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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Charged by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to consider and to make recommendations related to successful achievement of the University’s short- and long-term enrollment goals, we now submit our report. The task force identified 11 major barriers to enrollment growth that may be addressed in the near term through either decisive action or further study. To implement recommendations, we also recommend charging a standing committee to monitor and revise, as they see fit, the recommendations proposed here. Membership necessary to ensure appropriate and responsible representation on this committee is also defined. Our report further makes recommendations with regard to essential data that must be secured in order to manage enrollment growth and, also, identifies issues related to funding models that must be addressed if UW Bothell is to succeed in creating quality academic programs that enhance our reputation, retain current students, and attract new students.

Eleven Key Barriers

- Limited majors reduce our appeal to prospective students and negatively impact retention.
- Unfamiliar names of majors make student recruitment challenging.
- Class scheduling and delivery format reduces student interest in enrollment.
- Students may not enroll at UW Bothell due to a lack of defined pathways to degree programs.
- The limited availability of student life opportunities impacts recruiting and retention.
- There are insufficient efforts and resources to recruit and retain a diverse student population.
- UW Bothell has limited appeal to out-of-state students.
- International student recruitment is limited.
- The UW Bothell transfer admission process is not consistent, responsive, or effective in a competitive admissions process.
- UW Bothell is unable to match its competitors for the pool of most academically talented students.
- Absence of a FTE funding model hinders planning and places quality of student experiences at risk.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Although these barriers are identified in order of the priority we have assigned them, the final barrier involving funding models is one of the most critical. It is placed last because the committee was not charged to develop a funding model but rather to identify the implications inherent in different funding approaches.
A number of specific concerns drove the inception of this Task Force. Most notably, key administrators argued that a lack of organizational agility increased UW Bothell’s difficulty in meeting state-mandated enrollment targets during 2007-08. For example, after our recent expansion of undergraduate enrollment to all four years, the campus began to receive applications from transfer students above the entry level but not yet prepared to satisfy requirements for the academic program of their choice. In such instances, authority to change admission requirements was unclear and timely action on admissions decisions could not be secured.

Likewise, it had become increasingly clear that the funding formula by which academic programs secured new faculty had failed to ensure growth. Despite an institution-wide enrollment target for UW Bothell, existing programs were unwilling or unable to accept responsibility for that target. The funding formula and outmoded practices for creating new programs provided existing programs with little incentive or capability for substantially higher enrollment and a lengthy process by which new programs could be developed.

The aforementioned concerns created a compelling case for our Task Force to articulate the near-term adjustments necessary to attain UW Bothell enrollment targets and to help the University administration anticipate long-term challenges in sustaining rapid growth. The need, however, is not merely to meet enrollment targets but also to ensure that we do so in a way that adds to our reputation, as part of the UW system, for quality education.

Enrollment growth is vital to UW Bothell’s success. Not only is enrollment growth expected by the Washington State Legislature, but it serves a vital internal function in creating the economies of scale that are expected to enable this institution to achieve cost efficiencies necessary to provide quality educational experiences to its constituents. Enrollment growth cannot be the goal in and of itself; rather, it must be the means to producing desired educational programs consistent with the University of Washington’s reputation for excellence.

UW Bothell must close an enrollment gap, that at the end of the end 2007-08 academic year threatened to reach 448 students. For a campus having fewer than 2,000 students, this looked like a substantial hurdle. Fortunately, it is now apparent that UW Bothell will come much closer to its target than we originally expected. As of this date substantial enrollment growth among first-year students and increasing flexibility by existing academic programs have increased our student headcount by more than 300. This success is important and substantial, and credit is warranted to many individuals. However, substantial challenges remain ahead. We do know that enrollment grows faster in periods when the economy is weak. UW Bothell experiences a substantial surge after the 2001 recession, but total enrollment stayed flat for several years thereafter. If we are to avoid this fate in the current situation, it will be because we have anticipated the changes that will attract a more diverse student population in the future (see Appendix A: UWB enrollment history).
Over the longer term, however, the campus has committed itself to substantial growth and set a target enrollment of 5,000 students in 12 years. Assuming enrollment this year is 1,900 FTE students, we will need to grow at more than 10% per year per year to reach our goal. This is an ambitious goal. Arizona State University’s West Campus—a campus whose origins as an upper division campus and whose academic programs resemble that of UW Bothell—grew at an average rate of 6.5% over the last 20 years to attain a headcount in excess of 8,000 students (see Appendix B, ASU WEST Enrollment growth).

Data from the Washington Interstate Commission on Higher Education indicate high school graduates in this region will soon top out, and the demographics among those who complete high school is likely to change substantially. In particular, the percentage of first-generation college aspirants is expected to rise. These demographic changes suggest that colleges and universities that wish to grow will have to successfully adapt to new populations.
Already, UW Bothell is challenged in meeting the demands of the first-year students who have been a crucial element of our recent enrollment growth. In our first (2006-07) entering class, 135 students registered. Two years later, that number has increased to 250. Without the enrollment of these first-year students, UW Bothell would have missed its enrollment target in 2007-08 by over 20%. Our first-year students exhibit substantially different characteristics from the prior upper-division students to whom the institution had become accustomed. Our new first-year students are comprised almost entirely of 18 and 19 year olds, whereas earlier transfer students were more typically in their late twenties or thirties.

Success in our lower-division work requires campus adjustments. Retention is likely to be substantially lower among students who have not previously attended or graduated from community colleges. UW Bothell was able to retain roughly 83% of its first freshman cohort into 2007-08. However, many more indicated that they were considering transferring to another institution. Another 15% had failed to enroll as of spring 2008. The 2007 UW Bothell Institutional Research end-of-year student survey among first-year students revealed that as many as 25% of this second cohort were unsure of their return to UW Bothell for 2008-09 as they may transfer to another institution. Transferring out remains a major concern.
Survey data drawn from first-year students who have entered and those who have declined admission to UW Bothell as well as from our upper-division students indicate several important differences. Lower division students appear to be more interested in the broad array of college campus experiences and are less likely to be satisfied solely by a stimulating academic curriculum. Upper-division students, by virtue of employment or family commitments (sometimes both), are more likely to be place-bound and thus less likely to consider transferring to a college in another region. While the majority express high satisfaction with UW Bothell, a significant portion of the new first-year students view UW Bothell as a cost effective entry point that will enable them to transfer elsewhere (especially to the Seattle campus). In addition to campus life, these students are concerned about the number and type of academic programs offered on campus.

After their first year, 23% of the first freshman class indicated on the 2006-07 end-of-the-year survey a probable major that is not currently offered at UW Bothell. According to our surveys of entering first-year students enrolled with the expectation of majoring in one of the four undergraduate degree program areas, data suggests not as many are being won over by our current majors as the University might hope. More fundamentally, however, the recent UW Bothell and UW Tacoma Community College Survey of potential transfer students indicates the campus has had trouble attracting students who are interested in traditional majors (see Appendix C. First Report on 2008 Community College Survey). Although this issue is partially addressed through the 21st Century Campus Initiative, successful growth requires that the institution not lose sight of this. Accordingly, the Institutional Enrollment Growth Management Task Force felt the need to point out organizational imperatives to grow well-designed new programs.

It is with these and other concerns in mind that the Task Force proposes recommendations for existing barriers to growth and student retention.

Dan Jacoby
Co-Chair, Institutional Enrollment Growth Task Force
INTRODUCTION

The 21st Century Campus Initiative outlined several priorities for the University of Washington Bothell to focus on in the next 12 years, the greatest of which was enrollment growth. In response to the Initiative in May 2008, Dr. Susan Jeffords, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, initiated the Institutional Enrollment Growth Task Force with the following charge:

- Evaluation of types of data we should provide on a regular basis to inform enrollment planning and monitor progress in reaching our goals.

- Examination of the implications of potential program enrollment funding formula models.

- Examination of institutional barriers to admission, enrollment and retention, with proposed steps to address them.

- A short list of initiatives and/or programs, such as bridge programs, to support recruitment and retention efforts.

- Consideration of ways to enhance coordination with community college partners.

- Timelines and measures for success in implementing actions for each year of the next five years.

- Consideration of the structure and membership for a permanent advisory group to guide implementation of the action plan resulting from the task force work.

The Task Force met from May to September 2008 to discuss and explore each charge. A series of pertinent reports and studies included in the Appendices of this report were reviewed. Academic program directors and their advisors along with other members of the University community were invited to share in various discussions with the Task Force.

During the five months of discussion, members of the Task Force identified 11 major barriers to enrollment growth and a series of recommendations and corresponding timelines for addressing each barrier. While many issues and barriers were considered, only those that could have the greatest impact on enrollment growth are included in the report. The Task Force was conscientious of the need to lay groundwork for many of these recommendations and prioritize actions that best support the growth of the institution incrementally. This proposal outlines direct measures to address the enrollment growth expectations through 2020.

