highline College, North Seattle College, and South Seattle College. These colleges will assist RISE participants in gaining the skills necessary for higher wages, better jobs, and further advancement. The intent of the program is to expand access to training opportunities for specific populations of BFET recipients: veterans, long-term unemployed, limited English proficiency, homeless, and non-custodial parents in arrears. Funds will provide resources to pay for comprehensive case management and work-based learning opportunities. The funding level has not been finalized by DSHS at this time but will range from $800,000 to $950,000.
**Potential questions**

- What has been the general focus of federal funding to our system?
- How effective have the first two years of the RISE Pilot been?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-49, awarding the RISE program targeted funds to community and technical colleges for federal fiscal year 2018.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Mat Carlisle, program administrator, workforce education  
360-704-4341, mcarlisle@sbc.edu
A resolution allocating and awarding Resources to Initiate Successful Employment (RISE) funding to Highline College, North Seattle College, South Seattle College, and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges.

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

WHEREAS, the specified community colleges have fulfilled the requirements set forth for Resources to Initiate Successful Employment; and

WHEREAS, each Resources to Initiate Successful Employment budget has gone through a state level review process and has been recommended by their 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 authorizes the executive director to make adjustments to this action, including any necessary changes to the State Board’s policy manual, as necessary, for actions taken by the governor, legislature, data corrections, externally imposed restrictions or guidelines, uniform accounting and reporting requirements, and unanticipated changes in state or federal law.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary

Larry Brown, chair
Centralia College – property acquisition, 214 South Iron Street, Centralia, Washington

Brief description
Centralia College seeks to purchase the property located at 214 South Iron Street in Centralia, Washington. The property will be used for parking in the short-term and for academic programs in long-range plans. A total of approximately $60,000 in local funds will be used to purchase the property.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
This acquisition will increase student access to post-secondary education.

Background information and analysis
Centralia College has identified surrounding neighborhood properties in their 20-year master plan. Strategic property acquisition is an ongoing activity as parcels become available. The property at 214 South Iron Street consists of 0.04 acres with a 496 square foot residence built in 1925. Please see location of the proposed acquisition on the map in Attachment A.

This property is located inside the boundaries of the college’s Facilities Master Plan. The building will be razed and parking lot spaces developed. Future plans include outdoor activities for the health and wellness program. The estimated cost to purchase the property is $60,000.

Any repairs, maintenance, or renovations in the future will be paid by local college funds. Approval for future local capital expenditures will be requested as needed and be consistent with State Board guidelines.

Centralia College’s vice-president of finance and administration, under delegated authority from the Centralia College Board of Trustees, approved this request on August 7, 2017.

Potential questions
Is the acquisition consistent with the State Board’s goal of increasing student access to post-secondary education?

Recommendation/preferred result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-50, giving Centralia College authority to spend up to $60,000 in local funds for the purchase of the property located at 214 South Iron Street in Centralia, Washington.

Policy manual change: Yes ☒ No □

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
Proposed Acquisitions:

Z 214 South Iron Street, Centralia
Parcel Number 000202002000
Recent Acquisitions:

A Vacate sections of Ash and Walnut streets, and two mid block alleys surrounded by college owned properties.
Resolution 14-09-52

B 816 Centralia College Blvd, Centralia
Parcel Number 000844000000
Resolution 13-10-50

C 814 Centralia College Blvd, Centralia
Parcel Number 000843000000
Resolution 13-02-02

D 812 Centralia College Blvd, Centralia
Parcel Number 000842000000
Resolution 12-10-43

E 808 Centralia College Blvd, Centralia
Parcel Number 000840000000
Resolution 13-02-02

F 402 S King St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000628000000
Resolution 12-10-43

G 916 W Pear St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000688003000
Resolution 14-10-62

H 405 S Iron Street, Centralia
Parcel Number 000688003000
Resolution 14-12-74

I 115 S Washington Ave, Centralia
Parcel Number 000134003000
Resolution 15-09-35

J Off map, ~216 S Gold St, Centralia
Parcel Number 003527000000
was exchanged for K
Resolution 15-10-52

K ~385 S Cedar St, Centralia
Parcel Numbers 000799000000 & 000798002000
Resolution 15-10-52

L 709 Centralia College Blvd, Centralia
Parcel Number 000133001000
Resolution 15-10-52

M 110 S King St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000128000000
Resolution 15-10-52

N 717 Centralia College Blvd, Centralia
Parcel Number 000131000000
Resolution 16-03-17

O 112 S King St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000129000000
Resolution 15-10-52

P 114 S King St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000130000000
Resolution 16-05-10

Q 123 S Washington St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000134002000
Resolution 16-05-10

R 920 West Pear St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000688002000
Resolution 16-11-15

S 918 West Walnut St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000797000000
Resolution 16-11-15

T 0 West Walnut St, Centralia
Parcel Number 000798003003
Resolution 16-11-15

U 810 Centralia College Blvd, Centralia
Parcel Number 000841000000
Resolution 17-01-03

V 216 S Iron Street, Centralia
Parcel Number 000206000000
Resolution 17-05-24

W 402 S Oak Street, Centralia
Parcel Number 000459000000
Resolution 17-05-24

X 401 South Oak Street, Centralia
Parcel Number 000496000000
Resolution 17-06-38

Y 405 South Oak Street, Centralia
Parcel Number 000497000000
Resolution 17-06-38
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 17-09-50

A resolution relating to Centralia College’s request to purchase the property located at 214 South Iron Street in Centralia, Washington, to be used for parking and academic programs

WHEREAS, the college has identified surrounding neighborhood properties in the campus 20-year master plan; and

WHEREAS, the purchase of the property at 214 South Iron Street will provide additional student parking in the short-term and outdoor health and wellness programming in the future; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost to purchase this parcel is $60,000; and

WHEREAS, Centralia College’s vice-president of finance and administration, under delegated authority from the Centralia College Board of Trustees approved this request on August 7, 2017.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Centralia College to spend up to $60,000 in local funds to purchase the property located at 214 South Iron Street in Centralia, Washington.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

_______________________________  ________________________________
Jan Yoshiwara, secretary                Larry Brown, chair
Columbia Basin College – property acquisition, 2901 North 20th Avenue, Pasco, Washington

Brief description
Columbia Basin College seeks to use local funds to purchase the property located at 2901 North 20th Avenue, in Pasco, Washington. The property will be used for student housing. The value of the property is $14,000,000.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
This acquisition will promote student achievement and success by providing student housing.

Background information and analysis
Columbia Basin College has launched an initiative to provide student housing and resident life programming based on results of a student housing market survey conducted in 2015. Recent Facilities Master Plan updates also include an effort to provide student housing.

This property consists of approximately five acres with a 28,600 square foot apartment building composed of 44 units with 126 beds. The building was constructed in 2017. See attachment A for a map of this property.

Department of Enterprise Services is assisting the college in determining the appraised value of the property. Estimated total cost of the acquisition is $14,000,000. The college will use local funds for a negotiated cash sale.

Any repairs, maintenance, or renovations in the future will be paid by local college funds. Rent revenues will generate funds needed for maintenance and repairs. Approval for future local capital expenditures will be requested as needed and be consistent with State Board guidelines.

Columbia Basin College’s president, with delegated authority approved this acquisition on August 23, 2017.

