



MEETING MINUTES

Unified Education Enterprise

June 13, 2007

251-A & B Public Service Building, Salem, OR

Chair: Jerry Berger, Member, State Board of Education

Recorder: Jan McComb, Board Administrator, State Board of Education

Members Present:

Jerry Berger Member, State Board of Education
Nikki Squire Member, State Board of Education
James Sager Member, Office of the Governor

Tony Van Vliet Member, Board of Higher Education
Dalton Miller-Jones Member, Board of Higher Education

Other Attendees:

Pat Burk ODE, Chief Policy Officer
Mark Endsley OUS, Director K16 Alignment
Connie Green CCWD, Special Projects
Margie Lowe Governor's Office, Policy Advisor
Robert Mercer OUS, Director Enrollment Policy
George Pernsteiner OUS, Chancellor
Theresa Levy ODE, Ed Specialist,
Reine Thomas PCC Rock Creek, Dean of Instruction
Elaine Yandle-Roth CCWD, Instructional Program Specialist

Jon Weins ODE, Ed Specialist, Math/PK-20
Michelle Hooper ODE, Director, Systems Coordination
Doug Kosty ODE, Asst. Superintendent, Assessment
Mina Carson OUS IFS, President
Rick Dills Consultant
Jan McComb ODE, Board Administrator
Karen Sprague OUS, V-Provost/Undergraduate Studies
Marcia Stuart OUS, Interim Board Secretary

Common Acronyms:

AA/OT Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer
ATLAS Articulated Transfer and Linked Audit System
EDP Excellence in Delivery and Productivity
CC Community College
CCWD Community College and Workforce Development
CIA Council of Instructional Administrators (Comm. College)
CSSA Council of Student Services Administrators
IDTS Integrated Data Transfer System
IFS Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
JBAC Joint Boards Articulation Commission
K-12 Kindergarten through 12th grade

PK-20 Preschool through advanced degree
ODE Oregon Department of Education
OSA Oregon Student Association
OSBHE Oregon State Board of Higher Education
OTM Oregon Transfer Module
OUS Oregon University System
POP Policy Option Package
SB Senate Bill
SBE State Board of Education
UEE Unified Education Enterprise

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Jerry Berger, Chair of UEE Committee, called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. and welcomed participants. He noted that Gretchen Schuette has retired and no longer sits on the State Board of Higher Education; members from the State Board of Higher Education now are Tony Van Vliet and Dalton Miller-Jones.

2. ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

- Understand and provide guidance on the current status of each item of the UEE Work Plan
- Understand the status of work on SB 342, SB 300/SB 23, SB 23, and SB364/589 and other related legislation coming out of the 2007 session and the relationship of these bills to particular items in the current UEE Work Plan.

Discussion

Chair Berger reviewed the anticipated outcomes of the meeting, items.

3. APPROVAL OF APRIL 2007 MEETING NOTES

Action

Tony Van Vliet moved adoption of the minutes.

Vote

Hearing no objection, the minutes were adopted.

4. STATUS OF ITEMS IN THE UEE WORK PLAN

Alignment of Standards and Assessments – Salam Noor***a. Review of Standards & Assessments***

Salam Noor introduced the work done by WestEd on Oregon's standards and assessments. Jon Weins, ODE, distributed and explained a summary of the findings. The scope of the study was all the content standards, their breadth and depth, and the associated assessments. WestEd is a big organization with expertise in this area. In terms of alignment, WestEd found Oregon above average in terms of alignment. It was as detailed as required by the USDOE peer review standards require. There were some items with partial or no alignment with the content standards. WestEd recommended continual standard review to ensure continued alignment. The use of multiple choice tests may hamper depth of knowledge questions. They suggested looking at the items to see if the appropriate depth of knowledge was being assessed. The final report was due in July. WestEd asked if the content standards really represented the skills and knowledge desired by Oregon, whether the breadth and depth was appropriate, and whether the standards are clear. In terms of alignment, we differ from comparable states in terms of breadth and depth, scope and sequence. Details are coming on what is meant by that. Oregon was also compared to national standards, and Oregon standards were found to be generally good, but also some differences in terms of scope, depth, and sequencing. We will be asking WestEd for more work in four areas. One, to look at Essential Skills and report on the current capacity to absorb these Essential Skills with what is already in place. Two, to look at standards and what best practices would be and assist in identifying "core" standards. Three, look at alignment at a deeper level, deeper than Common Curriculum Goals level used for their initial study. And four, to look at the existing item pool to see if there are standards that could be assessed that are not currently assessed (many are higher order thinking skills).