The report concludes with a recommended structure for formulating an ongoing enrollment management committee to oversee the implementation of these recommendations and keep the University informed as to new opportunities and challenges to future enrollment.
BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Barrier 1. Limited majors reduce our appeal to prospective students and negatively impact retention.

UW Bothell Student and Community College Student Surveys indicate that the current menu of degrees and options fail to attract applications from students interested in traditional degree programs. The campus currently has four undergraduate academic programs, offering five baccalaureate degree programs and several options. In addition, the Education Program offers a fifth-year K-8 teacher certification program. Last year, a number of degree proposals were initiated in response to the 21st Century Campus Initiative begun under the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs office. Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS), the largest undergraduate program, has submitted proposals for new degrees in Environmental Sciences and is planning to convert all of its degree options into majors. UW Bothell’s Business Program also offers a variety of concentrations as well as an option in accounting. In spring 2008, the administration committed itself to a new Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) program.

Recommendations

The following are recommended actions to be implemented immediately.

- Majors must appeal to broad student interests while simultaneously complementing the character of the institution.

- Creation of new majors should be based upon data demonstrating student demand.

- Investments in new majors should be prioritized among those demonstrating the greatest potential for attracting net new student populations.

- To warrant formation of a new academic program, we believe a proposed unit should demonstrate the capacity to achieve a minimum of 100 new enrollments within 3 to 4 years of implementation. (A program is understood as an academic unit tied together by a budget that administers one or more undergraduate and/or graduate degrees).

- We recommend that new academic programs (or clusters of related academic degrees) be started only if they can be guaranteed definite funding sufficient to ensure their quality and viability including sufficient courses, faculty (at least five), staff and facilities.

- New majors must be subject to a different funding model during start-up so as to encourage responsible growth.

- In addition to investing in new majors, it is necessary to invest in current majors to ensure their continued attractiveness and competitiveness.
BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Barrier 2. Unfamiliar names of majors make student recruitment challenging.**

UW Bothell surveys of our first year applicants and enrollees indicate that a disproportionate number of first-year students attend UW Bothell to attend the Business Program. Early indications are that as these students progress through the CUSP program, they show increased interest in IAS, but so far there have been only 12 admissions into IAS compared to 23 in business. The 2008 UW Bothell and UW Tacoma Community College survey of over 1,000 community college potential transfer students clearly indicates that students who see their degree interests in existing UW Bothell programs are far more likely to express interest in UW Bothell than are those interested in science, social science, engineering, design, and humanities degrees. These students appear not to identify with the University’s interdisciplinary options.

**Recommendations**
The following are recommended actions to be implemented immediately.

- Define majors in terms easily understood by parents, students and general public.

- Promote and advertise majors by including career pathways.

- Utilize a range of market research and data in naming programs.

- Continue to market IAS options independently, and begin a similar plan for Business degree concentrations.

- CUSP needs to ensure timely opportunities to complete prerequisite courses for all UW Bothell majors.
BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Barrier 3. Class scheduling and delivery format reduces student interest in enrollment.
The Task Force heard discussion from advisers and recruiters that students want more options for taking courses online. In light of high energy costs, there is especially great interest in classes and degrees that reduce commuting. These concerns are matched by administrative worries about off-peak underutilization of classrooms, and an emerging consensus that enrollment growth will soon require construction of portable classrooms and development of off-campus delivery sites. Some schools have joined consortiums to share production costs and revenue from distance learning courses.

Recommendations
- Design one or more majors to use alternative times and/or mediums, including evening and weekend programs, with implementation by March 1, 2009.
- Offer online and hybrid courses beginning with fall 2009.
- Appoint a small committee to explore online course consortiums/federations and issue a report by January 1, 2009.

Barrier 4. Students may not enroll at UW Bothell due to a lack of defined pathways to degree programs.
The 2008 Community College Survey asked students what concerns were important in their choice of schools. Surprisingly, the item whose average score was highest was the ability to transfer their community college credits.

Recommendations
Unless otherwise stated, the following action is recommended for implementation as soon as possible.
- Charge the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs with the development and maintenance of articulation agreements.
- Establish UW Bothell direct transfer agreements with local community colleges.
- Improve liaison and relations with community colleges.
- Improve coordination with faculty, staff and community colleges.
- By March 1, 2009, create a policy that supports cross program enrollment and reduces time to degree.
- By March 1, 2009, improve coordination between academic programs and their advisors to enhance communication and share information about course offerings.
Barrier 5. The limited availability of student life opportunities impacts recruiting and retention.
Surveys of entering students demonstrate the importance of campus life to these students’ success and interest in UW Bothell. Without options for housing, UW Bothell is unable to recruit successfully out of our immediate region. Our survey of community college students indicate that as many as 50% of respondents indicate that location is a very important factor in their interest in UW Bothell. The percentages of students concerned with location are significantly higher at Everett and Bellevue Community Colleges and less so at Cascadia and Shoreline.

Recommendations
The following action is recommended to be implemented by fall 2010 at the latest.

- Implement student housing options.
- Expand resources for student life programming—especially in the evenings and on weekends.
- Create a student activities center that would house club and organizational space, meeting and programming space, expanded food options, among other amenities.
- Assess current facilities on campus and consider their usage for co-curricular activities.
- Create a student health and wellness center.
BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Barrier 6. There are insufficient efforts and resources to recruit and retain a diverse student population.
Although UW Bothell has significant diversity in age, gender and nationality, important minority groups are severely underrepresented. Through the 21st Century Campus Initiative, the University has renewed its commitment to diversity.

Recommendations
- By the conclusion of spring 2009, evaluate support systems required to ensure student success for underrepresented students. Study how these support systems complement or compete with student support for other potential populations (out-of-state, non-traditional, freshmen, etc).
- Define admission criteria for a summer bridge program by November 2008 in order to fully implement the program in time for summer 2009.
- Implement the Dream Project beginning fall 2009.
- Offer writing and math courses at appropriate levels to support a wide range of students.
- Offer additional scholarships by 2010.
- Increase human and financial resources for enhanced multicultural programming by fall 2010.
- Ensure that teaching faculty placed at entry and gateway courses are those best positioned to inspire and mentor, and who can innovatively engage with students in the classroom and beyond. This action is recommended for immediate consideration by CUSP.
- Beginning fall 2009, develop data systems to evaluate current success with diverse students and potential markets for recruiting same. This recommendation assumes that Institutional Research will work collaboratively with any standing committee or task force on diversity.
- Beginning with the fall 2009 term, engage the campus community in a conversation about the meaning of “diversity,” a term with a great deal of latitude.
BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Barrier 7. UW Bothell has limited appeal to out-of-state students.
Information from the UW Bothell student database indicate that out-of-state (non-international) enrollments constitute less than 1% of the student body. This is an untapped student population with high potential for enrollment growth.

Recommendations
- Increase merit-based scholarships in order to attract students with high scholarship in time for fall 2010 enrollment.
- By the start of fall 2010, identify and secure resources needed for publications, advertising, and out-of-state travel to recruit this population.
- As supported by reliable data, increase the number of new majors over the next 10 years (2008-2018).
- Effective fall 2009, begin participating in the Western Undergraduate Exchange, which allows out-of-state students to enroll at 150% of in-state tuition (a substantial discount).

Barrier 8. International student recruitment is limited.
Information from the UW Bothell student database indicate that 3% of the student body enrolls from outside of the country. International students are an untapped student population with high potential for enrollment growth.

Recommendations
- Request that the GFO Executive Council re-evaluate TOEFL requirements and consider alternatives by the conclusion of the fall 2009 term.
- Conduct a study to evaluate support systems required to ensure international student success prior to increasing commitment. Use this evaluation to prioritize international student recruitment relative to other potential populations (out-of-state, diversity, non-traditional, freshmen, etc). Issue a report along with recommendations by October 1, 2009.
- Increase privately funded merit-based scholarships in order to begin enrolling international students with high scholarship by fall 2010.
- Increase academic support services for English language learners by fall 2009 in order to support an expanded international student population.
BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Barrier 9. The UW Bothell transfer admission process is not consistent, responsive, or effective in a competitive admissions process.
Academic programs have been inconsistent with regard to application deadlines, processing, and admission notification for undergraduate transfer admission.

Recommendations
- Develop a holistic admissions review process at the academic program level within the 2008-09 academic year.
- By January 1, 2009, seek approval from the GFO Executive Council to define uniform campus-wide undergraduate application deadline(s).
- By January 1, 2009, seek approval from Academic Council to establish timelines for generating admissions decisions from the Office of Admissions as well as from the academic programs.
- Seek approval from the GFO Executive Committee and Academic Council in fall 2008 to allow the Admissions Office to admit transfer students to the University without commitment from individual programs. Admission to the academic programs will continue to be the responsibility of the faculty in those units. (Note: A formal proposal was submitted in July 2008 by the Director of Admissions.)

