

Challenging Success: *Can College Degree Completion Be Increased as States Cut Budgets?*

By Stephen G. Katsinas, The University of Alabama
Mark M. D'Amico, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
and Janice N. Friedel, Iowa State University

KEY FINDINGS

- Just 4 of 51 respondents indicate a long-term plan exists to fund operating budgets needed to increase numbers of adults with college degrees/certificates.
- Just 3 of 51 indicate a long-term plan exists to fund capital budgets needed to increase numbers of adults with degrees/certificates.
- Capacity is strained in 24 states, which have growing minority populations.
- 39 of 51 disagree their state funding system adequately rewards community college transfer.
- A large majority (35) said performance funding models are under consideration or implemented.
- By 2:1, graduation rate increases will be difficult to achieve, due to cuts.
- 16 report *de facto* enrollment caps implemented at community colleges.
- 3 of the 5 largest states report their public flagship and regional universities had raised admission standards to limit transfer.

***State Cuts Make Bolstering Degree/
Certificate Completion Difficult***

With deep cuts in state operating budgets, can higher education leaders and policymakers realistically expect our nation's public access colleges to increase graduation rates?

Nine of ten state community college leaders disagree that the long-term plans exist in their states to finance operating and capital budgets needed to expand college degree/certificate completion. Just 4 agree that their state funding systems adequately reward community college efforts to increase transfer to the baccalaureate degree, even as most report consideration/implementation of so-called "performance funding." By a 2:1 margin, state college leaders believe it will be difficult to raise graduation rates due to state budget cuts.

About this study

This report assesses college degree completion issues from the unique perspective of state community college directors responsible for coordination, supervision, and management of community colleges. Since 2003, The University of Alabama's Education Policy Center has documented these issues in our *Access and Funding in Public Higher Education* report series (see http://uaedpolicy.weebly.com/uploads/6/1/7/1/6171842/the_2011_state_survey.pdf).¹ Community colleges are the portal of entry into higher education for millions of academically-talented minority, low income, first-generation and adult students. With caps in enrollments at selective private and public flagship universities in many large states, to increase graduation rates will likely require expanding community

<i>In my state...</i>	<i>To increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates, a long-term plan exists in my state to finance...</i>	<i>The funding and incentive systems adequately reward community college efforts to increase transfer toward the baccalaureate degree.</i>	<i>In light of state funding cuts, achieving increases in graduation rates will be difficult.</i>
	<i>operating budgets</i>	<i>capital budgets</i>	
Agreement	4	3	24
Neutral/Don't Know	11	8	16
Disagreement	36	40	11

Source: 2011 Survey of Access and Finance, Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama

We thank the generous support of



college transfer to public access regional and flagship universities. The broad knowledge of National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges members of policy and practice across all education sectors provides perspective as to where college completion and related access and funding issues stand today.²

The impending deep federal cuts in summer Pell Grants next year, as state budgets are being cut, raises the question: Can college degree/certificate completion reasonably be expanded as tuition is predicted to rise to compensate for state cuts in public access college budgets? *Challenging Success* presents selected results of the 2011 Survey of Access and Finance, conducted from July 5 to August 24, 2011.³ We thank our advisory panel for survey input⁴, American Public University System for support, and NCSDDC members. The responsibility for any errors is ours and ours alone.⁵

We add these caveats in interpreting this report: (1) results are respondents' *perceptions*, not actual measures. State community college directors are most knowledgeable about issues in their own sector; responses to other items can be interpreted as estimates; (2) in most states the community college coordinating agency is **not** assigned formal authority to coordinate the development and monitor progress of long-term state plans for **all** public higher education sectors. Typically, plans are mandated by statute. (3) Responses may not add to 51, as respondents could choose to not answer items.

The Context: Key Findings from Squeeze Play

Our prior report, *Squeeze Play*, which all 51 NCSDDC members responded to, found students and families squeezed as tuition is predicted to rise by twice the inflation rate, while 29 predict flat-funding or cuts in state-student aid programs. Most report cuts in operating budgets for flagship and regional universities, and community colleges. High unemployment has exhausted available WIA/other workforce training funds in 21 states, constricting community colleges' ability to serve workers in need of retraining. *Squeeze Play* also found that to prepare workers for good jobs, funds are needed to expand high demand programs tied to high wage jobs in allied health, engineering, and information technology. This cannot happen if states reduce operating budgets for community

recession has increased pressure on colleges to offer/expand "quick" job training in non-credit areas in most states. *Squeeze Play* concluded access threats are acute in large states with fast-growing minority populations. The operating budget cuts come as enrollments are predicted to rise at community colleges in 2 of 3 states. Facilities construction/renovation was a major need in 48 states.