Discussion:

The reference to Indiana as it is consistently at the top when rating standards. Washington State standards were referenced because geographic proximity. Whether these standards are aligned with higher education expectations. The importance of identifying higher education entrance standards, what's required for success, and getting agreement from among faculty. OUS has General Education outcomes. Research supports that Essential Skills will prepare students for postsecondary education, but need to align and communicate these standards. Achieve expects states to anchor standards to postsecondary requirements. The need for students to be aware of what is expected of them prior to high school so they are on track. The impact of recent funding level on student achievement. Communicating that OUS standards are similar to higher profile universities. Importance of training school counselors on the range of options for students, and need for students to be prepared in a variety of skills and knowledge. The disconnect between students taking rigorous classes, getting high grades, then being placed in remedial courses in college. Whether a student who forgets material should be considered the same as never learning it in the first place by higher education. The overall quality of Oregon standards. The need for students to meet standards at each grade level. Whether aligning standards that are not assessed (social studies, humanities) is a worthy project, as those subjects make an educated person, and how that gets lost

with the focus on math, English, and science. Coordinating high school Plan & Profile with ATLAS. Ability of local districts to assess non-mandatory assessed topics like art, health, PE, second languages. If a student does all the work, the need to be able to tell student what he or she gets for the work. The intersection of this work with the work of the Joint Boards of Articulation Committee. The committee was also given a placeholder for community college success which is the community college placement exams that place students into the appropriate level of learning. The "First Year Study" was also shared as a benchmark for success in post secondary learning.

Agreement:

b. Next Steps

Review final WestEd evaluation, critique by Critical Friends group, review by other relevant existing groups that include postsecondary faculty.

Policy Governing Accelerated Learning: Karen Sprague for Reine Thomas

a. Update and next steps from the Dual Credit Task Force

Connie Green noted that Reine Thomas had resigned from Portland Community College. Karen Sprague provided the highlights from the Dual Credit Task force. Community colleges are the largest provider of these programs and the programs are wide-spread throughout Oregon (approximately 20,000 students taking courses). There are concerns from faculty as to whether or not the courses are rated as college-level; these concerns are attributed to the lack of standards or understanding as to how the programs are run and by whom (e.g., teacher qualifications, etc.). The goal in evaluating the accelerated learning program is to design cohesive standards. Nine people are on the taskforce and have high standards and interests in the programs. The background documentation for the taskforce will be posted to the web. The original study and data that has been sought for the taskforce was found by Elaine Yandle-Roth from a 1993 report produced by the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OUS). A number of the 1993 identified problems still persist; however, the accelerated learning program has improved overall.

It was reported that taskforce goals were discussed at the May meeting to address the problems. The three areas of focus include: 1) clarify and potentially standardized the programs policies, procedures and expectations; 2) consider NACEP national standards and 3) develop better data and tracking on a regular basis. Other issues discussed were the need or lack of need for a common name. These costs of these programs are variable depending on the schools delivering the credits. Another issue is the alignment of assessment and qualification of instructors. Currently, the instructors in the high schools must have qualifications on the same level as the lowest instructors in OUS (adjunct professors). It was brought up that in OUS graduate students are used as classroom instructors and thereby lowers the standard to an undergraduate degree required for instructors in the high school level classrooms. In conclusion, the taskforce will need to deal with the questions about 1) compatibility and inconsistency among the programs, and 2) develop and implement effective methods for evaluating the programs and ensuring their success. The taskforce is conducting this as a pilot; to be evaluated for usefulness in comparison to national standards.

Discussion:

In answer to a question, it was noted that the types of courses offered at high schools vary across the state. However, all areas of the state are reasonably covered. Concern was expressed that high schools could be created that only serve high-income areas. In response to this concern, it was stated that in districts that contain community colleges, certain standards are set for the number of schools that must offer accelerated learning courses dual credit and the level of qualified instructors. Superintendent Castillo advised that the Department of Education has a grant that provides funds specifically targeted to assisting schools that have under-privileged students in order to expand access. Oregon has a multi-pronged approach to the program (e.g., AP, IB, accelerated options, or negotiated agreements between high schools and postsecondary institutions, etc.). There is a Joint Boards' agreement (1978) that states

community colleges will serve the first two years of postsecondary education. This also affects the accelerated program delivery. An issue to be addressed is the need for another pathway for qualification other than just a master's degree in education versus a master's in the subject area which is required by the Community College OARs. This is due to the variance of requirements under the former TSPC standards and the new standards (this is also a national issue). It was noted that if the teacher earns an MAT/MST, there must be a certain number of credits that apply to the discipline in which they will be instructing but it may not be enough to qualify for adjunct/accelerated teaching for a community college.