Potential questions
Is the acquisition consistent with the State Board’s goal of increasing student access to post-secondary education?

Recommendation/preferred result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-51, giving Columbia Basin College authority to spend up to $14,000,000 in local funds for the purchase of the property located at 2901 North 20th Avenue, in Pasco, Washington.

Policy manual change: Yes ☒ No ☐
Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
Proposed acquisition
2901 N 20th Ave, Pasco WA
Parcel: 113300257

Columbia Basin College - Pasco Campus
A resolution relating to Columbia Basin College’s request to purchase the property located at 2901 North 20th Avenue, in Pasco, Washington, to be used for student housing

WHEREAS, the college has launched an initiative to provide student housing and resident life programming based on the results of a student housing market survey conducted in 2015 and the recently updated Facilities Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the purchase of the property at 2901 North 20th Avenue, consists of approximately five acres with a 28,600 square foot apartment building consisting of 44 units with 126 beds; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost to purchase the property is $14,000,000; and

WHEREAS, Columbia Basin College’s president, under delegated authority from the Columbia Basin College Board of Trustees approved this request on August 23, 2017.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Columbia Basin College to spend up to $14,000,000 in local funds to purchase the property located at 2901 North 20th Avenue, in Pasco, Washington.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary                           Larry Brown, chair
Columbia Basin College – Health Science Center Phase 2 increase

Brief description
Columbia Basin College is seeking approval to use up to an additional $3,750,000 in local funds to complete the construction of the Health Science Center.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
These improvements will promote student achievement and success with current and relevant educational opportunities.

Background information and analysis
Columbia Basin College is in the second phase of construction of the Health Science Center. A previous local capital expenditure request was approved for $17,000,000 in resolution 14-09-51. Final costs including hazardous material abatement, building demolition, and increased construction costs indicate the need for an additional $3,750,000.

Columbia Basin College’s vice-president of administrative services, with delegated authority from the board of trustees approved this expenditure request increase August 8, 2017.

Potential questions
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goal of building on system strengths and successes?

Recommendation/preferred result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-52, giving Columbia Basin College authority to spend up to an additional $3,750,000 in local funds to complete construction of the Health Science Center.

Policy manual change: Yes ☑ No ☐

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to Columbia Basin College’s request to use up to an additional $3,750,000 in local funds to complete construction of the Health Science Center.

WHEREAS, Columbia Basin College received prior local capital expenditure authority for $17,000,000 in resolution 14-09-51; and

WHEREAS, final project costs including hazardous material abatement, building demolition, and increased construction costs indicate the need for an additional $3,750,000; and

WHEREAS, Columbia Basin College’s vice-president of administrative services, with delegated authority from the board of trustees approved this requested expenditure increase on August 8, 2017;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Columbia Basin College to spend up to an additional $3,750,000 in local funds for the construction of the Health Science Center.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary
Larry Brown, chair
Olympic College – remove Barner structure

**Brief description**
Olympic College is requesting authority to remove the Barner home structure from the land located at 1711 Chester Avenue in Bremerton, Washington (UFI A21356).

**How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus**
The disposal of this property helps to build on system strengths and successes by maximizing capital resources.

**Background information and analysis**
Olympic College purchased this property consisting of approximately one acre and the Barner home in August 2010 for $719,213 using local funds. State Board Resolution 08-01-03 authorized this purchase.

The building has fallen into disrepair and would cost over two million dollars to renovate and the college has no academic purpose for the structure. Research confirms the structure does not qualify as a historic property. The land is currently used by the college for academic purposes, like culinary studies into sustainable food systems and other field studies, and will continue to be used in the same manner after the structure is removed. The property also provides college access to the waterfront.

Olympic College intends to spend up to $40,000 in local funds to remove the structure.

Consistent with State Board policy 6.40, Olympic College has notified Department of Enterprise Services Real Estate Services of this project. Disposal of the property was approved by Olympic College’s Board of Trustees on June 20, 2017.

**Potential questions**
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goal of building on system strengths and successes?

**Recommendation/preferred result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-53, giving Olympic College authority to remove the structure at 1711 Chester Avenue in Bremerton, Washington, known as the Barner home (UFI A21356).

Policy manual change: Yes ☒ No ☐

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
State of Washington
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Resolution 17-09-53

A resolution relating to Olympic College’s request to remove the Barner home located at 1711 Chester Avenue in Bremerton, Washington (UFI A21356)

WHEREAS, in State Board Resolution 08-01-03 Olympic College was authorized to purchase this property, consisting of approximately one acre and the Barner home in August 2010 for $719,213 with local funds; and

WHEREAS, the structure has fallen into disrepair and would cost over two million dollars to renovate; and

WHEREAS, the college has no academic purpose for the structure and it does not qualify as a historic property; and

WHEREAS, the land will continue to be used for academic purposes; and

WHEREAS, the college proposes spending up to $40,000 in local funds to surplus the structure; and

WHEREAS, Olympic College Board of Trustees approved the surplus of this building on June 20, 2017; and

WHEREAS, Department of Enterprise Services Real Estate Services has been notified of this project;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Olympic College to remove the structure at 1711 Chester Avenue in Bremerton, Washington, known as the Barner home (UFI A21356).

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary                           Larry Brown, chair
South Puget Sound Community College – Building 28 Transitions Studies renovation increase

**Brief description**
South Puget Sound Community College is seeking approval to use up to an additional $980,000 in local funds to complete the Building 28 Transitions Studies renovation project on its Mottman campus.

**How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus**
These improvements will promote student achievement and success with current and relevant educational opportunities.

**Background information and analysis**
South Puget Sound Community College is in the process of renovating classrooms, learning labs and offices in order to house the Transitions Studies programs in a single location.

Project funding in biennium 2015-17 included $400,000 in local funds as well as $817,000 in state funding. There was $699,000 requested for this project in the State Board’s 2017-19 capital request. The college intends to reimburse itself for this amount when the capital budget is adopted if the project is funded by the state and reimbursement is allowed.

The college requests an additional $980,000 in local funds to complete the project as planned. South Puget Sound Community College’s Board of Trustees approved this local capital expenditure increase request on July 26, 2017.

**Potential questions**
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goal of building on system strengths and successes?

**Recommendation/preferred result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-54, giving South Puget Sound Community College authority to spend up to an additional $980,000 in local funds to complete the Building 28 Transitions Studies renovation.

Policy manual change: Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to South Puget Sound Community College’s request to use up to an additional $980,000 in local funds to complete the Building 28 Transitions Studies renovation on its Mottman campus.

WHEREAS, South Puget Sound Community College is currently renovating classrooms, learning labs and offices to house the Transitions Studies programs in a single location; and

WHEREAS, project funding during biennium 2015-17 consisted of $400,000 in local funds and $817,000 in state funds; and

WHEREAS, the college requests to use an additional $980,000 in local funds to complete the project as planned; and

WHEREAS, South Puget Sound’s Board of Trustees approved this local capital expenditure request increase on July 26, 2017;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes South Puget Sound Community College to spend up to an additional $980,000 in local funds for the Building 28 Transitions Studies renovation.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary

Larry Brown, chair
South Puget Sound Community College – Lacey 3 building renovation

Brief description
South Puget Sound Community College is seeking approval to use up to $3,600,000 in local funds for additional renovations to the Lacey 3 building.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
These improvements will promote student achievement and success with current and relevant educational opportunities.