This is not the first time foundations, and federal and state officials tried to expand college completion in America.

The Benefits of Statewide Coordination

This is not the first era when foundations, and federal and state officials were intensively engaged in efforts to expand the numbers of Americans with college degrees and certificates. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, state coordination of public higher education was strongly recommended as good public policy by higher education experts including A.J. Brumbaugh (1963)⁶ and Lyman Glenny (1966).⁷ A key benefit to state policymakers was more effective use of tax dollars through development and execution of multi-year funding plans. Significant expansion of existing public four-year institutions and the establishment of new ones, and community college systems were needed to deliver on the promise of access to the bulge of children of World War II GIs, the "baby boomers," who approached traditional college-going ages of 18-24 years old from 1965 to 1973.

The planning process began by developing statewide goals and objectives for higher education. This included extending geographic and programmatic access to all citizens by creating a statewide network of comprehensive community colleges, enacting what was proposed by the Truman Commission report of 1947.⁸ This was followed by developing long-range plans to finance the operating and capital budgets needed to sustain those state policy goals. These were typically multi-year plans, as sustained investments were required to create/expand new state systems such as the State University of New York or the California State University System, and new community college systems. While recession might delay funding of multi-year plans, the public planning process was essential to convince the public as to the needs and benefits of state investment in public higher education.

Table 2

No Long-Term Plans and Funding Cuts Make Increasing College Degree Completion Difficult

<i>In my state...</i>	A long-term plan exists to finance the operating budgets needed to increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates.	A long-term plan exists to finance the capital budgets needed to increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates.	The funding and incentive systems adequately reward community college efforts to increase transfer toward the baccalaureate degree.	Policies to incentivize improved performance (e.g. funding models based on credits and/or degrees completed) are under consideration/have been implemented.	In light of state funding cuts, achieving increases in graduation rates will be difficult.
Alabama	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Alaska	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Arizona	Agree	Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Arkansas	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree
California	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Colorado	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
Connecticut	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Agree
Delaware	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Florida	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Georgia-TCS	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Georgia-UGS	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Hawai'i	Agree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Idaho	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Illinois	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree
Indiana	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree
Iowa	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Kansas	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Kentucky	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Agree	Agree
Louisiana	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Agree
Maine	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Maryland	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Agree
Massachusetts	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Agree
Michigan	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Agree
Minnesota	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Mississippi	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree
Missouri	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree
Montana	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Nebraska	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Nevada	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
New Hampshire	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
New Jersey	Neutral/Don't know	Agree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Disagree
New Mexico	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree
New York	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree
North Carolina	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Agree
North Dakota	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Ohio	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Oklahoma	Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree
Oregon	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree
Pennsylvania	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Agree
Rhode Island	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Disagree
South Carolina	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
South Dakota	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Tennessee	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Disagree
Texas	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Utah	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Agree
Vermont	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Agree
Virginia	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Washington	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
West Virginia	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Agree	Neutral/Don't know
Wisconsin	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
Wyoming	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Strongly Agree			1	10	6
Agree	4	3	3	24	18
Neutral/Don't Know	11	8	8	5	16
Disagree	28	31	26	8	10
Strongly Disagree	8	9	13	4	1

Source: 2011 Survey of Access and Finance Issues, Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama

Not one respondent from the nation's 9 largest states reports a long-term plan exists in their state to finance the operating and capital budgets needed to increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates.

Is the open door truly open? Respondents from 16 states indicate community colleges have limited the number of class sections, resulting in a de facto cap of enrollment.

With impending federal Pell Grant cuts, tuition rising at more than double the inflation rate and state-funded student aid stagnating in most states, students and their families are being squeezed. ...And the significant reductions in state operating budgets challenge public higher education access colleges committed to serving them.