Barrier 10. UW Bothell is unable to match its competitors for the pool of most academically talented students.

Recommendations
- Identify and support students who qualify and are eligible for non-UW Bothell merit scholarships. Request that University Advancement develop a plan in the 2008-09 academic year to begin identifying support for these scholarships.
- Request that the GFO Executive Council study the merits of establishing an honors program by the conclusion of the 2009-10 academic year.
- Create immediate links with faculty for undergraduate research opportunities.
BARRIERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Barrier 11: Absence of an effective FTE funding model hinders planning and places quality of student experiences at risk. A well-designed funding model will define crucial incentives for institutional growth management.

Recommendations
Immediately implement a near-term FTE funding model that enables programs to plan and deliver quality educational experiences. A permanent funding model should

- Allocate a fixed percentage of UW Bothell revenue for instructional costs e.g. 50% of total revenue.

- Design an explicit agreement about the nature of the campus we desire to be. Does funding represent a consistent level of faculty and staff resources per student? Should funding opportunistically follow every possibility of enrollment gain? Should allocation of faculty and staff resources be related to the cost of faculty and programs? Ideally any permanent funding formula would follow a campus study and agreement identifying colleges or universities we wish to emulate.

- Distinguish between maintenance of existing programs and the need to subsidize new academic initiatives.

- Take into account the concerns discussed by various existing programs (see attached Appendix D summarizing discussion of funding formula).

- Allow programs to make their own decisions about how best to allocate resources within the funding model. At the same time, however, the campus may wish to issue guidelines with regard to the percentage of reliance upon appointments on tenure track, non-tenure track, and part-time faculty. Programs should continue to have discretion on some parameters affecting enrollment such as admissions, class-size, appointment types, and degree options (including the mix between graduate and undergraduate degrees).

- Provide accountability as well as incentives. Consistent failure to meet enrollment targets requires redirection of a program’s instructional resources. Programs must also be rewarded sufficiently to take on over-enrollment on a short-term basis.

The importance of removing barriers to student retention
Until recently, retention has not been a significant issue at UW Bothell and enrollment planning could focus almost single-handedly on transfer admission. Upper division students who are enrolled within the programs available at UW Bothell were unlikely to transfer elsewhere for another major. Likewise, students who had attended and succeeded at community college had already demonstrated the capacity to succeed in a higher educational institution. With the admission of lower division students, however, it is harder to make these statements.
Retention among lower division retention at many public schools is typically in the neighborhood of 65%. At the University of Washington’s Seattle campus, however, retention rates are substantially higher. We believe that retention at UW Bothell can mirror that of Seattle, but it will take much deliberate work. The Task Force has outlined a number of items that have a strong bearing on retention of our lower division students. Most important among these is whether we have the degree programs that will keep students here once they complete their general education. Even where out degree programs are attractive, students need to understand how to progress from their general education in CUSP into majors. Lower division students are more likely to be retained if the campus provides more of the amenities that provide experiences that students seek. If UW Bothell, admitted 300 first year students and lost one third to attrition, the institution has to do that much more to recruit incoming students elsewhere. But more than its impact upon UW Bothell, is the impact upon our students, both those who stay and those leave. Helping our lower division students succeed is likely the best way to preserve our reputation.
IMPLEMENTATION

The Task Force recognizes that its suggestions are substantial and ambitious. To successfully implement these recommendations, we believe it is important to charge a body with authority to ensure that these recommendations are carried out or revised. Accordingly, we make the following recommendations for a new standing committee and for regular data production to adequately guide its work.

Enrollment Management Committee Membership and Structure
The Task Force identified representation from all departments within the University as being the best for maintaining an accurate picture of ongoing enrollment challenges and solutions. The following membership is recommended:

- Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management
- Director of Admissions
- Up to 3 faculty members from different academic programs (representing diverse fields)
- Director of CUSP
- 1 Graduate Advisor
- 1 Undergraduate Advisor
- 1 representative from the GFO Executive Council
- Office of Institutional Research representative

Recommended consultants to enrollment management group:
- Vice Chancellor for Administration and Planning
- Government Relations Representative
- 1 Consultant or a recent hire to bring in perspective from an outside point of view
- Representative from the Chancellor’s Advisory Board
- Student Affairs representative
- 2 students recommended by the ASUWB President

In addition, it is recommended that the committee have a support person to help coordinate activities, document meeting minutes, and draft recommendations and proposals. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will decide to whom the committee will report and the extent of its authority.
IMPLEMENTATION

Data to Inform the Enrollment Management Committee’s Work
It is important for UW Bothell to develop a set of on-going reports and data to monitor its enrollment progress. These reports should include demographics to provide the campus with better understanding of its student profile and educational interests. The Committee also will need to examine external data to project future enrollment challenges resulting from changing high school graduation rates, demographics, and market shifts. Below are reports determined by the Task Force deemed vital to the functioning of the on-going committee:

- Enrollment per funded faculty line by program
- Cost per student by program
- Revenue per student by program
- Admissions Statistics
- Enrollment Statistics
- Closed Class List
- Diversity Statistics
- Early Intervention Reports for Students Failing or with Low Grades
- Retention Reports
- Time-to-Degree statistics
- FTE/Head Count Reports
- Survey (or other information sources) of why students stop or drop out of UW Bothell
- Survey/Data on academic interests for student populations
- Survey/Data on what prospective students are seeking in a university
- High school demographics
- High school graduation rates
- Transfer bound rate (or actual number) from Washington’s community colleges
- Demographics by county, especially communities within our target market segment
ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

The Task Force recognized several additional concerns that it did not feel competent to speak to within the timeframe allotted for our report. Accordingly, we wish to make note of these items.

- **Summer enrollment.** Because several programs count heavily on summer enrollment, there is a continuing desire to include these enrollments in our count. Complicating the issue, however, is the fact that we are uncertain of the net costs or benefits involved if UW Extension no longer provided the services attached to these courses. While the Task Force was unable to resolve the matter, it does believe the issue is of sufficient importance to merit careful study.

- **Coordination and collaboration.** Time and again the Task Force heard testimony making it abundantly clear that advisers and admissions personnel have important information and perspectives that are not always bridged into academic planning or across academic programs. In areas such as graduate (and undergraduate) admissions, program linkages, and feedback regarding what works and what doesn’t, we learned that staff often have indispensable information. We urge all parties to consider the best ways to share information and to collaborate for the benefit of our students.

- **Marketing and institutional identity.** Crucial to all efforts to expand enrollment is a common understanding of our identity. It is important that UWB have a strong sense of its institutional mission. We believe it is crucial that we identify schools that we may aspire to be like so that UWB can develop benchmarks that will guide us toward becoming more like them. Without clarity regarding the type of institution we wish to be, we are likely to seek enrollment without consideration toward a coherent institutional framework. It is important that this identity be promoted among the faculty and staff, and that public relations use this consensus to promote our image. With these foundations, forceful brand and messaging platforms can and should be developed.

- **Additional attention to and funding for campus marketing will be required.** Enhancement of our web presence is highly desirable. Consistency in brand and messaging platforms is also important.

- **Continued dialogue is recommended regarding areas for collaboration concerning graduate admissions.**
SUMMARY

Our task force report makes a large number of recommendations. While several provide guidance at the operational level, several others suggest policy level changes. Most notably, we suggest that new programs be developed sequentially, rather than attempting to do many things simultaneously. It is important to identify areas for growth that will have the greatest positive impact consistent with our mission and identity. Degree programs must be started with sufficient faculty to pursue their work in ways that enhance the reputation of the campus. We recommend new programs have at least five faculty members, and that they should have enrollment targets of at least 100 students, and reasonable expectations of doing so in no more than 4 years.

We also recommend that at least one of these new programs be designed to take advantage of the opportunities technology provides for quality distance education programs, and/or alternative timeframes that make better use of off-peak hour campus utilization. While existing programs are urged to explore these opportunities, especially in light of current energy costs, we recognize that adding additional demands onto staff already stretched thin with the commitments of a growing campus may create a dangerous overreach. Distance education should never be offered at the expense of quality, and we imagine that hybrid courses involving on and off-campus work will be important to successful efforts. Finally, we suggest possible ways to piggyback on efforts of others by joining existing online education consortiums.

Central to future efforts will be our ability to attract students from greater distances within and outside the state. We urge cautious investigation into the preconditions that must exist for international students to succeed at UW Bothell before we proceed heavily in this direction. In the interim, we outline measures that should help increase our draw of students outside our immediate region, most importantly those that expand options for campus life and housing. We note with special interest two potentially significant groups of students to whom we should expand our appeal. First we must expand our outreach to underrepresented minorities, and ensure that we are prepared to help them succeed. Second, we seek to explore how we can expand the pool of exceptionally talented students entering UW Bothell.

One way to successfully manage growth is through an internal accountability system that establishes appropriate incentives. Program funding formulas must be sufficient to ensure quality growth. At the same time, programs must be responsible for the funding given to them. Accountability for new program and degree growth must be distinguished by a longer time horizon and be kept separate from target enrollments for existing degrees.