Background information and analysis
This phase of the Lacey campus capital improvements include final renovations on the first floor, full renovation of the second floor, exterior finish upgrades, and required code updates to the Lacey 3 building.

This renovation will provide classroom space for the Computer Aided Drafting/Building Information Modeling program near the Advanced Manufacturing program, allowing for enhanced cross-program connections.

South Puget Sound Community College’s Board of Trustees approved this local capital expenditure request in June 2016.

Potential questions
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goal of building on system strengths and successes?

Recommendation/preferred result
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-55, giving South Puget Sound Community College authority to spend up to $3,600,000 in local funds to renovate the Lacey 3 building.

Policy manual change: Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to South Puget Sound Community College’s request to spend up to $3,600,000 in local funds for the Lacey 3 building renovations.

WHEREAS, Lacey 3 building improvements include renovations on the first and second floors, exterior finish upgrades, and required code updates; and

WHEREAS, classroom space for the Computer Aided Drafting/Building Information Modeling program will be located near the Advanced Manufacturing program to enhance cross-program connections; and

WHEREAS, South Puget Sound Community College’s Board of Trustees approved this local capital expenditure request in June 2016;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes South Puget Sound Community College to spend up to $3,600,000 in local funds for the Lacey 3 building renovation.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary  Larry Brown, chair
Tacoma Community College – parking lot improvements

**Brief description**
Tacoma Community College is seeking approval to use up to $1,450,000 in local funds to study, design, and build parking lot improvements.

**How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus**
These improvements build on the system’s strength and success by providing safe, well-maintained parking lots for students, staff, and visitors.

**Background information and analysis**
Tacoma Community College would like to use local funds to conduct a study of all parking lots to be followed with asphalt replacement, curbing, sidewalks, crack fill/seal, new signage, and marking.

This comprehensive approach will extend the life of campus parking lots and make efficient use of funding.

Interim College president Bill Ryberg, with delegated authority from the Tacoma Community College’s Board of Trustees approved this local capital expenditure request on June 21, 2017.

**Potential questions**
Is this project consistent with the State Board’s goal of building on system strengths and successes?

**Recommendation/preferred result**
Staff recommends approval of Resolution 17-09-56, giving Tacoma Community College authority to spend up to $1,450,000 in local funds to study, design, repair, and replace campus parking lots.

Policy manual change: Yes ☑ No ☐

Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
A resolution relating to Tacoma Community College’s request to spend up to $1,450,000 in local funds for the study, design, repair and replacement of campus parking lots.

WHEREAS, Tacoma Community College would like to plan a comprehensive renovation of all campus parking lots; and

WHEREAS, identified work would include asphalt replacement, curbing, sidewalks, crack fill/seal, new signage, and marking; and

WHEREAS, Tacoma Community College’s interim president, Bill Ryberg, with board of trustees delegated authority, approved this local capital expenditure request June 21, 2017;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes Tacoma Community College to spend up to $1,450,000 in local funds for the repair and replacement of campus parking lots.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary

Larry Brown, chair
Student Achievement Initiative review: Final Report and Recommendations

Brief description
The Student Achievement Initiative (SAI) is the performance funding system for the community and technical colleges. It has been in place since 2006 and underwent a five-year review in 2012. The review was consistent with national experts’ recommendations for continuous evaluation of performance funding systems in order to ensure the overall goals and principles are being met. In 2016, the State Board and college presidents agreed to conduct another five-year review with the same goal. This update describes the culmination of the Student Achievement Initiative advisory committee’s work and recommendations for consideration by the State Board at this time.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
The Student Achievement Initiative is the guiding framework for the Boards’ goals around student success. SAI emphasizes student momentum for college success by both building college readiness (such as basic skills gains and completion of developmental education) and earning college credits, including college math. In this way, SAI captures critical educational gains made by all students, from those who come in the least prepared to those who are college ready. This progressive continuum of points recognizes the system’s strategic goal of increased educational attainment for all residents by supporting the key milestones that students make along the way to completion, as well as completion.

Background information and analysis
The Board endorsed a work plan for this review in January 2017. A system advisory committee was comprised of three presidents each from the Washington Association of Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC) educational services and operating budget committees; the instruction, student services, research and planning, and business affairs commissions; and State Board staff. The committee began its work with a review of the current outcome-based funding policy classification system, research, and Washington’s position within that framework. One of the identified gap areas for Washington in the typology for critical design and implementation principles is prioritization of underrepresented students. The committee suggested this be added to the SAI framework for the work ahead in drafting new or revised achievement and funding metrics. The committee also expressed a desire to simplify the framework and focus on leading indicators (milestones) that are most closely aligned to completions.

For the achievement metric evaluation, the committee reviewed student outcome data that described who earns points in SAI with the goal of identifying group differences and how revisions might aid in closing gaps. The results reiterated that basic skills students and students of color were underrepresented in college level attainment in completion. The exception was in certificate attainment, in which students of color are over-represented. The committee also discussed overarching principles and the need for policy alignment to state goals and other initiatives (such as the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act), and have drafted recommendations for changes to the metrics to reflect that alignment.

For the funding metric evaluation, the committee began with a review of the theory and history of performance-funding models and a history of Washington’s specific experience. The key elements of
consideration are the difference between bonus and base funding, the amount of funding, and alignment with principles of fairness/stability/no harm. The committee reviewed a series of data analyses with the goal of identifying possible impacts to per student funding and change in SAI funding in the context of each problem statement and the principles, primarily college characteristics (such as program mix, student demographic distribution, size, etc.). The result of this analysis revealed a different set of considerations if the allocation amount was to stay at five percent or increase, and if different student populations were counted in SAI or not.

Per the advisory committee’s work plan, the group concluded their work on May 22, 2017 and drafted a series of recommendations for changes to the principles, achievement and funding metrics. The recommendations were presented to WACTC for a first reading and feedback on June 1, 2017. On July 21, 2017, WACTC voted to approve the advisory committee’s recommendations and forward to the State Board for approval. The recommendations are outlined below and include the context and rationale behind the advisory group’s decisions.

### Student Achievement Advisory Committee Recommendations *(Attachment A)*

**Recommendation 1 - Principles:** Revise the principles to reflect an increased focus on degree and certificate attainment and closing the achievement gap for historically underrepresented students.

**I. Overall Principles for Accountability and Performance Funding:**
- The initiative supports improved educational attainment for students, specifically degree and certificate completion.
- The initiative allows colleges flexibility and supports innovation to improve student achievement according to their local needs.
- The initiative accounts for opportunity gaps for underrepresented students and provides incentive for colleges to close the achievement gap.

**II. Principles for Measurement:**
- Performance measures recognize students in all mission areas and reflect the needs of the diverse communities served by colleges.
- Performance measures must measure incremental gains in students’ educational progress irrespective of mission area.
- Measures are simple, understandable and reliable points in students’ educational progress.
- Measures focus on student achievement improvements that can be influenced by colleges.

**III. Principles for Funding:**
- Colleges are allocated funding for efficiency and productivity in student achievement.
- Colleges are treated fairly and consistently with recognition of varying student demographics, program mix and college characteristics.
- Performance funding rewards student success and becomes a resource for adopting and expanding practices leading to further success.
- The amount of performance funding is balanced between providing significant incentive without undermining the college’s ability to impact student success.