TABLE 3 Capacity Concerns Lead Public Institutions to Ration Opportunities				
	Community colleges have limited the number of class sections resulting in a de facto enrollment cap at all or some institutions in my state.	To significantly increase numbers of successful community college transfers who obtain baccalaureate degrees requires expanding my state's public universities.	Due to inability to meet the demand of growing transfer numbers, some or all of my state's... ...public flagship universities have raised admissions standards to limit transfer.	...public regional universities have raised admissions standards to limit transfer.
Alabama	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree
Alaska	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Arizona	Agree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Arkansas	Agree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
California	Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Colorado	Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Connecticut	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Delaware	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Disagree
Florida	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Georgia-TCS	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Georgia-UGS	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree
Hawaii	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Disagree
Idaho	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Illinois	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Indiana	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Iowa	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Kansas	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Kentucky	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Louisiana	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Maine	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Maryland	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Massachusetts	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Michigan	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree
Minnesota	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Mississippi	Neutral/Don't know	Agree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Missouri	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Montana	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Nebraska	Neutral/Don't know	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Nevada	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Agree	Agree
New Hampshire	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
New Jersey	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
New Mexico	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
New York	Neutral/Don't know	Agree	Agree	Agree
North Carolina	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
North Dakota	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Ohio	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Oklahoma	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Oregon	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Pennsylvania	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Rhode Island	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
South Carolina	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
South Dakota	Neutral/Don't know	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Tennessee	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Texas	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know
Utah	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree
Vermont	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Virginia	Disagree	Agree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Washington	Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree
West Virginia	Disagree	Neutral/Don't know	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Wisconsin	Strongly Agree	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know	Neutral/Don't know
Wyoming	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly Agree	7	2	1	1
Agree	9	10	5	6
Neutral/Don't Know	10	6	9	11
Disagree	17	25	27	25
Strongly Disagree	8	8	9	8

Source: 2011 Survey of Access and Finance Issues, Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama

Multi-Year Planning Is Needed Today

The need for multi-year planning is accentuated by long-term enrollment increases, even as state support is declining. Nearly 50 years later after “baby boomers” hit their college going years, our nation is in the midst of a new wave of students. From 2009 to 2012, an additional 1 million Americans will reach the traditional college-going ages of 18 to 24 years old. To this is added the 3 million more young adults ages 25 to 34.⁹

Much of the growth has been in America’s minority populations. In 1980 in Illinois, African Americans and Hispanics were 13.8 and 5.6 percent, respectively, of the total. By 2010, Illinois had grown by 1.4 million people, of which African Americans and Hispanics comprised 15 and 16 percent, respectively.¹⁰ Without long-term plans to finance the operating and capital budgets, will there be seats at the table of higher education for them?

State Cuts and Expanding College Completion

Financing plans for access and student success are critical. **Yet few respondents indicate long-term plans exist in their states to fund the operating and capital budget increases needed to increase numbers of adults with college degrees and certificates.** Just 4 respondents agree long-term plans exist in their states to finance operating budgets needed to increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates. A important related long-term capacity issue is the adequacy of the physical infrastructure. In our September 2011 report, 48 respondents said facilities funding was a major need. **But respondents from just 3 states indicate long-term plans exist in their states to finance the capital budgets needed to increase college degree and certificate completion.** A lack of long-term plans for operating and capital budgets means public access colleges may not have the funding needed to provide postsecondary opportunities to America’s growing minority populations. And if they are not funded to perform this function, which institutions will?

Rationing Opportunity at Public Access Colleges

Capacity issues in public access sectors are real and have led to potential limiting of access to postsecondary opportunities. Respondents from 16 states indicate that there are *de facto* enrollment caps at all or some of their community colleges, including many fast-growing ones.

Two of 3 disagree public universities need expanding to increase community college transfers completing baccalaureate degrees—but those agreeing include 4 of the 5 largest states (California, Florida, Illinois, & New York).

Have public flagship and regional universities raised admission standards to limit transfer? Just 6 were in agreement that public flagships had done so, and just 7 agree that their public regional universities had done so (36 and 33 respondents, respectively, disagreed). This is again tempered by the fact that 3 of the nation’s 5 largest states—California, Florida, and New York—agreed with both. How large states are coping with capacity pressures is discussed in further detail below.

