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Ten Years Ago…

- You were likely using dialup at home.
Ten Years Ago

- You accessed web pages built in frames using Netscape.
Ten Years Ago

- The only thing you could do on your cell phone was talk, and you owned a Palm Pilot.
Ten Years Ago
Ten Years Ago

- You still kept “floppies”.
Ten Years Ago

• “Social Networking” involved a bar.
Ten Years Ago…

- Distance Education occurred on cablevision.
- Video was captured and streamed over your VCR.
- Your campus’ or corporate “T-1” connection seemed like a huge pipe.
- “Year” fields had only 2 characters.
The Internet

- Number of hosts:
  - 1999: 50 million
  - 2009: 700 million
Internet Users

• Number of Users:
  • 1999: 360 million
  • 2009: 1.7 billion

• Today, 25% of the citizens of our planet are users of the internet.
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Google

- Today: Of the 137 billion searches performed in the US, 63.5% of them were “Googled”.
- Of all the growth in search volume, 90% was captured by Google, most from increasing the number of searches, not the number of people searching.
E-business: then

- Your main competition was your neighbor.
- Your main market was your neighbors.
- Your static website channeled your customers to your phone number.
E-business: now

- Your main competition can be anyone on the planet.
- Your main market is everyone on the planet.
- Your inefficiencies are discretely outsourced.
Pre 2001

- Web 1.0
  - 50k bandwidth
  - One-way content, static pages
  - Overhyped and overvalued companies: the bubble
- Lasting legacy: dark fiber (Moore’s Law) and pervasive governmental deficits
Post 2001

- Web 2.0
  - 1mb bandwidth/broadband to the home
  - Decentralization of content/user in control
    - users as contributors; participation, not publishing
    - “radical trust” (wikis)
  - Web is the platform: software on web vs. desktop
  - Leveraging data is king
  - *Standards, interoperability.*
Higher Education

- Technology-aided delivery now expected
- Costs of entry/conversion high (CMS)
- Distance ed proliferation, 2008:
  - Growth in higher ed student population: 1.2%.
  - Growth in online enrollment: 17%.
- We have a 1.0 delivery for a 2.0 student
Higher Education

- For-Profits: able to make this leap and change
- Publics: much harder to overcome past infrastructure
  - Community colleges especially underfunded
  - Complex student movement patterns make it harder to create seamless systems
- Need proof?
# CCC Transfer Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>% chg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>50,746</td>
<td>48,321</td>
<td>53,695</td>
<td>52,641</td>
<td>54,391</td>
<td>54,971</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>12,275</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>13,510</td>
<td>13,874</td>
<td>13,909</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>17,083</td>
<td>19,673</td>
<td>20,174</td>
<td>19,530</td>
<td>20,071</td>
<td>23,322</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOS</td>
<td>11,638</td>
<td>12,618</td>
<td>13,140</td>
<td>13,399</td>
<td>13,952</td>
<td>14,464</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Transfers: In State (not CSU/UC), 07-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX</td>
<td>8,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVRY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT TECHNICAL INSTITUTE</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESNO PACIFIC UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Rise of The Phoenix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96-97</td>
<td>2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>3,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td>5,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>5,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>8,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>8,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>8,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Who Transfers to Phoenix?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Phoenix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Up

- Web 3.0?
  - 10mb bandwidth
  - Mobile broadband, wi-max as last mile
  - Full video capability, full multimedia
  - Mobile tech
    - Computing and communication are as one; work/learn anywhere
    - Integrate communication, content, collaboration, layered with location
The New Deal

- AKA: “how Washington & Foundations are leveraging money to advance reform”
  - What it wants is standardization and commonality
  - Foundation influence, State competitions for funds
- Makes HE squirmy, but it is effective
**Areas of standardization**

- Data collection systems
  - Common Data Standards (CDS)
  - State longitudinal K-20 data systems
    - higher aggregation points, but not national
Areas of standardization

- Accountability metrics
  - VSA, VFA, IPEDS, CMSS, other foundation funded frameworks
- Student learning outcomes (SLO’s)
- Assessments
- National, State and System Goals
  - Obama 2020, Lumina 2025
- Performance based funding
Participation vs. Outcomes

High Student Outcomes

Low Participation Rate

Low Student Outcomes

High Participation Rate

550 degrees per FTE

CA 12%
The Golden Quadrant

- Has a variety of fee levels
- Has a variety of funding levels
- Has a variety of fin aid levels
Properties of High Outcome/High Partic. States

- Strong Statewide Articulation/Transfer Agreements
- Common Core Curriculum
- Common Course Numbering
- AA transfer guarantee or Statewide General Ed guarantee
- CTE pathways
Properties of High Outcome/High Partic. States

• Strong online student academic planners and support
• Common assessment tools
• Statewide Transfer scholarships

• In other words...the systems that make it easy for the *student*. 
Technology

- Is the glue of standardization
- We (systems, vendors) are building very good suites of applications/SOA
  - Applications, e-xscripts, e-portfolios, CMS, ERP, student services support
- Tech drives from the back seat
  - CB 21 phenomenon: how a data element is driving change in the CCC
Applause to Us

- Standards have been the logical evolution in the IT world
- Education has not embraced standardization with open arms
  - There are limits and “initiative fatigue”
- What we are doing provides hope that goals can be accomplished in this environment
Thank You

- For everything you are doing.
- You are truly a major part of the solution.
- Have a great conference and keep up the good work.