**Recommendation 2 – Achievement metrics:** The advisory committee reviewed a data report that identified the areas along the student achievement momentum framework where there is an achievement
gap and for which groups. Based on that analysis, the committee recommends revising the achievement metric framework to emphasize success in transitioning from basic skills and pre-college to college level, college English/Communication attainment, and retention and completion for historically underrepresented students.

2.A. Equity: low-income, basic skills, and historically underrepresented students of color1 receive an additional point at the completion of the first 15 college credit milestone and at degree or apprenticeship attainment. The extra point is duplicative if students are members of more than one of the historically underrepresented groups listed above.

2.B. Basic skills: revise basic skills points to reflect a greater emphasis on completion of critical milestone achievement and transition to college level work in this mission area.
   a. Federal level gains, completion of high school diploma or GED.
   b. Transition to college level coursework in alignment with ability to benefit (first six college-level credits).

2.C. Precollege math and English: shift the incentive from completion of the precollege sequence to completion of the associated college gatekeeper courses of math and English.
   a. Students beginning in precollege math and English receive a point after completing associated college level course within a year.
   b. A new point for college level English/Communication is added for all students.

Recommendation 3 - Funding: The advisory committee reviewed a series of data analyses that estimated the possible funding impacts of making principle-driven changes to the student achievement funding metrics. These possible changes included increasing the amount of the allocation for SAI above five percent, decreasing the proportion of the SAI allocation dedicated to points per student, increasing the proportion for completions, and including only state-funded students in SAI.

3.A. The committee recommends keeping the amount of funding for SAI at five percent of the total allocation.

The committee determined that any funding increase beyond five percent impacts other areas of the allocation model. The amount of funding that would move into SAI decreases the amount available to be distributed by base enrollment and weighted Full Time Enrollment (FTE). Analysis showed that regardless of the size of the increase, districts with a significant amount of basic education weighted FTE tend to be negatively impacted. This redistribution can potentially create a sense of competition between colleges, which could cause angst during the current period of lower enrollment and uncertainty in budgets. The committee concludes that the recommended changes to the achievement metrics and other aspects of the funding model will introduce enough change and that increasing the percentage at this time would create more instability than can be tolerated given the relative newness of the allocation model.

3.B. The committee recommends the current funding metric distribution within the five percent be revised as follows:

---

1 Historically underrepresented students of color include African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Pacific Islander. Multiracial students with any one of the listed codes are included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Metric</th>
<th>Current Allocation Percent</th>
<th>Proposed Allocation Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Points (less completions)</td>
<td>45% (2.25% of total allocation)</td>
<td>40% (2.0% of total allocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points Per Student</td>
<td>45% (2.25% of total allocation)</td>
<td>40% (2.0% of total allocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>10% (0.5% of total allocation)</td>
<td>20% (1% of total allocation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This recommendation increases the amount of performance funding dedicated to completions. Combined with the extra weight for degree and apprenticeship completions for historically underrepresented students, this shift represents a commitment towards the new principle for SAI, which accounts for the opportunity gap and provides incentive for colleges to focus on closing the achievement gap.

3.C. The committee recommends that only state-funded students be counted in SAI.

With this recommendation, the majority of students removed from the current SAI model are dual enrollment, primarily Running Start. Currently, these are the only type of contract-funded students that are included in SAI (no international or corrections). The recommended changes to the achievement metrics put more weight on college level points, which helps Running Start colleges as those students earn on average more points per student, specifically college level. Because points and funding are distributed based on a share, this distribution results in a small negative impact for colleges with large populations of underrepresented students, specifically basic skills as well as for technical colleges, who have very few Running Start students. Subsequently, when dual enrollment students are removed from the funding model the small negative impact in funding for colleges with higher basic skills populations is mitigated, and technical colleges show a positive funding impact. However, some of the colleges with higher numbers of Running Start students lose funding as compared to the current model. The committee recommends removing all non-state funded students from SAI to create more parity for colleges with a greater share of underprepared students and to keep the populations of students consistent across the allocation model.

Recommendation 4 - Implementation: The advisory committee recommends the 2017-18 academic year be used as both an implementation period and the first data year for the new criteria. A technical workgroup with system-level representation should be established to assist the State Board staff throughout the 2017-18 year, refining the criteria for the new metrics and communicating the changes to the system during the implementation period. The data will be run under the new criteria for academic year 2017-18 and will be used in the 2019-20 allocation model per the current schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Year for SAI</th>
<th>Allocation model year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2016-17 (current)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential questions

- Do the recommendations align with the goals and priorities of the State Board?

Recommendation/preferred result

The goal is that the Board approve Resolution 17-09-57, with the above-mentioned changes to the Student Achievement Initiative (SAI) metrics and funding components as recommended by the SAI advisory committee and as approved by WACTC.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Darby Kaikkonen, policy research director
360-704-1019, dkaikkonen@sbccte.edu
Tab 2, Attachment A

Student Achievement Advisory Committee Recommendations
Approved by WACTC, July 21, 2017

**Recommendation 1 - Principles:** Revise the principles to reflect an increased focus on degree and certificate attainment and closing the achievement gap for historically underrepresented students.

**Recommendation 2 – Achievement metrics:** Revise the achievement metric framework to emphasize success in transitioning from basic skills and precollege to college-level, college English/Communication attainment, and retention and completion for historically underrepresented students.

- **2.A. Equity:** low-income, basic skills, and historically underrepresented students of color (African American, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander) receive an additional point at the completion of the first 15 college credit milestone and at degree or apprenticeship attainment. The extra point is duplicative if students are a member of more than one group.

- **2.B. Basic skills:** revise basic skills points to reflect a greater emphasis on completion of critical milestone achievement and transition to college level work in this mission area.
  - a. Federal level gains, completion of high school diploma or GED
  - b. Transition to college level coursework in alignment with ability to benefit (first 6 college-level credits)

- **2.C. Precollege math and English:** shift the incentive from completion of the precollege sequence to completion of the associated college gatekeeper courses of math and English.
  - a. Students beginning in precollege math and English receive a point after completing associated college level course within a year
  - b. A new point for college level English/Communication is added for all students

**Recommendation 3 - Funding:**

3.A. Keep the amount of funding for SAI at 5% of the total allocation.

3.B. Revise the current funding metric distribution within the 5% as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Metric</th>
<th>Current Allocation Percent</th>
<th>Proposed Allocation Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Points (less completions)</td>
<td>45% (2.25% of total allocation)</td>
<td>40% (2.0% of total allocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points Per Student</td>
<td>45% (2.25% of total allocation)</td>
<td>40% (2.0% of total allocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>10% (0.5% of total allocation)</td>
<td>20% (1% of total allocation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.C. Only state-funded students are counted in SAI.

**Recommendation 4 - Implementation:** The 2017-18 academic year be used as both an implementation period and the first data year for the new criteria for allocation model in FY20. A technical workgroup with system-level representation should be established to assist the state board throughout the implementation period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Year for SAI</th>
<th>Allocation model year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2016-17 (current)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 17-09-57

A resolution relating to the Student Achievement Initiative achievement metrics and funding components.