***24 states report capacity strains...
Since 2000, nearly all saw
significant growth in their
Hispanic populations***

The Moving Demographic Target Strains Capacity

State planning for public higher education does not occur in a vacuum. Demographics matter; America’s are changing—rapidly. Table 4 summarizes responses from the 24 states indicating capacity strains in one of the four items presented in Table 3. To place capacity strains in context, changes in the total and Hispanic population from the 2000 and 2010 Census are shown. Among these 24, 9 report population increases under 10%, 4 between 5 and 10%, 8 between 10 and 20%, and 3—Arizona, Nevada, and Utah—report population increases above 20% in just ten years.

It is important to note that in our nation’s largest states, small percentage increases in population can mask large increases in numbers. For example, New York’s 2.1 percentage increase in population between 2000 and 2010 translates into an additional 400,000 people. The Empire State’s Hispanic population grew by 19.2% over the decade, which means an additional 549,339 New Yorkers of Hispanic origin. This pattern of Hispanics constituting a substantial percentage, if not a clear majority, of population growth was repeated in nearly all 24 of the states indicating capacity strains.

TABLE 4

States Indicating Access Capacity Strains and Population Growth from 2000 to 2010

	<i>Respondents Indicating "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"...</i>				<i>CHANGE, 2000 to 2010 in...</i>				
	Community colleges have limited the number of class sections resulting in a <i>de facto</i> enrollment cap at all or some institutions in my state.	To significantly increase numbers of successful community college transfers who obtain baccalaureate degrees requires expanding my state's public universities.	Due to inability to meet the demand of growing transfer numbers, admissions standards have been raised to limit transfers at some or all of my state's public...		TOTAL Population Growth		HISPANIC Population Growth		
			flagship universities	regional universities	Number	%	Number	%	
1	Arizona					1,261,385	24.6	599,532	46.3
2	Arkansas					242,518	9.1	99,184	114.2
3	California	California	California	California		3,382,308	10.0	3,047,163	27.8
4	Colorado					727,935	16.9	303,086	41.2
5	Connecticut					168,532	4.9	158,764	49.6
6		Florida	Florida	Florida		2,818,932	17.6	1,541,091	57.4
7	Illinois	Illinois				411,339	3.3	497,316	32.5
8	Louisiana					64,396	1.4	84,822	78.7
9	Maine	Maine				53,438	4.2	7,575	80.9
10		Maryland	<i>Maryland</i>	Maryland		477,066	9.0	242,716	106.5
11	Massachusetts					198,532	3.1	198,925	46.4
12				Michigan		-54,804	-0.6	112,481	34.7
13		Mississippi				122,639	4.3	41,912	105.9
14	Nevada		<i>Nevada</i>	Nevada		702,294	35.1	322,531	81.9
15	New Jersey					377,544	4.5	437,953	39.2
16		New York	New York	New York		401,645	2.1	549,339	19.2
17	North Carolina					1,486,170	18.5	421,157	111.1
18	Oregon					409,675	12.0	174,748	63.5
19		South Carolina				613,352	15.3	140,606	147.9
20		South Dakota				59,336	7.9	11,216	102.9
21	Utah	Utah				530,716	23.8	156,781	77.8
22		Virginia				922,509	13.0	302,285	91.7
23	Washington	Washington	Washington	Washington		830,419	14.1	314,281	71.2
24	Wisconsin					323,311	6.0	143,135	74.2
Total	16	12	6	7					

Note: The largest states are **bolded and italicized**.

Sources: (1) 2011 Survey of Access and Finance Issues, Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama. (2) Data on Total Population Growth and Hispanic Population Growth: Ennis, S.R., Rios-Vargas, M., and Albert, N.P. (2011). The Hispanic Population, 2010. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau. May. Table 2

Without long-term operating and capital budget plans in place, will enough seats be at the table of our nation's public access colleges and universities to serve the growing numbers who want in?

Today, many are concerned with increasing numbers of minorities who make it through community colleges, transfer, and complete baccalaureate degrees. ***Among the 24 states indicating capacity strains, in 15 the Hispanic population grew by more than 50 percent in just ten years.*** Even in states with smaller total population increases, Hispanics increased in the double-digits. Thus, among the 24 states indicating capacity strains, nearly all have seen significant Hispanic population growth between 2000 and 2010.

