JOINT BOARDS OF EDUCATION
Tuesday, November 22, 2011
10:00 am – 12:00 pm
1800 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 515, Portland, Oregon
Campus Map: http://www.pdx.edu/campus-map

AGENDA

CONSENT ITEMS
AP/IB Alignment ........................................... Krissa Caldwell; Karen Marrongelle, Sona Andrews
Dual Credit Program Approval ....................... Krissa Caldwell; Karen Marrongelle, Sona Andrews
Oregon Transfer Module ............................... Krissa Caldwell; Joe Holliday, Sona Andrews
January 2010 Minutes ......................................... Marcia Stuart
September 2010 Minutes ...................................... Marcia Stuart

INFORMATION ITEMS
HB 3521 Review ................................................ Cam Preus; Sona Andrews
Applied Baccalaureate Update ....................... Cam Preus; Sona Andrews
SB 254 Update .................................................... Cam Preus; Karen Marrongelle
OEIB Update ..................................................... Matthew Donegan, Samuel Henry
Higher Education Student and Institutional Success (HB 3418) ........... Cam Preus; Sona Andrews

Staff: Charles Triplett, State Board of Higher Education: 503.725.5717; Jan McComb, State Board of Education: 503.947.5618.
Joint Boards of Education meetings comply with open meeting laws and accessibility requirements. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made at least 48 hours before the meeting to Marcia Stuart at (541) 346-5749.
BACKGROUND
At the February 15, 2011, meeting of the Unified Education Enterprise (UEE), the Committee voted to adopt the Annual Advanced Placement (AP) / International Baccalaureate (IB) Review Process and Timeline, the AP Course Credit schedule, and the IB Course Credit Schedule. The AP and IB Course Credit schedules are updates to the Statewide AP and IB Alignment Policies, adopted by the Joint Boards on January 7, 2010. As AP and IB examinations and curricula are updated on a yearly basis, the Course Credit schedules must be reviewed and updated each year; the AP/IB Review Process and Timeline was approved by the UEE to address the need for annual review of the AP and IB policies.

Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate College Credits: Annual Review Process and Timeline
Approved Unified Education Enterprise- February 15, 2011
Approved Joint Boards of Education- TBA

Guidelines:
- Goal is to have all 24 postsecondary institutions grant the same NUMBER of credits at a comparable instructional level (e.g., 2nd-year language vs. 1st-year language). Individual campuses/departments will determine specific courses as necessary.
- Changes made will take effect in the following school year’s recruitment cycle (i.e., approval in February 2010 applies to exams taken in 2010-11 school year). Except where justified by changes in curriculum, credit numbers, and areas of credits should remain consistent from year to year to avoid confusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug/Sept</td>
<td>OUS/UEE Staff</td>
<td>Contact IB to confirm year’s changes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:help@ibo.org">help@ibo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug/Sept</td>
<td>OUS/UEE Staff</td>
<td>Check AP website to confirm year’s changes</td>
<td><a href="http://advancesinap.collegeboard.org/">http://advancesinap.collegeboard.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>OUS/UEE Staff</td>
<td>Contact review work group, set up/update group listserv, distribute information re IB/AP changes</td>
<td>Use “commitment” list from prior year and contact campuses/organizations, as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct/Nov</td>
<td>Review Work Group</td>
<td>Determine what changes to credits or documents are needed</td>
<td>Listserv and/or meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>How</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov – Jan</td>
<td>OUS/UEE Staff</td>
<td>Prepare final documents for approval process based on work group decisions; submit work group for approval</td>
<td>Distribute via email to ICAR for feedback/approval; to Provosts’ Council, ASC, and CIA in November; to UEE and Joint Boards in Jan/Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>OUS/UEE Staff</td>
<td>Disseminate approved Credit charts; apply to admissions policies, high school counselors’ handbook, institution websites and catalogs Obtain tentative commitments for following year’s work group</td>
<td>Emails to work group, institutions, place on website(s) Work group contacts/listservs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College Board-Advanced Placement Examinations**

**College Credit Review Schedule**

Standard review schedule: the school year prior to the new course/exam, the credits will be reviewed. If no changes are implemented, the credits previously approved will automatically carry over.