WHEREAS the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges has the statutory authority, as provided in RCW 28B.50.090, to establish the method for distributing state appropriations to the college districts in the state; and

WHEREAS, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges established the Student Achievement Initiative to reward colleges for improvements in increasing student success and to allocate five percent of the state allocation on the basis of this performance funding system; and

WHEREAS, a Washington Association of Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC) advisory committee conducted a five-year review of the current metrics and funding distributions and have recommended changes as outlined in Tab 6, Attachment A; and

WHEREAS, WACTC approved the recommendations for changes set forth by the student achievement advisory committee in July 2017; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges adopt the recommendations as set forth by the student achievement advisory committee and approved by WACTC on July 21, 2017.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

____________________________________  ______________________________________
Jan Yoshiwara, secretary                  Larry Brown, chair
Final 2017-19 Operating Budget Review

Brief description
At the time the State Board met on June 27-28, 2017, an operating budget had not passed out of the Legislature. During that meeting, staff presented information on the House and Senate budget proposals. In anticipation of legislative action, staff asked the State Board to adopt an initial fiscal year (FY) 2018 operating budget allocation based on maintenance-level funding (the same in both the House and Senate budgets) and also asked that the State Board delegate authority to the executive director to update and distribute the allocation once a final budget was enacted. An operating budget passed out of the Legislature on June 30, 2017, and was signed by the Governor on that same day.

This is a brief review of the enacted 2017-19 Operating Budget and the resulting allocation.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
The biennial budget request is one of the primary tools used by the State Board to request state appropriations that support the State Board and system priorities. The State Board’s System Direction and Mission Study goals guide the development of the budget request and the tools used to allocate funds to the college districts.

Background information and analysis
FY 2018 is the second year the State Board has allocated the majority of funds with the new allocation model. The operating budget allocation distributes funding based on six main components:

1. Performance – Measured by the Student Achievement Initiative.
2. Base enrollments – Calculated by district based on a three-year rolling average of actual enrollments.
3. Priority enrollments – Four categories of student FTE receive an additional 30 percent weight for funding purposes. The four categories include students enrolled in: Basic Education for Adults; Science, Technology, Engineering, or Math (STEM) courses; upper-division applied baccalaureate courses; and courses addressing the mid-level “skills gap” as identified by the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board.
4. Minimum operating allocation – Per college base allocation of $2.85 million.
5. Safe harbor allocations – Funds distributed based on other methods, including budget provisos and State Board earmarks. Annual allocations for employee compensation, building maintenance and operations, and lease funding are held in safe harbor for four years. In the fifth year, the annual allocations are added to base funding in the allocation model.
6. Agency allocation – State Board operations and state services paid on behalf of the system.

Total biennial funding: The final enacted 2017-19 Biennial Operating Budget provides $1.493 billion in state funds for the community and technical college system. Of this total, $1.446 billion is provided at Maintenance Level, meaning it is intended to cover the cost of compensation and services authorized prior to the 2017-19 biennium. An additional $47 million is appropriated at Policy Level for newly approved compensation increases and policy investments. On an annual basis, this results in $735 million for FY 2018 and $758 million for FY 2019. For the biennium, this is a six percent increase over state appropriations in 2015-17. When all budgeted funds are included (state and local funds, including tuition), the biennial system operating budget is $3.0 billion for 2017-19. Attachment A provides an additional level of detail on the allocation of state funds.
**2018 Allocation**: In mid-July, districts received the majority of their annual state funding in the first allocation of FY2018. Below is a summary of the main components of the allocation to districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Initiative / Performance Funding</td>
<td>$36,740,550</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Enrollment Allocation Base (Enrollment Funding)</td>
<td>$343,103,762</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Funding for Priority Enrollments (Weighted FTE)</td>
<td>$37,649,073</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Operating Allocation (MOA)*</td>
<td>$85,500,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Harbor – Provisos and Earmarks</td>
<td>$204,867,615</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board – Admin, System IT, Program, Reserves</td>
<td>$26,950,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$734,811,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This amount was $11.8 million less than expected, due to the lack of a Capital budget and the resulting loss of Maintenance and Operation funds. This amount is proposed for inclusion in the Supplemental Budget Request.

**Potential questions**
- Do the allocation and related supporting guidelines reflect the priorities of the State Board?
- Are there any unanticipated outcomes?

**Recommendation/preferred result**
State Board members will receive an update and have the opportunity to review the 2017-19 system operating budget and allocation.

Policy Manual change: Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Cherie Berthon, operating budget director
360-704-1023, eberthon@sbctc.edu
## 2017-19 Biennial Operating Budget
### Community & Technical College System

*Near General Fund State (NGF-P) + Capital Construction Account*

**Dollars in Thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Authority</th>
<th>2015-17</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Carry Forward Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 732 COLA</td>
<td>$8,010</td>
<td>$17,589</td>
<td>$25,599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension &amp; DRS Rate Changes</td>
<td>$2,162</td>
<td>$2,208</td>
<td>$4,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases and Local Assessments</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$324</td>
<td>$577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;O</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation on Tuition Backfill</td>
<td>$703</td>
<td>$1,067</td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Service Changes</td>
<td>$(686)</td>
<td>$(770)</td>
<td>$(1,456)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Maintenance Level Funding</strong></td>
<td>$12,092</td>
<td>$22,068</td>
<td>$34,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding at Maintenance Level</strong></td>
<td>$718,023</td>
<td>$728,075</td>
<td>$1,446,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Level**

- Guided Pathways
  - $1,500
- Expand MESA Sites
  - $750
- Dedicated Funding for I-BEST
  - $750
- Central Service Charges
  - $1,118
- M&O
  - $209
- Funding for bills (HB1375,1115,SB5022,5100)
  - $484
- CAP Tuition Backfill (adjustment)
  - $379
- Adv. Manufacturing Tech Center Debt Service
  - $2,223
- Unmanned Aircraft Program - Sunnyside
  - $150
- Needs Assessment - Covington Programs
  - $150
- Youth Development Program-Everett
  - $60
- M&O Fund Shift*
  - $

**Policy Level - Compensation**

- Employee Salary Increases
  - $5,627
- Health Benefit Rate Change
  - $2,964
- Minimum Wage I-1433
  - $424

**Subtotal - Policy Level Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017-19</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16,788</td>
<td>$47,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017-19 Total Budget</strong></td>
<td>$734,811</td>
<td>$1,493,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change from 2015-17 Biennium: 8% 5% 6%

*$825,000 shifted from GFS to Captial Projects Acct annually

### New Policy Investments

**Guided Pathways**

Investment in Guided Pathways model, or similar programs designed to improve student success, to redesign academic programs, and expand academic advising and support services.
Expand MESA Sites
The Washington Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement (MESA) program is expanded to six additional sites to serve approximately 750 students.

Dedicated Funding for I-BEST
Funding is provided to increase enrollments in the I-BEST. Funding will support approximately 120 additional I-BEST full-time equivalent enrollments (FTEs) annually.

Funding for bills (HB1375,1115,SB5022,5100)
Funds are provided to implement the following bills that passed the Legislature:
   Cost of Course Materials - HB 1375
   Paraeducator Specialty Certificates - HB 1115
   Education Loan Information - SB 5022
   Financial Literacy Seminars - SB 5100

Advanced Manufacturing Tech Center
Estimated debt service payments for the construction of the Clover Park Technical College Center for Advanced Manufacturing Technologies facility that is funded in the 2017-19 biennium capital budget. (Capital Projects Account)

Unmanned Aircraft Program - Sunnyside
One-time funding is provided for the Aerospace Center of Excellence, hosted by Everett Community College, to develop an Unmanned Aircraft System program in Sunnyside.