Sixteen of these 24 report *de facto* enrollment caps, and 12 indicate their public universities need expansion to significantly increase community college transfers obtaining baccalaureate degrees. **And in each state reporting raised admissions standards to limit transfer at their public flagship and public regional universities, the Hispanic population grew substantially.** This is troubling, if minorities are to use community colleges as pathways to the baccalaureate.

In light of state funding cuts, achieving increases in graduation rates will be difficult.

State	Increase in Hispanics, 2000 to 2010		<i>To increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates, a long-term plan exists in my state to finance..</i>		In light of state funding cuts, achieving increases in graduation rates will be difficult.
	Number	%	<i>operating budgets</i>	<i>capital budgets</i>	
California	3,047,163	28	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/DN
Florida	1,541,091	57	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/DN
Georgia-TCS	418,462	96	Neutral/DN	Neutral/DN	Neutral/DN
Georgia-UGS			Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/DN
Illinois	497,316	33	Disagree	Disagree	Agree
New York	549,339	19	Disagree	Disagree	Agree
North Carolina	421,157	111	Neutral/DN	Strongly Disagree	Agree
Ohio	137,551	63	Neutral/DN	Neutral/DN	Neutral/DN
Pennsylvania	325,572	86	Disagree	Disagree	Agree
Texas	2,791,255	42	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Source: 2011 Survey of Access and Finance Issues, Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama

Table 5 presents the Hispanic population increases from 2000 to 2010, juxtaposed with three other survey items: the existence of long-term plans to finance the operating and capital budgets needed to increase the numbers of adults with college degrees and certificates, and the challenge of achieving graduation in light of state budget cuts. Because Georgia’s dual system of community and technical colleges with its Technical College System and its University of Georgia community colleges, 10 responses are presented next to 9 pieces of state data on Hispanic population growth.

In each large state, the Hispanic population growth, numerically and on a percentage basis, was substantial. **Not one respondent from the nation’s largest states indicated a long-term plan exists in their state to finance the operating budgets needed to increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates:** 7 of 10 disagreed, with the other 3 neutral. **And not one indicated that a long-term plan exists in their state to finance the capital budgets needed to increase the number of adults with college degrees and certificates:** 7 disagreed, 1 strongly disagreed, and the other 2 neutral/did not know. When asked if, in light of state funding cuts, achieving increases in graduation rates would be difficult, just 1 respondent strongly disagreed, while 4 agreed and 5 were neutral. We again note responses reported here are perceptions of NCSDDC members, who typically are not the heads of state coordinating agencies charged to devise master plans to finance operating and capital budgets.

Can College Degree/Certificate Completion Expand as States Cut Higher Education Funds?

Taken together, these data call into question states’ capacity to expand system capacity to serve a growing citizenry seeking college degrees and certificates. That our current boom is comprised of large numbers of non-white students makes this conclusion especially troubling. We recommend further study be conducted to analyze statewide plans of the 50 states, to assess if those plans had the explicit goal of expanding access to postsecondary education beyond high school. Such a study could also analyze those plans to see if they had formally stated the goal of extending geographic and programmatic access to all citizens in their states.

Tight state finances continue to threaten access and capacity in many states. Demographic changes similar to those in Illinois can be observed in many states that indicate capacity strains at their public access colleges and universities. The end of federal ARRA stimulus funds, a slow recovery of state tax revenues, and competing state priorities will likely intensify the struggle for scarce state dollars. That so few states report long-term plans exist to finance the operating and capital budgets needed to increase numbers of adults with college degrees and certificates is troubling. By better than 2:1 margin, our survey reveals state community college leaders believe it will be difficult to raise graduation rates due to state budget cuts. For these reasons, we conclude that expanding college degree and certificate completion will be a continuing challenge.