It was asked whether there are standards that would align the 24 institutions and yet still give them autonomy in what they offer. This will be addressed by the taskforce in the future. It was noted that dual credit programs are also created between high schools and private postsecondary institutions. It was cautioned that over-standardization of the program could stifle the good things that are occurring. Another accelerated option that occurs in a few high schools is that students, at the ninth grade, are offered a program that enables the student to attend high school for five years; the fifth year would be to earn college credits through the dual credit or dual enrollment program at the community college. The student would earn 16, 28, or 32 credits, depending on the agreement, and those credits would be paid through the K-12 appropriation. The student has the opportunity to earn a high school diploma and an associates' degree, thereby giving the parents a satisfaction that their tax dollars are funding this.

Pathways from High School to College, Technical Training, and Career: Elaine Yandell-Roth, Karen Sprague

(Nomenclature/Definitions: for Oregon's Systems Designed to Help students Move from High School through Postsecondary Systems which Prepare them for Careers.

This effort was initiated to clarify the "jargon" that has arisen and may be contributing to confusion and frustration as students, parents, and educators attempt to chart the best path for the student's future, is the first step toward a more understandable system. The committee was encouraged to provide additional nomenclatures to the list. It was expressed that terminology among the educational system needs to be systemized; however, clarification of requirements is the ultimate goal. ATLAS is going to assist students in identifying their path; however, articulation of the differences in paths needs to be addressed. In order to assist students in their curricula pathway, this document will be placed on the "map of pathways" website that is underdevelopment.

5. INFORMATION FROM OUS FOCUS GROUP ON ESSENTIAL SKILLS: Mark Endsley & Dalton Miller-Jones (and Rick Dills)

A faculty forum met on May 11, 2007, in Eugene that included participants representing seven OUS campuses, three community colleges, and representatives of OWEAC (the Oregon College Writing Leadership Group) and was facilitated by Mr. Rick Dills (a retired Oregon administrator and educational consultant). The purpose of convening a forum was to solicit thinking about new diploma requirements and the list of "Essential Skills" that developed by the Oregon State Board of Education. Goals included identifying the components of Essential Skills sets and then recommend policy for assessing mastery. The forum was tasked with developing recommendations that would be reported to the UEE: 1) review and respond to ODE's proposed Essential Skills for the high school diploma; 2) provide input from the perspective of postsecondary education faculty; and 3) begin to develop a "continuum of proficiency" in Essential Skill areas, spanning from the postsecondary matriculation to graduate study.

The process that was compiled was thought to be one that would be used on campuses to continue the work and to gather feedback on how the process works. Organizing questions included: 1) What "essential skills" do students need to be successful in college? 2) How are these essential skills described

in various proficiency frameworks? 3) How good is good enough for college success? What are the implications for developing essential skills in high school? 4) What does the forum recommend and where does OUS faculty involvement go from there? The process for examining these essential skills was framed through four stages: reflecting, analyzing, generating—designing down, and recommending essential skills that were addressed four information and communication skills (read, write, presentation, and technology tools) and five thinking and problem-solving skills (analytical thinking, innovative thinking, problem-solving, mathematics, and scientific inquiry).

Discussion:

It was noted that new Essential Skills have been adopted by ODE; therefore, concern was expressed over a lack of communication between staff on shared data that may prevent up-to-date analysis. In analyzing the skills, the forum participants were requested to “map” proficiency frameworks relative to the two areas. In response to a question concerning disconnect between community college and university faculty, Mr. Dills advised that there was not a disconnect; in fact, there was “a good sharing of information.”

Questions for Input to UEE:

- 1) How does the current ODE Essential Skills list look from higher education perspective? What needs further thinking?
- 2) What evidence of Essential Skills proficiency would higher education find useful? How might OUS measure and influence the proficiency levels of entering students?
- 3) What process do we propose for involving higher education in further discussion of “essential skills” and “academic proficiencies?”