Needs Assessment - Covington Programs
Funding is provided for Green River College to provide higher education courses in Covington and Southeast King County in response to the education needs assessment conducted by the Student Achievement Council in the 2015-17 biennium.

Youth Development Program-Everett
One-time funding is provided for Everett Community College to expand a youth development program operated by Everett Community College in conjunction with a county chapter of a national civil rights organization.
**2018 Supplemental Operating Budget Request**

**Brief description**
In even-numbered years, the Legislature adopts a supplemental Operating Budget to address significant emergent issues, corrections and adjustments to the biennial operating budget. The items described below and listed in the proposed Resolution 17-09-58 have been discussed with the college presidents and represent staff recommendations for the 2018 Supplemental Operating Budget Request.

**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 supplemental budget request is an important vehicle for the continued expression of system policy priorities. The ability of the system to meet its goals is directly impacted by the outcomes of the budget process.

**Background information and analysis**
With its appropriation of $43.7 billion, the 2017 Legislature adopted the largest Operating Budget in state history. While most of the $5.5 billion biennial increase was committed to K-12, questions linger on whether or not this amount is sufficient. For the college system, the 2017-19 Operating Budget included salary increases, tuition increases and funding for student success initiatives. Unfortunately, the Legislature adjourned without adopting a Capital Budget, creating an annual loss of $11.4 million used in college Operating Budgets to maintain and operate facilities.

Guidance from Office of Financial Management (OFM) on supplemental budget development requires agencies to limit requests to:
1. Necessary technical corrections to the currently enacted budgets.
2. Non-discretionary changes in legally mandated caseloads or workloads.
3. Only the highest priority policy enhancements or resource reprogramming budget proposals, consistent with Governor Inslee’s priority goals.
4. Additional federal or private/local funding expected to be received for the remainder of the biennium.

Although not binding on higher education institutions, it is in our best interest to keep this direction in mind as we develop and describe system requests.

**Budget Request Items**
The following items are based on discussion and guidance from presidents’ group, the Washington Association of Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC) and include a reference to how each fits within the limitations described by OFM. The requests are not listed in priority order.

1. **$3.5 million to Invest in Teaching and Learning** (Policy Level/High Priority) – This funding will be used by districts to address critical faculty staffing issues that impact student outcomes. Depending upon local priorities, the funding would be used to recognize increments that encourage professional development and faculty retention and/or improve student support and access to teachers by hiring more full-time faculty and lessening reliance on part-time instructors. This request would provide 136 faculty conversions (four per college), improving our
full-time/part-time mix by over one percent, or it would provide increments for full- and part-
time faculty.

2. **$10 million for Adjustment to Compensation Funding** (Maintenance Level/Technical) – Colleges have lost ground as OFM and the Legislature have shifted to a funding methodology that relies upon tuition revenue to pay compensation cost increases. During the 2017-19 biennium, employee salaries are slated to increase by six percent and benefits by nearly eight percent. Tuition, consistent with current law, will increase approximately 4.2 percent during that same period. A shortfall of approximately ten million dollars will develop through the differing dollar amounts resulting from these increases – causing colleges to reduce programs, student support and/or staff. It’s recommended that the system ask the state to make the additional investment needed to make up this shortfall.

3. **$230,000 to Allow Opportunity Grant and other SBCTC Financial Aid Programs to Keep Pace with Tuition Increases** (Maintenance Level/Technical Adjustment) – During the 2017-2019 biennium, tuition will increase by 2.2 percent in FY 2018 and approximately two percent in FY 2019. The Legislature provided an incremental increase in funding for the State Need Grant so that it could maintain consistent service levels, but it did not provide similar adjustments for the financial aid programs within the community and technical colleges. It is recommended that the system propose a funding adjustment so that our successful financial aid grant programs can continue to serve the 9,000 students we reached in 2016-17. Without the increase, the Opportunity Grant and Worker Retraining program will have to reduce aid by two percent, affecting approximately 200 FTE students.

4. **$2.2 million for Student Success/Guided Pathways** (Policy Level/High Priority) – Improving student achievement and success is the system’s highest priority. Guided pathways is a proven model that substantially increases retention by at least ten percent and college completion rates by 17 percent. It does this through streamlining curriculums, providing additional student guidance, and giving students a clear a road map for their college career. Currently five colleges are implementing Guided Pathway programs under grants from College Spark. In the 2017 Session, the Legislature provided $1.5 million annually to expand that investment to six additional colleges. Our students and their future employers cannot wait several more years for these best practices to reach all colleges. It is recommended that the system request “seed” funding to allow colleges that have not received any funding for this effort to develop a plan that will allow them to quickly implement student success strategies with funding we hope will be provided in the 2019-21 biennium.

In addition to the above listed funding requests, staff recommends the following policy change:

**Move Maintenance and Operations Funding Authorization from Capital Budget to Operating Budget.** (Maintenance Level/Technical Adjustment) – The lack of a capital budget has resulted in the annual loss of $11.4 million to college operating budgets used to pay for supplies, routine repairs, materials and maintenance staff salaries. Without these funds maintenance and repairs will be deferred and staff will lose jobs, potentially increasing future costs and creating unsafe learning and working environments. Funds are available in the Capital Construction Account but, without a capital budget, colleges and universities are not authorized
to access them. It’s recommended that the system partner with universities to propose shifting the appropriation (spending authority) from the capital budget to the operating budget on a permanent basis. Funding will continue to come from the Capital Construction Account. Although this request has been made in the past, at this time it appears that the universities are supportive and OFM is open to the idea.

**Potential questions**

Do the recommended policy investments and policy change for the 2018 Supplemental Operating Budget align with the Board’s priorities for the community and technical college system?

**Recommendation/preferred result**

The Board is asked to adopted Resolution 17-09-58 approving the submittal of the State Board 2018 supplemental operating budget request to OFM for the community and technical colleges system.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Cherie Berthon, operating budget director
360.704.1023, cberthon@sbctc.edu
State of Washington  
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges  
Resolution 17-09-58

A resolution relating to the agency request for the 2018 Supplemental Operating Budget:

WHEREAS, the enacted 2017-19 Biennial budget reflects the system’s emphasis on supporting the community and technical college system and the supplemental budget process allows for a continuation of identifying investment policies that further support our students, and;

WHEREAS, the community and technical college system has lost ground as the Office of Financial Management and the Legislature have shifted to a funding methodology that relies increasingly upon tuition revenue to pay compensation cost increases, and;

WHEREAS, the 2018 Supplemental budget instructions from the Office of Financial Management provide an opportunity for agencies to submit, for consideration, policy investment requests that support Governor Inslee’s priorities.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges authorizes the Director to submit to the Governor a 2018 Operating Budget proposal for an estimated $16 million, including the following requests:

1. **$3.5 million to Invest in Teaching and Learning** – This funding will be used by districts to address critical faculty staffing issues that impact student outcomes. Depending upon local priorities, the funding would be used to provide increments that encourage professional development and faculty retention and/or improve student support and access to teachers by hiring more full-time faculty and lessening reliance on part-time instructors.

2. **$10 million for Adjustment to Compensation Funding** – This funding will be used to make up the shortfall between the amount provided to pay for employee salary increases and the tuition increase.