REFERENCES

1. See Katsinas, S.G., D'Amico, M.M., & Freidel, J.N. (2011). *Squeeze play for students and college*, Access and finance issues in public higher education. The 2011 survey of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama. Accessed November 15, 2011 at http://uaedpolicy.weebly.com/uploads/6/1/7/1/6171842/the_2011_state_survey.pdf
2. The National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges is an affiliated council of the American Association of Community Colleges. This report was written independently; neither the NCSDDC nor the AACC formally endorsed it.
3. Responses were received from all 51 NCSDDC members or their designees, representing every state. Puerto Rico, also an NCSDDC member, was not surveyed. Responses from Arizona, Maryland, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania came from their state community college associations. Georgia's responses come from both the University System of Georgia (GA-USG) which coordinates community colleges, and the Technical College System of Georgia (GA-TCS) which coordinates technical colleges across the Peach State. New York's response was from the State University of New York system, not the City University of New York.
4. The Advisory Panel for the 2011 Survey of Finance and Access in Public Higher Education include Marilyn J. Amey, Michigan State University; Anthony P. Carnevale, Georgetown University; Brent D. Cejda, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; Marc Cutright, University of North Texas; Pamela Eddy, College of William & Mary; Linda Serra Hagedorn, Iowa State University; Arthur M. Hauptman, Cary A. Israel, President, Collin College District (TX); Daniel J. Hurley, American Association of State Colleges and Universities; R. Frank Mensel, Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama; Michael T. Miller, University of Arkansas at Fayetteville; James C. Palmer, Illinois State University; Hilary Pennington and Sidney Hacker, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; James O. Rose, Wyoming Community College Commission; Terrance A. Tollefson, East Tennessee State University; Holly Zanville, Lumina Foundation for Education; Eboni Zamani-Gallaher, Eastern Michigan University.
5. The authors thank EPC Fellow Delphine Harris and EPC Research Associate J. Lucas Adair for their assistance.
6. Brumbaugh, A.J. (1963). State-wide planning and coordination of higher education. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. 45 pages.
7. Glenny, L. (1966). Politics and current patterns in coordinating higher education. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, and the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education. November. 32 pages.
8. Zook, G.F. (Chairman). (1947). Higher education and American democracy. Report of the Commission on Higher Education. Six volumes. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 377 pages.
9. DeMonBrun, R.M., and Katsinas, S.G. (2011), forthcoming.
10. Katsinas, S.G. (2011). Stagnating enrollments in Illinois public higher education, 1980-2010. forthcoming.

THE EDUCATION POLICY CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

The College of Education's Education Policy Center seeks to inform and improve education policy-making and practice, and our understanding of the roles education plays in a free and equitable society, through a coordinated program of research, topical and historical analyses of education-related issues, and services for education practitioners and policy-makers in Alabama and the nation. On-going Center projects include:

Annual Surveys of Access and Finance Issues can be found at <http://uaedpolicy.weebly.com/cc-directors-surveys.html>

The Alabama College Transfer Advising Corps (2007-2011) is one of 10 \$1 million national demonstration programs funded by the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. In partnership with the UA Office of Academic Affairs, the Alabama Community College System, and 13 partner colleges, over 24,000 students attending community colleges in high poverty areas received transfer counseling services.

The University of Alabama Superintendent's Academy is a partnership with Alabama State Department of Education to create a more diverse, competent, and prepared applicant pool ready to assume district-/system-wide leadership positions.

The Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges was published in 2006 and updated in 2011. The federal government cannot tell how many community colleges exist, because data are collected by units of accreditation and not districts. The Carnegie Basic codes are embedded in all US Department of Education data bases. EPC Director Steve Katsinas, Senior Fellow Vincent Lacey, and David Hardy of the College of Education are Consulting Scholars to the Carnegie Foundation with this project.

Wayne J. Urban's book, ***More Than Science or Sputnik, the National Defense Education Act*** (2010), provides a comprehensive re-examination of the NDEA. Urban is now working on a biography of former Harvard University President James Bryant Conant.

Director: Stephen G. Katsinas, Ph.D.

Associate Director: Wayne J. Urban, Ph.D.

Director, The University of Alabama Superintendent's Academy: Richard L. Rice, Jr., Ph.D., J.D., C.P.A

Research Associates: J. Lucas Adair, Matthew DeMonBrun, Rebecca Midkiff

Senior Fellows: Mary Allen Jolley, Vincent Lacey, Frank Mensel, Pat Moeck, David Murphy, Robert Pedersen, James "Skip" Dotherow.

Research Fellows: A. Delphine Harris, Michael A. Kennamer, John Clinton Kinkead, Kristie R. Rankin, Melissa P. Tarrant.

Box 870231, Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0231

Telephone: 205-348-2470 - FAX: 205-348-3828

<http://uaedpolicy.weebly.com/cc-directors-surveys.htm>