In all these areas, the issue of quality remains paramount. Enrollment growth should not proceed if we cannot ensure that those who enroll have positive and productive experiences.
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UWB Enrollment: Actual and Targeted, 1991-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Budgeted FTE</th>
<th>Actual Annual FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASU West Campus Headcount 1984-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1984</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1985</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1986</td>
<td>2,142</td>
<td>(15.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1987</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1988</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1989</td>
<td>3,799</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1990</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1991</td>
<td>4,414</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1992</td>
<td>4,946</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1993</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1994</td>
<td>4,681</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1995</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1996</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1997</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1998</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1999</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2000</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2001</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2002</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2004</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2005</td>
<td>7,734</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>8,211</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2007</td>
<td>8,664</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASU Planning and Budget Office
Executive Summary

- Between March 21 and June 2, 1094 regional community college students participated in a UWB survey regarding college transfer. The largest response was from Bellevue CC (n=579) and the smallest from Cascadia (n=60). Shoreline generated 202 responses, while Everett generated 253.
- 974 of these students indicated some desire to attend a 4-year school
- Of these 47% or 466 students when asked the likelihood they would apply to UWB or UWT or Neither, indicated they would apply to UWB
- Six factors scored most highly in questions related to transfer. These include
  - Transfer of credits
  - Quality of Instruction
  - Availability of Preferred Major
  - Degree of Career Preparation
  - Getting Good Grades
  - Commuting Distance
  - Interdisciplinarity, small class size and campus life scored much lower
- Among all students the 5 most desired categories of study were
  - Business 24.8%
  - Health/Nursing 19.1%
  - Social Sciences 16.0%
  - Computer Science 10.4%
  - Sciences 8.6%
- Among students interested in UWB existing programs, preferences are:
  - Business 30.8%
  - Nursing 18.7%
  - IAS 18.7%
  - CSS 9.7%
  - Education 3.9%
- These same students were asked about other possible degrees in planning or discussed at UWB. The degrees which received interest from 15 or more students included
  - Psychology (BS)
  - Health Sciences or Pre-health Professions
  - Architecture and Interior Design
  - Human Resources
  - Communications and Media
  - Law
APPENDIX C  First Report on Community College Survey

INTRODUCTION: Over the period from March 21 to June 2, 1094 students at four regional community colleges responded an e-mail request to complete an online survey about their college plans. The survey remains open, but we do not anticipate a significant number of new responses. A similar survey had been piloted in Tacoma last year.

BACKGROUND: Our survey was designed to help us better assess the potential transfer student market. Internal surveys in the past have failed to identify student who have not chosen to apply or attend UWB.

Our fall 2007 first year student report demonstrated that our draw among first year students was highly concentrated among students who were either interested in a Business or CSS degree. After experiencing their first year, a large proportion of our students indicated that they were either considering or planned not to graduate from UWB. First year students appear to attracted to UWB primarily because is conveniently located for commuters, because of our and the UW Seattle reputation for quality, and because of their interest in specific academic programs.

Over the past 7 years, there has been relatively little growth in undergraduate enrollment outside of CUSP. From 2001 to this year, growth was greatest in Business (74.5 FTE), Nursing (38.6 FTE, though a more substantial % gain), Teacher Certification (38.1). IAS, the largest undergraduate program increased by 30.2 FTE, while CSS fell by 74.3. It is however, worthwhile to note that 2001 makes a difficult base year because enrollments surged due to recession (except in computing due to the dot.com crisis). Enrollments fell in the next year. Using 2000 as a base year puts IAS performance closer to other programs (expanding nearly 25% over 8 years, where Business – the next smallest percentage growth program—grew by 42%). However, the decline in CSS becomes larger.

As the campus accepts greater FTE targets in order to expand programs, enrollment has failed to keep pace. This background explains why it is imperative that UWB do a better job understanding the potential transfer, which is the purpose of the Community College Survey.

RESULTS

1. CC Students responses. Of 1094 responses, 80 students indicated they were not interest in attending a four year school, and another 74 indicated they were not sure. Those students who were sure they would not apply to a four-year school, were not asked supplementary questions related to UWB or UWT. Cascadia College produced 60 responses, the smallest number among the four (unlike other schools, they sent out no reminder, but they also have the smallest enrollment). Turnout was larger at the other 3 schools, Everett (n=253) Shoreline (n=202), and Bellevue (n= 579). Response rates were typically under 5 percent, though an analysis of 13000 Bellevue e-mails suggest the vast majority of students did not open their mail.
2. What are the most important transfer factors among students who indicate they are likely to apply to UWB?

Using a five point scale the 6 items receiving highest scores involved
   1. The ability to transfer credits from current institution (4.9)
   2. The quality of instruction (4.8)
   3. The availability of desired major (4.7)
   3. Preparation for a career (4.7)
   4. Getting good grades (4.7)
   5. Commuting Distance (4.6)

Factors we have given considerable attention to that scored substantially lower include:
   1. Small class size (4.1)
   2. Interdisciplinary Curriculum (3.6)
   3. Campus Size (2.8)
   4. Campus Organization and Activities (2.6 and 2.4)
   5. Childcare (1.9)

This data reinforces much of what we have learned. Community college students who come to UWB appear to be interested in pragmatic concerns like preparation for their career, majors, grades and transfer credits. Many of these student, have attended to community colleges because of family or work commitments in the region, and therefore do indicate the same degree of preference for quality campus life as do younger students beginning college for the first time.

3. What are the most important factors among students who indicate they are NOT likely to apply to UWB?

   a. LOCATION.
      At each college the largest percentage of students who indicate they are not interested in UWB generally name inconvenient location as their primary factor. This factor is typically named by 40 to 50% of respondents, it was highest at Everett and Bellevue and lowest at Cascadia.

   b. MAJORS.
      Our survey asked four questions about majors, including what their current program of study is, what their desired degree would be, what existing UWB major they were most likely to be interested in, and finally, among majors under possible consideration at UWB, what were their preferred options. The last two questions were asked only of student who indicated an interest in attending UWB.

   b.1 DESIRED MAJORS.
      Desired programs of study at community colleges may be broadly classified as follows:
      Business 24.8%
APPENDIX C  First Report on Community College Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health/Nursing</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Nursing is 14.1% of this total)
(Social science, law, history, policy, etc)
(Includes information technology)
(Excludes 5% health sciences above)
(Includes Studio Art and Languages)

N = 733 and excludes all students who wrote in another degree option.

b.2 Interest in UWB by Desired Major.
Among the 733 students above about half express some interest in applying to UWB. As has been noted in a similar analysis of first year students, the percentage of students indicating interest is typically above average among those for whom UWB offers corresponding majors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who desire majors not related to UWB’s current curriculum are much less likely to indicate interest in UWB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law or Public Policy</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students whose interests are roughly be duplicated by existing programs indicate interest at approximately the school average (history, social science, urban planning, environmental Studies, and humanities).

b.3 Preferences for existing UWB Majors
The survey asked the 465 student who indicated that they are likely to apply to UWB which of our existing majors they would prefer. These responses are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mngmnt</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrktg</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tx and Innvtn</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mngmnt Info Systm</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Nursing).............................................. 18.7%

IAS.......................................................... 18.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEB</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STE</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Psych</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cla</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Studies</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global St</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Computing</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 Cert</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Cert</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.4 Preferences for majors under consideration
When given a chance to indicate preferences for majors that are being planned or have been talked about at UWB, 120 of the 465 students indicating interest in UWB indicated a preference for one of the existing UWB majors.

The most frequently indicated majors were
- Psychology (BS) 50
- Health Sciences or Pre-health Professions 49
- Architecture, Design and/or Planning 22
- Human Resources 19
- Communication and Media Studies 16
- Law and Social Justice 16
- Electrical Engineering 15
- Biology 13
- STS 13
- History 11
- Public Health 11
- Creative Arts 10

**Combinations of Similar Fields**
- All Engineering (Elect, Engrg, Civil, Mech) 32
- Law & Soc Policy (16), Public Policy, Pol, Econ(10) 26
- Creative Arts or Interdisciplinary arts 17
- Environmtl Studies/Science 14

Others included fields were:
- Chemistry 9
- Literature 3

It is worth noting that Psychology primarily students drew away from groups existing majors: Psychology (14,), SEB (8) and None of the Above (10).

Among the 120 students who said that they were most interested in one of the existing majors, the largest group came from Nursing (36), Accounting (21), CSS (18) and Management (13). These four total 88 of the 120. Only four originally named IAS option IAS options. It may be
possible to interpret these data as distinguishing between those who come to UWB for a particular program of study and those for whom the program is not the major draw.

c. Naming
Follow-up questions were included to determine whether names mattered to students for several of these fields.