3. **$230,000 to Allow Opportunity Grant and other SBCTC Financial Aid Programs to Keep Pace with Tuition Increases** – This funding will be used to maintain participation rates and award amounts within the Opportunity Grant and other State Board financial aid programs.

4. **$2.2 million for Student Success/Guided Pathways** – Improving student achievement and success is the system’s highest priority. Guided pathways is a proven model that substantially increases college completion rates by streamlining curriculums, providing additional student guidance and giving students a clear road map for their college career.
5. Move Maintenance and Operations Funding Authorization from Capital Budget to Operating Budget – This policy change would move the authority to access funds in the Capital Contraction Account from the capital to the operating budget, allowing colleges to maintain safe learning and working environments.

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

APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 13, 2017.

ATTEST:

Jan Yoshiwara, secretary            Larry Brown, chair
Capital budget update

Brief description
State Board staff will provide an update on the impacts of not having any new appropriations in the 2017-19 capital budget and the subsequent 2018 supplemental capital 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 in Resolution 16-05-22. Additional details and authorizations to finance using non-appropriated funds were added in resolutions 16-09-41, 16-09-45, 16-09-53, and 17-01-05.

The State Board adopted Resolution 17-06-45 during its June meeting. This resolution directed staff to add projects from the biennial capital budget request, which were not funded or authorized, with new requests for local financing in the 2018 supplemental capital request. At the time of adoption, the Legislature was in its third special session and it was unknown if a capital budget would be adopted.

As of this writing, the Legislature has passed a reappropriations-only capital budget. Although members of the Legislature are discussing possible solutions to their impasse, it is unclear whether or not a capital budget with new appropriations will be enacted before the next scheduled session in January 2018.

Staff has worked with colleges to update all 2017-19 requests to reflect a delay in their funding. Requests for the 2018 supplemental budget are due to the Office of Financial Management by October 9, 2017. These updates assume the authorities will be provided in May 2018.

Maintenance and operations fund swap
In 2003 the legislature moved a portion of the funding provided by the state for maintenance and operation of existing facilities from our system’s base operating budget to its capital budget. This move also changed the funding source from the general fund to the system’s building fee account. Similar fund swaps were made in the budgets for all of the state’s higher education institutions to free up general fund revenue for other purposes.

The maintenance and operation of existing facilities continues to be the highest priority in the capital budget. Both the State Board’s 2018 capital and operating requests ask for the funding to be moved back to the operating budget, preferably with funding from the general fund to free up the building fee to be used for capital purposes as originally intended. The State Board has made similar requests in the past but there may be new interest in this due to the unprecedented lack of new appropriations for capital and how this impacted ongoing operation of the facilities.
Impact of no new capital appropriations

Colleges are faced with a decision to either lay off or find other sources for the salaries of maintenance and operations staff who have been funded in the capital budget since 2003. These unexpected expenses reduce the funding available for other programs and services at the college.

Capital projects are made up of a series of sequential steps. In addition to the reduced buying power as time passes, a delay in starting designs can trigger new code and local requirements. A delay between design and construction can trigger redesigning to meet new requirements. Even a short delay can have significant cost impact when projects are weather dependent or need to be done during breaks in the academic schedule to minimize disruptions.

Some colleges are moving forward with urgent work that was expected to have been funded in the capital budget. These colleges hope to get reimbursed when a budget is enacted. Since project management services are typically funded directly to the Department of Enterprise Services in the capital budget, the colleges have this additional expense. The colleges also need State Board approval for some of the local capital expenditures. The State Board has delegated the authority to approve local capital expenditures for project up to $1 million to its executive director. Larger projects are typically on the State Board’s agenda for consent.

2018 supplemental capital request

There is a side by side comparison of the new appropriations in the original 2017-19 and 2018 supplemental requests in attachment A. The authorities requested in 2017-19 along with the new authorities approved by the State Board for the 2018 supplemental capital request are shown in attachment B.

Requests were adjusted for changes in sales tax rates and delays. The funding for minor projects that could not be completed this biennium has been postponed until next biennium. These revisions result in a net decrease in the overall request amount. The same level of bond funding as in the “compromise” budget (that funded through Clark’s project) could fund the 2018 request through North Seattle’s project.

Potential questions

- Are there other questions related to the capital budget the State Board would like staff to explore?
- Does the State Board have concerns or ideas related to advocacy for the 2018 supplemental capital request?

Recommendation/preferred result

The Board will have an understanding of the impacts on our system of not having new appropriations in the 2017-19 capital budget and how they affect the 2018 supplemental capital request.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒
Prepared by: Wayne Doty, capital budget director
(360) 704-4382, wdoty@sbctc.edu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Request</th>
<th>Cumulative Request</th>
<th>Revised Request</th>
<th>Cumulative Request</th>
<th>Revised/Org</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>30001291</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Preventive Facility Maintenance... (M&amp;O Fund Swap)</td>
<td>$22,800,000</td>
<td>$22,800,000</td>
<td>$22,800,000</td>
<td>$22,800,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>30001369</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor Works - Preservation</td>
<td>$21,309,000</td>
<td>$44,109,000</td>
<td>$21,309,000</td>
<td>$44,109,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>30001293</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor Repairs - Roof</td>
<td>$8,433,000</td>
<td>$52,542,000</td>
<td>$5,307,000</td>
<td>$49,416,000</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>30001294</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor Repairs - Facility</td>
<td>$26,676,000</td>
<td>$79,218,000</td>
<td>$16,587,000</td>
<td>$66,603,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>30001295</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor Repairs - Site</td>
<td>$4,166,000</td>
<td>$83,384,000</td>
<td>$4,166,000</td>
<td>$70,169,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>30001368</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor Works - Program</td>
<td>$26,630,000</td>
<td>$110,014,000</td>
<td>$16,389,000</td>
<td>$86,558,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>30000137</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Science Engineering Technology Bldg</td>
<td>$37,757,000</td>
<td>$147,771,000</td>
<td>$39,257,000</td>
<td>$125,815,000</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>30000985</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Wells Hall Replacement</td>
<td>$2,772,000</td>
<td>$150,543,000</td>
<td>$2,840,000</td>
<td>$128,655,000</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>30000138</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Learning Commons</td>
<td>$33,960,000</td>
<td>$184,503,000</td>
<td>$34,952,000</td>
<td>$163,607,000</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Olympic</td>
<td>30000986</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Shop Building Renovation</td>
<td>$929,000</td>
<td>$185,432,000</td>
<td>$953,000</td>
<td>$164,560,000</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pierce Fort Steilacoom</td>
<td>30000987</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Cascade Building Renovation - Phase 3</td>
<td>$3,438,000</td>
<td>$188,870,000</td>
<td>$3,508,000</td>
<td>$168,068,000</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Big Bend</td>
<td>30000981</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Professional-Technical Education Center</td>
<td>$35,063,000</td>
<td>$223,933,000</td>
<td>$35,346,000</td>
<td>$203,414,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>South Seattle</td>
<td>30000988</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Automotive Technology</td>
<td>$2,241,000</td>
<td>$226,174,000</td>
<td>$2,501,000</td>
<td>$205,915,000</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>30000982</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Main Building South Wing Renovation</td>
<td>$24,919,000</td>
<td>$251,093,000</td>
<td>$25,683,000</td>
<td>$231,598,000</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Highline</td>
<td>30000983</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Health and Life Sciences</td>
<td>$23,372,000</td>
<td>$274,465,000</td>
<td>$24,221,000</td>
<td>$255,819,000</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>30000989</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Medical Mile Health Science Center</td>
<td>$3,150,000</td>
<td>$277,615,000</td>
<td>$3,238,000</td>
<td>$259,057,000</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>30000984</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Center for Advanced Manufacturing Technologies</td>
<td>$33,288,000</td>
<td>$310,903,000</td>
<td>$35,821,000</td>
<td>$294,878,000</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>30000990</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Allied Health, Science &amp; Manufacturing</td>
<td>$3,546,000</td>
<td>$314,440,000</td>
<td>$3,592,000</td>
<td>$298,470,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Spokane Falls</td>
<td>30001458</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Fine and Applied Arts Replacement</td>
<td>$2,766,000</td>
<td>$317,215,000</td>
<td>$2,827,000</td>
<td>$301,297,000</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>30000135</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>North Clark County</td>
<td>$5,212,000</td>
<td>$322,427,000</td>
<td>$5,688,000</td>
<td>$306,985,000</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>30000136</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>$3,923,000</td>
<td>$326,350,000</td>
<td>$4,015,000</td>
<td>$311,000,000</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>30000127</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Student Services and Instructional Building</td>
<td>$3,564,000</td>
<td>$329,914,000</td>
<td>$4,151,000</td>
<td>$315,151,000</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>North Seattle</td>
<td>30001451</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Library Building Renovation</td>
<td>$3,369,000</td>
<td>$333,283,000</td>
<td>$3,448,000</td>
<td>$318,599,000</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>30001452</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology Building Replacement</td>
<td>$1,130,000</td>
<td>$334,413,000</td>
<td>$1,156,000</td>
<td>$319,755,000</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cascadia</td>
<td>30001453</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Center for Science and Technology</td>
<td>$3,342,000</td>
<td>$337,755,000</td>
<td>$3,421,000</td>
<td>$323,176,000</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$337,755,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$323,176,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>96%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original requests were adjusted for changes in sales tax rates and delay. Minor projects that could not be completed this biennium were postponed until next biennium.

