



Community and Technical College Mission Study Summary of Findings to Date

May 11, 2009

Educational Attainment in Washington State

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

Population Growth

- Due to population growth about 45,000 additional students will seek enrollment in community and technical colleges by 2028 (about 22,000 additional FTEs)
- Overall enrollments will shift to an older student population
 - One fourth of the growth will be among traditional age college students
 - One fourth among younger adults (25-34 years old)
 - Half of the growth will come from adults 35 and older

- Applied bachelors degrees at community and technical colleges could grow to 2,400 students (1,900 FTEs) over the next 10 years
 - To keep up with growing number of technical degrees earned and increase transfer opportunities for technical degree graduates
 - Means broader range of degree programs, additional colleges

Needs of the Future Economy:

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

21st Century Job Skills:

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

21st Century Learning:

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

Lessons from Disrupting Class, Clayton Christensen:

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

Governance:

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

Expenditure Efficiencies:

- **20% spent on overhead:** The share of total expenditures for administration (about 20%) is about the same across colleges and universities.
- **Cost per FTE varies because of # of staff per FTES.** UW and WSU spend 2.5 times more and regional universities spend 1.5 times more on total expenditures

per FTES than CTCs spend. Higher administrative expenditures at universities is a result of more staff. Community and technical colleges have one-third fewer staff per student than universities have.

- **College size drives administrative spending per student.** The largest college districts spend less per student and the smallest college districts spend more. The primary variable in spending is the number of staff per student. Large colleges have fewer staff per student and smaller colleges have more staff per student.