

**Higher Education Study Committee
Goal Group 1, Increasing Educational Levels
SC Commission on Higher Education, Conference Call
10:30 am – 12:30 pm**

September 17, 2008 Meeting Notes

Working Group Members Present

Dr. Suzanne Ozment, Chair
Dr. JoAnne Anderson
Dr. Cheryl Cox
Dr. Debra Jackson
Wayne Landrith
Dr. Tom Moore
Dr. D. M. Parker
Dr. Michael Parsons
Dr. Mary Thornley
Dr. Garrison Walters

CHE Staff Present

Camille Brown
Julie Carullo
Dr. Gail Morrison
Dr. Mike Raley

Other Guests

None

Working Group Members Not Present

Mark Bounds
Dr. Tim Hardee
Adam Jordan
Dr. Valerie West

Dr. Ozment opened the meeting. The document titled “Allocation of Tasks for Goal 1” (attached) was introduced, reviewed, and discussed. The idea of breaking into subgroups to accomplish the work was discussed. It was determined that the work could be accomplished as a committee of the whole.

The differences in the approaches used in North Carolina and Kentucky were discussed. It was noted that the KY plan began with an aspirational goal. At the time KY started its plan, significant resources were made available and the plan was supported by the governor. Over time, leadership changed and there have been decreases in the support for higher education. However, it was also noted that in KY the basis of the goals has remained constant despite the change in leadership. In NC, a more practical approach was employed. The gap between jobs and the educational levels needed was considered. Goals were broken down by level, and the state focused on realistic goals.

The tie between the groups focused on goal 1 and goal 3 (workforce training and educational services) was discussed. Dr. Cox, who is also a participant on the goal 3 group, discussed their work and thoughts on the relationship between the two groups. The goal 1 focus is on improving the pipeline to higher education and increasing the number of graduates at each level of postsecondary education without being specific about the types of degrees and programs needed.

The goal 3 focus is not on attainment per se but on where the needs are and how we prepare people for jobs in needed areas. Good communication is needed between the two groups. It was suggested an editorial group should review the work of both groups to ensure the efforts are not contradictory. It was suggested that CHE staff could serve in this capacity.

The “Analytic Approach” described in the document was then discussed. It was suggested and several agreed that an aspirational goal for a time out in the future (e.g., 2025) should be set. The Action Plan was discussed as the step toward the aspirational goal.

Capacity issues were discussed. The NC focused growth model was discussed and it was suggested that it might not be a good model for SC given the differences in the higher education governance structure in the two states. It was suggested that SC could accomplish by negotiation what NC does by mandate. The group then discussed the setting of enrollment goals and incentives for institutions. The need to consider institutional goals, resources, and statewide needs was discussed. The group requested that information from institutions be collected on current growth plans over the time frame and the needed resources if the goals are to be met. It was noted that the private institutions contribute to meeting capacity needs of the state and it was suggested that Mike LeFever might be able to assist in collecting information from the independent institutions. Challenges of growing enrollment include recruiting qualified faculty, providing student housing, and expanding academic and support facilities. It was clarified that institutions would be setting goals and that there is a need to determine whether the goals are coordinated with the needs.

Potential growth areas were discussed including increasing the numbers of high school graduates and attracting more non-traditional students. The impact of student preparation on enrollment was also discussed. It was noted that more students who are better prepared for college are needed. The work under the EEDA aimed at improving the transition was noted.

The tasks to be accomplished before the next meeting were summarized. CHE staff will continue to work on data, draft a description relating the action plan to a larger aspirational goal, and collect information from institutions on capacity, growth goals and resources. CHE will also work on outlining what the report might look like and providing a template from which the group can work. It was agreed that the more the group had to react to the better.

Upon adjourning the meeting, Dr. Ozment thanked the participants and noted that the next meeting would be on Friday, October 17, at 10:30 a.m. For planning purposes, she noted the meeting could be expected to last about two hours and encouraged everyone to attend in person.

Allocation of Tasks for Goal 1

Revised: October 23, 2008

Preface

The Goal 1 Task Force has a very challenging assignment, one that makes careful parsing of tasks and perhaps also division of labor essential. This short document is intended to provoke discussion on how to make that easier.