2 The legislatures 2017-19 capital proposals funded the Clover Park project with a COP backed by college Building Fees. The debt service for this was provided in the 2017-19 operating budget.
## 2018 SBCTC Capital Request for New Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>30001454</td>
<td>Long-term Lease for Student Housing</td>
<td>30-year Lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Seattle</td>
<td>30001455</td>
<td>COP for Student Wellness and Fitness Center</td>
<td>$ 10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia</td>
<td>40000009</td>
<td>COP for Parking Facilities</td>
<td>$ 29,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>30001457</td>
<td>COP for Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Columbia</td>
<td>30000978</td>
<td>Re-authorize COP for Renovation of Main Building</td>
<td>$ 3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>40000004</td>
<td>COP for Student Success Center</td>
<td>$ 20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>40000007</td>
<td>COP for Upper Parking Lot Improvements</td>
<td>$ 1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Puget Sound</td>
<td>40000006</td>
<td>COP for Health and Wellness Center</td>
<td>$ 16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>40000005</td>
<td>COP for Student Housing</td>
<td>$ 26,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>40000003</td>
<td>COP for West Campus Expansion</td>
<td>$ 22,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park</td>
<td>30000984</td>
<td>COP for Center for Advanced Manufacturing Technologies</td>
<td>$ 35,821,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COP: Certificate of Participation; a financing instrument managed by the State Treasurer's office typically used for local financing.

1 The legislatures 2017-19 capital proposals funded the Clover Park project with a COP backed by college Building Fees. The debt service for this was provided in the 2017-19 operating budget.
2018 legislative agenda priorities

Brief description
The Board will be briefed on potential 2018 agency request legislation.

How does this link to the State Board goals and policy focus
Identifying possible changes to state law that results in improved service delivery to students supports critical system goals as outlined in the State Board Goals and Policy Focus in two major categories:

- **Promoting student achievement and 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.
- **Increasing access to post-secondary education:**
  - Advocate for adequate state funding and minimize tuition increases for students.

Background information and analysis
Entering the 2017-2019 legislative biennium, the State Board requested three bills:

- **Corrections Education (SB 5069/ HB 1129):** Legislative policy request
  - National research shows that prison education reduces recidivism rates and frees public funds for other important priorities. A statutory change was needed to allow the use of state funds for academic degree programs within corrections institutions.

- **Bookstore Tax Issue (SB 5677/ HB 1913):** Legislative policy request
  - A number of colleges contract with for-profit vendors to operate bookstores. The Department of Revenue has issued decisions stating this arrangement would be subject to leasehold excise tax. A statutory change was necessary to clarify that contracts with vendors are for services, not for commercial enterprise.

- **Customized Training Program (HB 1103/ SB 5381)**
  - The Customized Training Program was set to sunset on July 1, 2017. A request to the legislature was necessary to extend or lift the sunset.

All three request bills passed the legislature and were signed by Governor Inslee. The success of these policy requests can be attributed to leadership from the State Board, Presidents Association (WACTC), Trustees Association (ACT), Student Association (WACTCSA), partnerships with Faculty including representatives of Washington Education Association (WEA), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and State Board staff.

Entering the 2018 legislative session, the following issues may result in agency request legislation. Including the need for a capital budget, and support for a supplemental operating budget request that focuses on funding not received during the 2017 legislative sessions.

**Basic Education for Adults caseload forecast – tentative request**
Modifying request legislation from 2016, the State Board 2018 agency request seeks caseload forecast status for Basic Education for Adults programs. The goal is to identify the number of state residents ages...
25-44 who do not have a high school diploma or credential, and the number of students expected to enroll in basic education for adult courses at community and technical colleges. The information gained would provide valuable data to support future budget requests needed to support basic education for adults, and inform the legislature of the need for these programs.

**Stakeholders:** State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), Caseload Forecast Council

**Status:** SBCTC staff is engaging in stakeholder work.

**“Free” college**

During the 2016 and 2017 legislative sessions bills were introduced to deliver a “Washington Promise” of two years of free community college education for state residents.

The Governor’s Office has pulled together a workgroup to develop a “Free College” program, patterned after similar programs in New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, etc. Discussion is focused on two years of “free” tuition for low and middle income families. The group has met once and at this time The Washington Student Achievement Council, Council of Presidents, Office of Financial Management, the Governor’s Office, and SBCTC staff are participating, with a plan to have a recommendation to the Governor by the end of September.

Seattle mayoral candidate Jenny Durkan has also proposed a “Seattle Promise” plan that proposes the city pay for two years of community college tuition for all the city’s public high school graduates.

**Stakeholders:** SBCTC, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Council of Presidents, and Public and Private four-year Universities

**Status:** Legislative inquiries have come to SBCTC staff

### Potential questions

- Does the board have feedback about agency request legislation?
- Are there suggestions from Board members about the 2018 legislative agenda and/or other legislative priorities for the system?

### Recommendation/preferred result

The board will provide feedback regarding potential agency request legislation and relevant next steps.

Policy Manual Change Yes ☐ No ☒

Prepared by: Arlen Harris, legislative director
360-704-4394, aharris@sbctc.edu