Sciences: In Biology and Health Sciences, substantially more students were attracted by the name Health Sciences. Pre-health Professions was a relatively close follow-up. Biology did not appear to have a substantial independent draw.

Planning and Design: Among 22 student indicating architectural and planning fields, the preference was for Architecture and Interior Design. Almost of this demand came from Bellevue, and likely corresponds with their interior design program.

Law and Policy: Follow-up questions to 26 students choosing policy or law produced a virtual tie between Law, Politics and Economics and Law and Social Justice. The former name received slightly fewer extreme negatives, while the later had slightly more positive responses. While the name law and social justice was field tested across all schools, it was not included in the prior questioning about possible majors except in Bellevue. In previously polled colleges the name for public policy and or political economy varied slightly.

Arts: Among the 17 students indicating a preference for Creative Arts or Interdisciplinary Arts were relatively small and when those names were field test with others, there was little difference among the two, and only fine arts, among the other field tested names, received any substantial interests.
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The Task Force met with the academic program directors on August 5, 2008, and the following is a summary of the major points discussed.

An exchange of views regarding faculty funding formula produced the following concerns and points:

• Most program directors would like to have a transparent funding formula in order to be able to plan for the future.

• Most program directors would prefer the formula to leave discretion to their faculty on how best to alter the margins related to accountability (i.e., how programs are designed, whether classes are larger, whether more or fewer part-time faculty or senior lecturers are used).

• The current formula has not facilitated the growth of wholly new programs. Existing programs have been reluctant to take on substantial new FTE targets, while there has been no one to speak for the creation of new programs.

• Growing new programs means that existing programs must achieve greater enrollment efficiencies than they have in order to support start-ups. In short, funding new programs threatens existing programs.

• Existing programs find the current funding environment challenging.

• Nursing notes that it brings in some additional funds on its own, and that it has recently moved toward 5 credit courses. There are also plans to try to work with larger non-nursing undergraduate classes.

• Education faculty are currently scheduled to teach six three-credit courses, but are moving toward five credit courses and expect to achieve some efficiencies in this way. Without firm funding commitments, gateway courses might end up being taught by adjunct faculty which is something most programs prefer to avoid.

• Business is mainly interested in securing commitments, but imagines that it is likely they will have to increase class size in undergraduate courses. Business achieves high course enrollments at the graduate school by creating a streamlined program in which the entire cohort attends each class. The graduate program is taught primarily by tenure track faculty.

• IAS faces similar problems with the other programs and prefers to make its own decisions about how to stretch resources. Efficiencies have been achieved through the creation of the PIP program, which uses advanced graduates under the mentorship of
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current tenure track faculty. IAS is concerned that the funding formula masks unequal resources per student when average faculty cost and other expenses are factored in.

• CSS leadership expressed the least interest in a strict funding formula. They also note that their lower average class sizes are partly offset by relatively high production of independent study (low credit courses). The concern here is that the campus must make and keep commitments to programs, at least until their maturity.

• Accreditation standards are important to the professional programs and set baseline expectations for student-faculty ratios, and in many cases, to full and part-time ratios.

• Funding formulas currently reflect high part-time student participation in Education and Nursing. This means that there are more heads per FTE requiring advising and grading. We discussed whether the increased work necessarily involved more faculty time, and whether some of this time might be offset by higher levels of staffing.

• Several programs are concerned about whether they would want to take on additional FTE’s in the short run if they are not automatically given additional funding for the overages. We discussed the possibility that they would receive some fixed proportion of tuition revenues. Two main concerns about this surfaced. One concern was that this would represent a lower base funding and probably result in greater use of part-time faculty. The other, and related concern, is that this might become a permanent funding pattern. So, it would be necessary to ensure that temporary funding of this sort was rectified with permanent dollars as the overages are added back into a funding metric.

• The existing formula implicitly makes some statement about student access to faculty, and is adjusted on the basis of perceived advising and individual contact for specific programs (graduate, Nursing, Education, and Lab Sciences). However, after conversions of lines to lecturers and part-timers, student access to core faculty may vary considerably due to program choices.

The following areas were identified as potential modification of the funding formula:

• Use a unitary ratio for graduate and undergraduate faculty lines. Currently preferential treatment for graduate students puts incentives on graduate relative to undergraduate students. A unitary measure allows programs to decide which to emphasize, along with other concerns within their programs.

• Providing a fixed dollar per student was also briefly discussed. Such a measure would likely prioritize low cost degrees and could sacrifice the diversity of offerings necessary to bring more students on board. However, discussion also indicated that we have limited consensus on how we want the campus to grow, and whether any limits on the relative size of single programs is appropriate.
• Increases in the funding student ratio per faculty as a source of funding new lines produced a number of concerns. Most notably is that the changes not be retroactive, but rather be only on new hires. Concern was also voiced that any funding formula should take into account external sources of funding and differences in tuition.

• There was little agreement on a common metric, but among the data measures that directors appear to want to review are courses and students per funded line, cost per student, and cost relative to revenue per student.

Discussion with the Task Force members on August 18, 2008

• Rather than a suggested funding formula, the task force felt that models were a better approach to the topic

• 21st Century Campus Initiative Funding Growth Model Guidelines

• FTE formula needs to go beyond enrollment – to benefit campus as a whole (incubation and growth moneys) - Invest in growth – and implement programs for which you can recruit students.

• FTE formula should create incentive for enrollment and growth

• Separate instructional vs. growth funding (split by percentage, or a funding metric) – some money needs to be dedicated to institutional growth funds

• FTE formula has to follow the students for the programs to remain sustainable

• Programs can't plan without FTE formula

• Programs should be allowed to prioritize funding – there needs to be a balance between quality of instruction and flexibility of fund allocation

• Formula to determine what we want our institution to look like – who are our aspirational peers?

• To aid in thinking about how to construct a funding model, determine metrics such as courses and students per funded faculty line, (to show variations between targeted and actual), cost per FTE, and Revenue/Cost per FTE for all programs.

Written comments submitted by Michael Stiber, Interim Director of CSS, on September 7, 2008, and in regards to the challenge associated with developing a successful funding model for UWB
The Enrollment Management Task Force has been directed to make recommendations regarding re-institution of an FTE funding model. According to the draft document circulated by the Task Force, Barrier 11 to increased enrollment states, "Absence of a FTE funding model hinders planning and places quality of student experiences at risk. A well-designed funding model will define crucial incentives for institutional growth management." However, I do not see that this assertion follows logically from experience at UWB. In fact, the faculty FTE funding model has only been absent for a year, during which enrollment has increased significantly and great strides have been made in strategic planning and creation of new degrees. I understand that there is great support for an FTE funding model; it should be justified on the basis articulated in meetings by its proponents, which has not primarily been its potential to increase enrollment.

Personally, I am skeptical that one can create a model that can at once be flexible enough to do all the things desired of it (take into account the heterogeneous nature of our different programs, allocate sufficient funding for creation and support of new programs, etc) and be transparent (one of the major motivations for a model). It may be decided to go ahead anyway, but please allow me to express some cautions in the hope that, if a model is created, it will address these issues.

1. Models can create incentives for programs, and by extension for the campus, that are not in the best interest of students:

   a. They can discourage innovation by prioritizing incremental growth of existing programs over creation of new programs.

   b. They naturally focus financial decisions on increments of new funding, rather than the entire budget.

   c. They may ignore the cyclic nature of enrollments in some degrees that are driven by macro-economic factors. This happens when they don't average over time or across clusters of disciplines. This in turn can inhibit strategic decisions, such as counter-cyclic hiring, in which faculty might be hired during "down years" -- when jobs are scarce -- and instead drive hiring when degrees are popular and faculty may be hard to recruit. In effect, models run the risk of creating funding decisions at too small a level of "granularity" in space and time. In many complex situations, seeking to optimize matters at the small scale (i.e., programs and individual years or biennia) does not result in global optimization (the campus over multiple biennia).

   d. The accounting-driven nature of decision-making under models can greatly discourage cross-programmatic activities, purely as an artifact of the way
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FTE accounting is done. For example, it can be difficult to create interdisciplinary courses merely because the FTE accounting cannot be worked out.

2. By using models, I believe that we may make our under-enrollment much higher profile than it could be. Instead of focusing on true barriers to enrollment over many years, we instead may focus attention on the smallest actions that will produce the next increment in enrollment. In other words, it can promote a tendency to look at the symptoms, rather than the underlying problems and solutions.

3. FTE-driven models may not take into account ways other than just increased enrollment that a program can justify itself, such as securing extramural funding, increasing the campus's intellectual breadth, or serving as a starting point for the campus's expansion into new areas.