Setting Goals

The approach recommended at the initial meeting was to set goals for each of the four areas, then analyze the system to gauge the possibilities, making adjustments for availability if needed. The four areas are: Graduate/Professional, Baccalaureate, Associate, and Certificate. Subsequent to the Goal 1 meeting, the Goal 3 group suggested that its role might be to determine the areas of need for each degree level. This suggests the need for close coordination between the two groups.

Analytic Approaches

A different approach, or one that might complement the macro goal setting described above, would be to examine elements of the potential student resource base and consider what numbers are realistic. This approach could be outlined as follows:

1. Consider South Carolina's educational deficiencies by level and set realistic goals
 - a. Traditional-aged students
 - i. Evaluate the P-12 to higher education pipeline and determine what numbers of new students could reasonably enroll in colleges and universities over the plan years
 1. Secure necessary data and related information
 2. Analyze the pipeline and consider points where change could occur
 3. Develop numerical goals
 4. Consider the allocation of new enrollments among colleges and universities
 - a. With respect to capacity
 - b. With respect to cost
 5. Recommend changes and resources needed to meet the goal
 - ii. Evaluate the in-college pipeline and determine increased numbers of graduates that could result from changes in productivity
 1. Recommend changes and resources needed to meet the goal
 - iii. Recommend plan numbers in both graduates and enrollments?
 - iv. Leave emphasis areas (academic fields) to Goal 3 group?
 - b. Evaluate the adult market and determine what numbers of new students could be brought into higher education
 - i. Consider these different markets
 1. No high school diploma
 2. HS diploma but no college
 3. Some college

4. College graduate seeking increased education
 - ii. Evaluate each market to determine what numbers of new students should enter in colleges and universities over the plan years
 1. Recommend changes and resources needed to meet the goal
 2. Consider the allocation of new enrollments among colleges and universities
 - a. With respect to capacity
 - b. With respect to cost
 - iii. Leave emphasis areas (academic fields) to Goal 3 group?
- c. Attracting and retaining graduates
 - i. Secure appropriate data
 - ii. Evaluate mechanisms and recommend numbers
 - iii. Recommend changes and resources needed to meet the goal
 - iv. Leave emphasis areas (academic fields) to Goal 3 group?

Creating Subgroups

There are two possible ways of establishing subgroup. One would be along the lines of the macro-goal setting approach:

- Graduate/Professional
- Baccalaureate
- Associate and Certificate

Another strategy would be to do the macro setting as a whole and create subgroups for the systems analysis. Consider the following:

Possible connection of tasks to subgroups

- Subgroup 1: Strengthening the P-12 to higher education pipeline/ academic preparation, affordability, and aspirational access
- Subgroup 2: Strengthening the P-12 to higher education pipeline/ transition to college—developmental education
- Subgroup 3: Improving productivity within higher education
- Subgroup 4: Determining capacity and cost for increased traditional enrollments
- Subgroup 5: Adult education—all issues
- Subgroup 6: Attracting and retaining graduates

An alternative to formal subgroups would be assignments to existing groups, e.g. the existing state developmental education group could be asked to make recommendations on their area; university staff who focus on first-year retention could be asked to do the same.

Appendix: Detail on the pipeline

Three major categories to consider: 1) P-12; 2) Transition P-12 to HE; and 3) Inside HE. Although the distinctions seem clear, there are important overlaps as will be described below.

I. The P-12 to HE Pipeline

- a. Academic Preparation
 - i. Curriculum that prepares students for college
 - ii. Teachers who know how to present the material and how to support students
 - iii. School leaders who know how to ensure quality
 - iv. Adequate physical resources
 - v. Other
- b. Affordability
 - i. Level of state support for institutions
 - ii. Low tuition/ need-based aid
 - iii. Affordability guarantees
 - iv. Community scholarships
 - v. Merit scholarships
 - vi. Other
- c. Aspirational Access
 - i. Providing parents with information about financial aid
 - ii. Student mentoring
 - iii. Changing community attitudes
- II. The Transition
 - a. Alignment of curriculum
 - b. Early placement assessment
- III. Inside Higher Education
 - a. Developmental Education
 - b. First-year programs
 - c. Mentoring
 - d. College culture

Note that there is significant overlap in these categories—e.g. affordability is an issue at all levels. Even so, the distribution is useful in determining how to focus.