Recommendations to the UEE:

- a. How does the current ODE Essential Skills list look from a higher education perspective? What needs further thinking:
 - 1) Combine and simplify the Essential Skills list into fewer categories, demonstrable in a variety of subject domains.
 - 2) Emphasize the evaluation of reading, writing, and math skills.
 - 3) Consider adding “self-directional and meta-cognitive skills,” (e.g., time management; self-reflection; diligence; focus; curiosity and comfort with ambiguity; and the ability to determine credibility of sources).
- b. What evidence of Essential Skills proficiency would higher education find useful? How might OUS measure and influence the proficiency levels of entering students?
 - 1) Expect students to submit admission/placement information connected to essential skills requirements using high school work samples/collections that demonstrate OUS “matriculation” levels.
 - 2) Develop placement or formative assessments for OUS courses that measure proficiency in Essential Skill areas.
 - 3) Identify “researched, context-based” measures that assess essential skills but do not rely on the judgments of “people who know the students.”
- c. What evidence of Essential Skills proficiency would higher education find useful? How might OUS measure and influence the proficiency levels of entering students?
 - 1) Actively involve OUS, and OUS faculty representatives, in all further discussions of Essential Skills needed to “prepare students for next steps—higher education.”
 - 2) Use OUS faculty to describe and exemplify representations of essential skills proficiency needed to successfully matriculate into OUS institutions.
 - 3) Facilitate collaboration among general education faculty regarding what adequate proficiency in skill areas such as writing looks like, using student work samples and scores.

- 4) Continue meaningful collaboration between OUS faculty and high school teachers (e.g., PASS moderation exercises).
- 5) Involve public and private schools of education regarding pre-service and in-service professional development related to essential skills.
- 6) Provide OUS faculty professional development related to assessing and developing proficiency in essential skill areas, from matriculation to graduation and beyond.

The key to the success of this is staff communicating consistently and continually. Teresa Levy is working with/on a taskforce addressing Essential Skills in correlation to the recommendations resulting from this forum. It was agreed that the forum was a good beginning to addressing these areas. Teresa advised that the goal is to have a more comprehensive inclusion of participants from K-12, community colleges, OUS, and business for the purpose of ensuring the elimination of duplication of effort. It is essential to arrive at an agreement on the right skills, the expected proficiency levels for success, and the secondary list could be demonstrated in a variety of ways. This is needed between the sectors to ensure success.

Mark Endsley advised that rough notes and the material used will be posted to a website; it was requested that the materials be provided to the forum participants prior to posting to the website.

Discussion:

Guidance is needed as to what and who will be contributing and addressing the Essential Skills for academic proficiency. Dr. Miller-Jones noted that it is difficult for higher education to provide a unified voice due to the environment. He stated that it would be essential for the provosts provide the guidance and act as “point man” on their campuses. Nikki Squire advised that students need clear targets; ODE provides requirements that assist the student in matriculating to postsecondary institutions. It is critical that participants in this endeavor have the respected reputations and the voice to communicate to others the outcomes from this undertaking. It was recommended that joint leadership for the taskforce reach agreement concerning the knowledge and skills expected of students’ success rather than disconnected education segments concurrently working to ultimately bring recommendations. There are five major taskforces working on implementation, with all education segments participating, with the oversight of the Governor’s Office. It was recommended that the taskforce charges be provided to the UEE staff. It was noted that PASS and other states have worked on similar issues with useful developments; it was recommended that the taskforce use these resources. Dr. Noor shared that, during an Achieve presentation in Washington, DC, it was affirmed for him that Oregon has a system that is out of alignment, for a variety of reasons; however, Oregon is further along in reaching the Achieve standards. Dr. Dills stated that this process brings this to the forefront and will contribute to the success of Oregon’s education system.

Dr. Miller-Jones added a concluding statement that this work is a continuing work. Dr. Squire thanked Dalton and Rick for their contribution and presentation.

6. UPDATE ON LEGISLATION RELEVANT TO THE UEE WORK PLAN

a. SB 342 (2005)

Doing well on this legislation. Appreciation was expressed to the CIA for their assistance. AP is done; there are some curricula questions that still need to be addressed. Matriculation issues still persist (degree credits required at one institution and not at another). AAOT revision has been addressed and Provosts and CIA will discuss in the fall. JBAC is going to address the IB credits to be more consistent like AP.

b. SB 300 (2005)/SB 23 (2007)

These bills are the Expanded Options program. Changes have been made through SB 23; the measure has passed and the status update is provided in the UEE work plan.

c. SB 364 (2005)/SB 589 (2007)

This bill did not make it out of committee; however, a budget note was added to the ODE budget to conduct a study on state Career Technical Education funding and support/delivery mechanisms/models. SB 589 did contain innovative proposals.

d. Other

HB 2263 is working its way through the legislature and contains a provision concerning the abolishment of the CIM/CAM and introduces a common accountability system for the Oregon Report Card and the federal AYP report.

Next meeting: September 20, 2007. It was agreed that continuing communication of effort between the sectors is essential to the success of the UEE charge.

Nikki Squire adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.