4. Such models may justify faculty lines solely on the basis of number of FTE, rather than on what programs will do with them. As an institution of higher learning, we should assert that, while it is necessary to be fully enrolled over time, it is not sufficient to merely be fully enrolled.
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Continued Growth for 2 Distance Ed Models

Two unique models of providing distance education to mainly nontraditional students are coming into their own, each showing a healthy expansion of enrollments and growth in available course offerings. One, the Online Consortium of Independent Colleges & Universities, has been enlarging since its inception, while the other, Western Governors University, faced years of skepticism from critics who said its ambitious goals would never be met. Now, both are testing their success with fresh numbers and statistics, suggesting that online education needn’t only come from large for-profit companies or local community colleges.

In 2005, Regis University announced a consortium of colleges that would work together, rather than compete, to share each other’s online courses in a way that would in effect vastly expand the offerings of each of the group’s members. Since then, the 39 founding colleges of the OCICU have expanded to 68, with 1,784 course enrollments over the past year.

The model is unusual in that it allows colleges that are interested in offering courses online, but don’t necessarily have the resources to cover every conceivable topic, to supplement their catalog with classes that already exist — in the consortium and on the Web, but not on their campuses. So far, seven of the member colleges, including Regis, act as “providers,” essentially allowing other colleges in the group to pick and choose which courses to make available to their own students, with full institutional credit assigned through the student’s college.

“We’ve just experienced remarkable growth and great feedback from the schools participating,” said Thomas R. Kennedy, executive director of new ventures at Regis. “Especially as member schools ... they don’t have any online schools whatsoever, and overnight they have one. That’s one of the beauties of it.”

That near-instant capability can serve students in a number of ways. Do they need to fulfill a general elective requirement, like sociology or political science? The providers offer plenty of possibilities for students at colleges that don’t have the resources to fill every gap in the curriculum. What about students interested in a niche topic, like Irish studies? Some of the providers, as well as members that are planning on offering up courses to the rest of the consortium in the future, have such offerings as well.

Many, but not all, of the member colleges are religiously affiliated, and most fit the profile of small- or medium-sized institutions in the Council of Independent Colleges that may not have the resources to get into the
distance education business on their own. Members pay a one-time fee of $3,500 to join the consortium plus an annual fee of $1,000, Kennedy said, to cover administrative costs. Of the approximately $1,350 in tuition for a three-credit course, he added, about $500 would go to the provider school per student — essentially extra cash for a course that was already being held, he pointed out — and $700 would remain at the student’s home college, which would incur no additional cost.

“All these provider schools are doing is opening up their classes … to visiting students, in a way,” he said. The key difference, however, is that students receive credit as if they took the courses at their own institutions, rather than as transfer credits.

Kennedy said he’s been urging member colleges to pocket that extra tuition money “and start investing in your own online program.”

Some are doing just that. Keuka College, in upstate New York, administers degree completion programs by partnering with hospitals and community colleges across the state. To help students in its various programs who need to take a specific course or two to complete their degrees, the college can now send them to offerings available online through the consortium.

“We found that by using courses offered through the consortium, we could offer students more forms of access,” said Gary Smith, associate vice president for professional studies and international programs at Keuka, especially for the “general education or general elective pool that’s outside our major program offerings.”

This year, Keuka will ramp up its own online courses by playing to its strengths: If all goes according to plan, Smith said, the college will add classes in Asian studies to the consortium’s lineup.

A ‘Competency-Based’ University Takes Off

Another model that’s meeting or exceeding the expectations of its leaders is breathing a sigh of relief. Western Governors University, founded in 1997 by 19 state governors, started with ambitious plans to grow its enrollment and become a regional economic engine. But the initial plans faltered and the university found itself the object of criticism and even scorn — although that wasn’t necessarily confined to Western Governors.

“If you go back to the mid-’90s, when the idea for WGU bubbled up from among the conversations from the governors of the Western states, there was at that time no clear sense of whether or not online education would work, period, or would work with any level of success and any decent level of quality,” said Patrick Partridge, the university’s vice president of marketing and enrollment. But, he acknowledged, there was plenty of skepticism in academia as well. “I think that skepticism was both of a financial type and sort of an awareness … of the kind of political hurdles in the higher-ed world.”

These days, the picture for both online education in general, and WGU in particular, seems quite a bit brighter. The nonprofit institution, which receives no state support and sustains itself primarily through tuition and private donations, announced this month that it had reached an enrollment of 10,000 students — up from 500 in 2003. That growth can be attributed to a number of factors, including regional accreditation, but the university also emphasizes two features that distinguish it from most of its peers: a “competency-based” approach to assessing students’ work, and its nationally accredited Teachers College.

From the outset, courses and curriculums are developed with input from senior faculty together with an “outside council” including practitioners from a given field. Course material is then assessed to a level that is considered “highly competent,” Partridge said, by the developers of the course, effectively creating a standardized set of requirements in lieu of more independent assessments by individual instructors. Upon completion, employers can theoretically be assured that students are proficient in a specific set of skills and knowledge.
The university doesn’t give letter grades, and it allows students to take as long as they want in their course of study — which could be a mixed blessing, since they pay a flat fee (a bit under $3,000) every six months. All in all, Partridge said, “we are as different from the other online schools as they are from” traditional higher education. It’s a model not suited to everyone, he acknowledged, but especially tailored to students with a certain “impatience” or “determination” to complete in a timely manner.

Another significant draw for WGU is the Teachers College, which, unlike any other such online program, places graduates at schools in virtually every state. Now, at least half of WGU’s students are enrolled in the teaching program. “[W]e offer a path to initial teacher licensure for individuals all around the country who want to become teachers, often later in life where returning to a traditional school of education … is just not that convenient,” Partridge said.

The university projects further growth in the coming years, with a predicted enrollment of up to 15,000 in the foreseeable future. “We really see the future as one in which the people of the United States and the adult audience need to have very good-quality and affordable options to either get a first bachelor’s degree or continue to pursue [a] master’s degree, in particular change careers and pursue dreams that will in the long run strengthen our economy, the citizenry and make our country, our states, etc., stronger,” said Partridge.

— Andy Guess

_The original story and user comments can be viewed online at [http://insidehighered.com/news/2009/06/19/distance](http://insidehighered.com/news/2009/06/19/distance)._
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Introduction

This publication, “Key facts about higher education in Washington,” brings together much of the information one might need to understand and discuss higher education issues.

While this publication does not attempt to answer every question that may come up in discussions about higher education, it highlights the most often-asked questions about institutions, faculty, students, costs, budgets, financial aid, and other topics.

First published in 2002, “Key facts about higher education in Washington” is updated annually by the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). Additional information about higher education is available through the agency’s Web site: www.hecb.wa.gov.

Other Web sites contain useful information on different aspects of higher education and many of these sites are listed throughout the booklet as resources.

HECB responsibilities

The Higher Education Coordinating Board is a 10-member citizen board that administers the state’s student financial aid programs and provides planning, coordination, monitoring, and policy analysis for higher education in Washington.

The board is charged by law with representing the “broad public interest above the interests of the individual colleges and universities.”

Created by the Legislature in 1985, the HECB was formally established in January 1986 as the successor to the Council for Postsecondary Education. Board members are appointed by the governor and confirmed by the state Senate. They serve four-year terms, with the exception of the student member, who serves one year. In January 2006, the members of the board began selecting one of their colleagues as the chair. The agency’s executive director serves at the pleasure of the board.
Major functions of the board include:

- Administering state financial aid programs
- Preparing a strategic plan for higher education
- Recommending budget priorities and policy changes
- Approving degree programs
- Ensuring program quality
- Establishing minimum freshman admission requirements at public four-year colleges and universities
- Helping families save for college
- Motivating young people to go to college
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How well prepared for higher education are Washington students?

Beginning in 2008, high school students will have to meet Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) standards in three areas—mathematics, reading, and writing—to earn the Certificate of Academic Achievement and a high school diploma. Beginning with the class of 2010, students also will have to meet WASL science standards in order to graduate. Because most Washington students will need to attain the Certificate of Academic Achievement before beginning college-level work, WASL performance is an important factor in college preparation. In 2005-06, over half of 10th grade Washington students met the statewide standards in reading and writing. Black, Hispanic, and Native American students lag behind their Asian/Pacific Islander and white peers in 10th grade WASL performance.

2005-06 10th grade WASL scores:
percentage meeting statewide standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2005-06 10th grade WASL scores:
percentage of students meeting statewide standards by race/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction: [http://reportcard.ospi.c12.wa.us](http://reportcard.ospi.c12.wa.us)
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Are college-level learning opportunities available to Washington high school students?

A number of college-level learning opportunities are available to Washington high school students, including Running Start, Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), College in the High School, and Tech Prep.

Running Start
The Running Start program enables 11th and 12th grade students to take college courses at the state’s community and technical colleges and Washington State, Eastern Washington, and Central Washington Universities. School districts pay tuition costs, while students are responsible for books and other expenses. After some initial piloting projects, the program was expanded statewide in the 1992-93 academic year.


Advanced Placement
The Advanced Placement (AP) program offers high school students the opportunity to take college-level courses in their high schools. Students participating in AP may earn college credit, depending on how they score on their AP examinations. Advanced Placement courses are taught by high school teachers following guidelines published by the College Board.

