



System Design Study

March 2, 2009 Meeting Notes

The first meeting of the System Design Study Group was held at the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges in Olympia on March 2, 2009 from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Attendees: Don Bantz (TESC), Jim Bricker (SBCTC), John Gardner (WSU), Roberta Green (HECB), Bill Grinstein (HECB)—via phone, Earl Hale (HECB), Michele Johnson (PC), Linda Kaminski (YVCC), Tom Keegan (PC), Thayne McCullough (GU), George Mills (UPS), David Mitchell (OC), Dennis Murphy (WWU), Jack Oharah—(ECC) via ITV, Wayne Quirk (CWU), Sam Smith (HECB), Doug Wadden (UW)

Other Guests: Vi Boyer (ICW), Charlie Earl (SBCTC), Jesús Hernandez (HECB), Linda Kieffer (EWU), Jim Mike Reilly (COP), Terry Teale (COP), Jan Yoshiwara (SBCTC)

HECB staff Attendees: Ann Daley, Jan Ignash, Jim Reed, Randy Spaulding

Meeting Notes:

Co-chairs John Gardner and Earl Hale welcomed the group and asked members to introduce themselves. Earl then provided the rationale for the study, citing as catalysts the recent efforts to expand higher education in Snohomish and Kitsap counties as well as efforts to expand the community college role in providing baccalaureate degrees. He also noted that each member's role in the group is twofold: 1) to use their best thinking and look beyond a single institutional perspective and 2) to be a communication link to the campus leadership concerning the work of this initiative. He also alerted the group to the possibility that their campus institutional research staff could also be asked to contribute their expertise to the initiative to help with the data analysis portion of this study.

Ann Daley, Executive Director of the HECB, introduced the context for the study, noting that this System Design Study was referenced in both the *2008 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* and the *2008 Implementation Plan*. Redesigning the higher education delivery system is specifically mentioned in the *Implementation Plan* as a key element of the 10-year action plan to strategically expand system capacity and includes degree targets and identified gaps. Ann stated that "We need to lay out a road map for the next 10-20 years so growth and change in higher education isn't done on such an ad hoc basis." The task before this System Design Study group, she added, is to develop recommendations to the questions "How do we fill in the gaps toward a more aggressive goal of degree production?" "How should new campuses grow over time?" "What is an appropriate array of programs?" "What should the enrollment plan for the next 10 years be?" As part of the answer to these questions, the group will also

need to address the concept of “expand on demand” that was described in both the *Master Plan* and the *Implementation Plan* and develop recommendations for rational rules for growth.

Ann reported that both the Legislature and Governor have indicated support the work of the System Design Study group, with expectations that the recommendations from this group will inform decisions that are being discussed in the Legislature, including the issue of building of a new campus in Snohomish County. If HCR 4404 passes the Legislature, the study would be authorized. Terry Teale, Executive Director of the Council of Presidents, added that the Legislature is not looking for a study, but for a *plan* on how the higher education system should be developing. “We need this study to make sure we’re accurately structured to meet the demand,” she said. “Up until recently in this state, we’ve been pretty mission-focused. It’s hard to say if we still are. Maybe so. But we need to look again.” Vi Boyer, Executive Director of the Independent Colleges of Washington added that the group needed to ensure that it stayed focused on the broader vision.

Next, Jan Ignash, Deputy Director with the HECB staff, led the discussion on the components of the draft Work Plan, asking in particular for comments and edits on the study questions, the scope of the study and elements of analysis and the timelines. Among the recommendations for changes to the Work Plan were the addition of language that would include the contraction and elimination, as well as expansion, of programs; consideration of employers’ demand for higher education; and a greater attention to the role of technology and new learning modalities throughout all of the study questions. The group also recommended the inclusion of information concerning current and projected faculty demographics and reward structures as part of the elements of analysis. Jan noted that she intended to revise the Work Plan according to their recommendations and send out a revised draft within a day or two of this meeting. (Note: Revision was sent on March 4, with a request for final edits by noon March 6.) Jan also noted that the purpose of the System Design Study was *not* to conduct a needs assessment because that work had already been completed as part of the 2008 Master Plan initiative. Although a small portion of the data might need to be updated, the Work Plan focused on turning existing data into information so that the System Design Study group could make informed recommendations about system design.

As a last item of business, the group discussed timelines for future meetings and agreed that full day meetings were necessary. Some time during the meetings might also profitably be spent working in smaller groups on specific topics or inviting expert guests to contribute to a topic.

The next meeting is scheduled for May 4 (Monday), from 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (location TBA). Future meetings are also tentatively scheduled for June 15, July 20, September 16, and October 19.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20.