Advanced Placement students, enrolled at both public and private high schools, took 41,132 exams in 2005-06 (which is an increase of 15.2 percent over 2004-05). Of these, 24,663 (60 percent) had passing scores of 3 or higher.

Source: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
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**International Baccalaureate**
The International Baccalaureate (IB) program is a college prep course of study leading to examinations in core fields. Colleges and universities may award credit for International Baccalaureate work, depending on IB examination scores. The program began as a way to establish a common curriculum and university entry credential for students moving from one country to another.


**College in the High School**
College in the High School programs provide college-level courses to 11th and 12th grade students. These courses are offered at the high schools and may be taught by high school faculty who are also adjunct faculty at a college. The courses use the same curriculum, assessments, and textbooks as identical courses offered on campus would use. The courses must be college-level, included in the college’s catalog or an appropriate supplement, and taught as part of the college curriculum.


**Tech Prep**
Tech Prep offers students an opportunity to earn community college credit while still in high school by enrolling in a “tech prep” course. These courses are aimed at preparing students for technical and professional careers by requiring that they earn a B grade; students pay a $15 application fee to the college awarding the credit. Tech Prep credit is awarded for many types of courses, ranging from accounting to auto body repair to drafting and Web site design.

*Source:* Various community and technical colleges.
The Running Start program enables qualified high school juniors and seniors to simultaneously earn college and high school credit by taking courses free of charge at community and technical colleges, Central, Eastern, Washington State Universities, and The Evergreen State College – as well as Northwest Indian College. About 10 percent of all high school juniors and seniors in public schools are taking at least one college course through Running Start.

High school students are tested before being admitted to the two-year colleges to determine whether they are capable of doing college-level work. In fact, the Grade Point Average for Running Start students is comparable to that of similar two-year college students. Research has shown that Running Start students who transfer to four-year universities perform as well or better than traditional college students.

The number of students involved in the Running Start program has grown steadily. In 2004-05, 16,022 students participated (which equals 9,794 FTE enrollments). This represents a 3 percent increase over 2003-04.

**Growth in Running Start enrollments at community and technical colleges continues to increase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* Does not include Running Start students at four-year higher education institutions.
Washington high school students outperform their national peers on college entrance examinations.

Most Washington students seeking admission to four-year colleges take one (or both) of two college entrance examinations – the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or the American College Test (ACT). The SAT is an aptitude test, while the ACT is a curriculum-based achievement test.

- The SAT assesses how well students analyze and solve problems, and many colleges in the nation consider the scores as a measure of the critical thinking skills students need for academic success in postsecondary education. The SAT includes three reasoning tests: critical reading, mathematics, and writing. Scores for each test are scaled from 200-800, with a total composite scoring range of 600-2400.

  Approximately 54 percent of Washington high school graduates in 2005-06 took the SAT. Their average score was 1570 (out of 2400), 52 points above the national average of 1518.

- The ACT includes four tests: reading, English, science, and math. Scoring ranges from 1 to 36 for each of the four tests. A composite score is created by averaging the test results.

  About 15 percent of the Washington high school class of 2006 took the ACT at some time during their sophomore, junior, or senior year of high school. Their average composite score of 22.9 (out of 36) was 1.8 points above the national average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington SAT and ACT average scores compared to national average scores: 2005-06</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 SAT</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 ACT</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How do Washington students’ test scores compare by gender?

Females do not score as well as males on the SAT in math and critical reading, but perform better than males in writing. In Washington, males achieved an average score of 553 on the math portion of the SAT, compared to 515 for females. In all categories, Washington’s students’ average scores were higher than the nation’s students.

SAT mean scores by gender: 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Math Males</th>
<th>Math Females</th>
<th>Critical Reading Males</th>
<th>Critical Reading Females</th>
<th>Writing Males</th>
<th>Writing Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gap between males and females is less pronounced on the ACT than the SAT. In Washington, for example, females outscored males on English and reading, while trailing in math and science. This pattern was true at the national level as well.

ACT scores by gender and subject area: 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Washington Males</th>
<th>Washington Females</th>
<th>Nation Males</th>
<th>Nation Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of students meeting ACT’s College Readiness Benchmark Scores, by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Meet all Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: The College Board and ACT, Inc.
Remedial courses are basic education courses that do not carry college-level credit. Of the 2004 high school graduates who began postsecondary education at Washington’s two-year and four-year colleges and universities within a year after graduating from high school, 37 percent (overall) enrolled in remedial mathematics and/or English courses.

Remediation rates vary by type of college – with four-year institutions becoming more selective and requiring students to attend two-year colleges for needed remedial work.

More students enroll in remedial mathematics than in remedial English, as illustrated in the following table.

### 2004 college remediation:
percentage of high school graduates enrolled in remedial coursework (average for all higher education institutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial mathematics</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial English</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and mathematics</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(students taking both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No remedial coursework</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in college

What do Washington students do after they graduate from high school?

The “Washington State Graduate Follow-Up Study” for the high school class of 2004 indicates that approximately 56 percent of high school graduates enroll in postsecondary education within the first year of graduation. Because data are not available for about 11 percent of graduates, this percentage is likely even greater.

In addition, data indicate that 33 percent of high school graduates are employed and not attending college. However, it is important to note that most college students are also employed—in addition to their postsecondary pursuits.

Pursuits after graduating from high school: class of 2004

There are differences in the college-going rates for racial and ethnic groups.

Within one year of graduating from high school, Asian students enroll in college at the highest rates. Students of other racial/ethnic backgrounds enroll at lower rates.

Percentage of high school graduates going to college, by race and ethnicity:

2004
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How many students transfer from a Washington community or technical college to a four-year institution?

About 15,000 Washington community and technical college students transferred to four-year institutions in 2004-05. Not all transfer students have degrees and not all students with two-year degrees transfer.

Approximately three-fourths of the students transferred to public four-year institutions; this includes more than 1,800 Running Start students. In addition, over 3,000 students transferred to other baccalaureate institutions, either in-state or out-of-state (this includes 475 students who transferred to the University of Phoenix and 210 to Portland State University).

Most students transferring from the community and technical colleges enter the public four-year institutions

Source: State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Academic Year Reports, Student Progress and Success, p. 3.
Transfers

What percentage of new students at public four-year institutions transfer from community and technical colleges?

Overall in Washington’s public baccalaureate institutions, transfer students from Washington community and technical colleges make up 26 percent of the new entering undergraduates.

The share at the research universities is 17 percent; at branch campuses it is 82 percent; and at the comprehensive institutions it is 30 percent.

Community college transfers make up about a quarter of all new undergraduates at public four-year institutions


Notes: Students with Running Start credits are included in “high school.” “Other” includes transfers from Washington four-year institutions, transfers from out-of-state, and unknown.
Transfers

What are the trends in student transfer rates?

While the overall number of transfer students continues to increase, only about 20 percent of the community college students who say they intend to transfer to a public four-year institution actually do so within two years.

Source: HECB analysis of data provided by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Entering college is only the beginning of the postsecondary journey for the state’s students. How well do these students proceed to graduation?

“Retention” rates, also referred to as “persistence” rates, measure the proportion of students enrolled at an institution in any given year – excluding graduates – that return for the next academic year. Of particular concern are freshman retention rates, as attrition is highest between a student’s first and second years.

The four-year public institutions are under a legislative mandate to make efforts to improve their freshman retention rates.

Typically, freshman retention rates range from about 70 percent to about 90 percent at the four-year institutions.

Source: Fall 2006 - reports submitted by baccalaureate institutions to the Higher Education Coordinating Board.
Achievement

How quickly do public undergraduate students earn degrees?

Graduation rates include the proportion of entering freshmen who earn degrees within six years of beginning their studies, as well as the percentage of transfer students with associate degrees who earn bachelor's degrees within three years.

Six-year graduate rates vary widely across the four-year public institutions in the state. This variation may be due mainly to differences in the level of academic preparation that students bring to the schools.

### Six-year graduation rates at the four-year public institutions for students who enter as freshmen

- EWU: 48.2%
- CWU: 49.1%
- TESC: 55.6%
- WWU: 61.3%
- WSU: 60.2%
- UW: 74.2%

*Sources: Data submitted to HECB by public baccalaureate institutions, and SBCTC data. Note: graph shows the percentage of students who entered public baccalaureate institutions as freshmen in 1999 and graduated in 2005 (TESC and UW) or entered in 2000 and graduated in 2006 (CWU, EWU, WWU and WSU).*

### Three-year graduation rates at the public four-year institutions for transfer students with associate degrees from Washington two-year public institutions

- 1998-2002: 62.3%
- 2003-05: 68.8%
- 2005-06: 70.3%

*Sources: Data submitted to HECB by public baccalaureate institutions, and SBCTC data*
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How many degrees and certificates are awarded each year at the community and technical colleges?

Community colleges award associate of arts degrees that prepare students for transfer or recognize two years of general education. Community and technical colleges also award associate degrees in applied technologies in several hundred programs as preparation for technical and paraprofessional positions.

Community and technical colleges award certificates in a variety of specific job-related programs. Certificate programs range in length from several weeks to more than two years. Colleges also help thousands of adults complete high school or earn the General Education Development (GED) certificate. In addition, nearly a thousand students each year complete apprenticeship training.

Degrees, college-level certificates, and other awards from community and technical colleges:
1995-96 and 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Achievement**

How many degrees are awarded each year at four-year institutions?

Public four-year institutions award the majority of degrees in the state. Private institutions (both non-profit and for-profit) also produce significant numbers of degree recipients.

**Awards at public four-year institutions**

*have increased for all types of degrees: 1995-96 and 2005-06*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>1995-96</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>17,396</td>
<td>20,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>3,868</td>
<td>4,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Awards at independent four-year institutions**

*have increased for most types of degrees: 1995-96 and 2005-06*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>1995-96</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>5,173</td>
<td>7,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>4,498</td>
<td>4,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (U.S. Department of Education).*
Women earn a larger share of bachelor’s degrees than men. However, men and women receive disproportionate numbers of degrees in certain fields of study.

| Percentage of students, by gender, earning bachelor’s degrees: 1995-96 and 2005-06 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                                      | 1995-96         | 2005-06         |
| Women                                 | 54.8%           | 56.6%           |
| Men                                   | 45.2%           | 43.4%           |

Program areas in which one or more Washington public four-year institutions disproportionately awarded degrees: 2004-05

**Female Students**
- Family and consumer sciences/human sciences
- Health professions and related clinical sciences
- Education
- Public administration and social service professions
- Psychology
- Visual and performing arts
- Foreign languages, literatures, and linguistics
- Area, ethnic, cultural and gender studies
- Communication, journalism, and related programs

**Male students**
- Computer and information sciences
- Engineering technologies/technicians
- Engineering
- Mathematics and statistics
- Business, management, and marketing
- Architecture and related services
- Physical sciences
- Parks, recreation, leisure, and fitness studies
- History
- Security and protective services
- Philosophy and religious studies
- Social sciences

*Sources*: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (U.S. Department of Education) and HECB study, *Gender Equity in Higher Education*, December 2006.

*Note*: Programs listed in italics are highly disproportionate (a variance of 20 or more percentage points from the institutional mean). Others listed range from a 10- to 20-percent variance.
Over time, there have been small increases in the proportion of bachelor’s degrees earned by minority students. However, diversity within the state’s higher education system does not reflect diversity in society.

### State population compared to college enrollment, by race and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2004: Percentage of population ages 17-39 (%)</th>
<th>Fall 2005: Undergraduate enrollment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or Nonresident Alien</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source*: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (U.S. Department of Education).

*Note*: Data reflect public and independent four-year institutions.
Achievement
Race & ethnicity

What are the trends of college-going rates for racial and ethnic minority students?

Percentage of high school graduates enrolling in college by race/ethnicity: 1998-2003

Source: WSU Social and Economic Services Research Center for the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Washington State Graduates Follow-up Study (various years)
**Achievement**

What percentage of Washington residents hold at least a bachelor's degree?

Washington ranks 11th nationwide in the number of state residents with a bachelor's degree or higher.

**Percentage of 25 – 64 year olds with a bachelor's degree or higher**

![Bar chart showing percentage of 25-64 year olds with a bachelor's degree or higher by state. Washington ranks 11th.](chart.png)

*Source: 2000 U.S. Census.*
**Achievement**

How does education level affect income?

Most Washington residents with a high school diploma and those with at least some college experience — including bachelor’s degree recipients — earn more than the national average. However, the average income for Washington residents with a master’s or doctoral degree is less than the national average.

### Average income compared to education attainment

APPENDIX G. Knocking at the College Door, Projections of High School Graduates by State and Race/Ethnicity, 1992 – 2022

Knocking at the College Door
Projections of High School Graduates by State and Race/Ethnicity, 1992-2022

WASHINGTON

At over 3.3 million, the nation’s graduating class of 2007-08 is projected to be history’s largest. In fact, 2007-08 will mark the last year in an era of continuous growth in the nation’s production of high school graduates, a period that reaches back to 1992. Over that time, the number of graduates swelled by 26.7 percent. In 2008-09, however, our country will begin a protracted period during which its production of high school graduates is expected to stagnate, assuming existing patterns persist. The number of graduates nationally will dip slightly over the next several years before growth resumes at a slower pace around 2015. Ultimately, projections indicate that between 2004-05 (the last year of available actual data) and 2021-22, the number of high school graduates will grow by approximately 265,000, or 8.6 percent.

The national data obscure significant variations in this picture at the regional and state levels, however. Regionally, in the decade leading up to 2004-05, the number of high school graduates grew the fastest in the West at 24 percent, with the South growing by 23.5 percent, the Northeast by 20.7 percent, and the Midwest by 14.2 percent. But the regions face very different futures in the years to come. The South will see the most growth in its production of high school graduates, at about 9 percent by 2014-15, and the West’s numbers will climb by 7.1 percent. But the number of graduates produced in the Northeast and the Midwest will decline – by 6.1 and 3 percent, respectively.

As with the national view, the regional picture masks considerable variation at the state level (Figure 1). Washington produced 13,217 more graduates in 2004-05 than it did a decade earlier, an increase of 25.4 percent. However, projections indicate that the state will experience slowing growth in its production of high school graduates in the years ahead, assuming existing patterns of high school completion and migration continue. The state projects to have about 2,271 more high school graduates in 2016-17 than in 2004-05, an increase of about 13.3 percent. Virtually all of that growth will occur by the graduating class of 2007.

Washington experienced extremely rapid growth in its production of high school graduates between 1991-92 and 2004-05, the last year for which actual data were available (Figure 2). That year, 61,094 students graduated from public high schools in Washington, 15,713 more graduates than were produced in 1991-92, which represented growth...
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of 37.7 percent. Nonpublic schools in Washington contributed an additional estimated 4,091 graduates in 2004-05, and their production level is expected to remain basically unchanged the years ahead. Of the state’s total number of high school graduates each year, nonpublic schools produced an estimated 6 percent, on average.

Along with much of the rest of the nation, Washington is poised to enter a new period characterized by much more stagnant growth or declines in the production of high school graduates. After peaking in 2009-10 at nearly 65,271, the state will begin a brief period of diminishing production in the number of public high school graduates through 2013-14, assuming a continuation of existing patterns of enrollment, progression, and completion. During that timeframe, the number of public high school graduates is forecast to dip by 5 percent. Thereafter, it is projected to begin a modest recovery that boosts the number of high school graduates to just above the 2009-10 level by 2017-18 and then remains basically stable through the remainder of the projected period.

The racial/ethnic composition of Washington’s public high school graduating classes will continue to show diversification over the coming decade and more (Figure 3). In 1994-95, White non-Hispanics accounted for 78.8 percent of the graduates from public high schools. A decade later, that proportion had dropped only slightly to 77.1 percent. But the next decade will see accelerating declines in the share of public high school graduates who are White non-Hispanic, with projections indicating it will reach 67.2 percent by 2014-15.

These changes are roughly comparable to the experience of states all over the country. Although the magnitude may differ substantially, the nation as a whole is undergoing sweeping changes in the racial/ethnic composition of its population. In Washington, as in other states, the big changes are the result of rapid growth in the number of Hispanic high school students and graduates, coupled with a shrinking number of White non-Hispanics in the educational pipeline. Growth in the number of Asians/Pacific Islanders is also an important factor in Washington’s shifting demographic picture. While immigration has contributed to the growth of these populations, signs of the continuing demographic shift are evident in data indicating a dramatic increase in the number of Hispanic births, due in part to a higher fertility rate among Hispanic women.

Graduates from all minority groups in Washington are expected to climb or stay basically unchanged between 2004-05 and 2014-15, while White non-Hispanic numbers will fall substantially. Hispanic graduates from public schools in the state numbered 4,683 in 2004-05, and within a decade Hispanic graduates are projected to number 8,986, an increase of 83.6 percent. The second largest minority group in Washington, Asians/Pacific Islanders, will grow from 5,138 in 2004-05 to 6,662 a decade later (29.7 percent). Black non-Hispanics will increase by 412 to 3,085 in the same time span (15.4 percent). Meanwhile, the number of White non-Hispanic graduates will be down by more than 6,000 (12.9 percent) to 40,904 (Figure 4).

For more information, contact: Doreene Mize, Vice President, Public Policy and Research, 303.541.0221, dmize@wiche.edu; or Brian Prescott, Senior Research Analyst, Public Policy and Research, 303.541.0250, bprescott@wiche.edu.

To view the full publication or to place an order for a bound copy, visit our website at www.wiche.edu/policy.
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