If the AP organization amends its schedule, the review schedule will adapt accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUS Review Year [effective following school year]</th>
<th>AP—New Exam Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>• Calculus AB and BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>• French Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• German Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• World History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>• Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spanish Literature and Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010-11 list of courses and course information can be found at: [http://www.collegeboard.com/student/testing/ap/subjects.html](http://www.collegeboard.com/student/testing/ap/subjects.html)

Track update information via: [http://advancesinap.collegeboard.org/](http://advancesinap.collegeboard.org/)
International Baccalaureate Examinations  
College Credit Review Schedule

Standard review schedule: the school year prior to the new course/exam, the credits will be reviewed. If no changes are implemented, the credits previously approved will automatically carry over.

If the IB organization amends its schedule, the review schedule will adapt accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUS Review Year [eff. following school year]</th>
<th>Topic – IB changes to curriculum and exams</th>
<th>Last old exam</th>
<th>First new exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>– Classical languages</td>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Social &amp; cultural anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Film</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>– Geography</td>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>ITGS</td>
<td>Nov 2011</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Language A: Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Language A: Language &amp; literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Language B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Language ab initio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– World Religions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>– Sports, health &amp; exercise science</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Computer science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Further mathematics SL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Mathematical studies SL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Mathematics SL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Mathematics HL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td><strong>Review IB Diploma policy using OUS 2010-13 data report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Design technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Visual arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of IB Schedule: *IB Diploma Programme Coordinator’s notes, May 2010*
OUS Schedule created: *Fall 2010*
**ADVANCED PLACEMENT COURSE CREDIT**

**Spring 2011**

Approved Unified Education Enterprise- February 15, 2011
Approved Joint Boards Education—TBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP Exam Taken</th>
<th>Exam Score</th>
<th>Credit Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art – History</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art – Studio</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus AB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus AB</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus BC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus BC</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Lang &amp; Culture</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science A</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language &amp; Comp</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature &amp; Comp</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Lang &amp; Culture</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Lang &amp; Culture</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (U.S.)</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (European)</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (U.S.)</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (World)</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Geography</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Lang &amp; Culture</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin—Vergil</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro Economics</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Economics</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics B</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics C - Mechanics</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics C - Elect &amp; Magn</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Language</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Literature</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Exams below are not current; provided for information purposes*

- Computer Science AB: 3, 4
- Computer Science AB: 4+, 8
- French Literature: 3+, 4
- Italian Lang & Culture: 3+, 12-15
- Latin Literature: 3+, 4

**Notes:**

1. For AP exam titles not listed here, students should contact individual institutions for credit information.
2. Individual institutions will identify specific course articulations for their campus.
# Statewide International Baccalaureate Alignment Policy

Spring 2011

**Note:** Students with certificates not listed below should contact individual institutions for credit information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Certificate Earned with Standard Level Exam Score of 5, 6, or 7</th>
<th>Certificate Earned with High Level Exam Score of 5, 6, or 7</th>
<th>Community College and OUS Subject Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Systems and Societies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: Africa</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>African History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: Americas</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>US History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: Asia/Oceania</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>Asian History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: Europe &amp; Middle East</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>European History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: Medieval Europe &amp; Islamic Wld</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>European History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>World History [Modern]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A1 (English)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Writing or English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A1 (other than English)</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A2: 2nd Language (except Eng)</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language B (all languages except English)</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language A2 &amp; B: English</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>General elective credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Film Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Tech in a Global Society</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Studies</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>8 to 12</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Mathematics</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (Solo, Group or Composition)</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Intro Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Social/Cult Anthrop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Arts</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>8 to 9</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Religions</td>
<td>PILOT</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Religion/Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports, Exercise, &amp; Health</td>
<td>PILOT</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>PILOT</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Dance/Perf. Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>IB Points</td>
<td>US Points</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 to 9</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Asia/M.E.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>Asian History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History: Europe</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>European History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic History</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>Islamic history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Exams listed below have been phased out; listed for information purposes.*
During the 2010-11 academic year, the Oregon Dual Credit Oversight Committee considered eight applications for dual credit program approval.

BACKGROUND
Following the September 28, 2010, Joint Boards of Education approval of Oregon’s dual credit standards and approval process, eight institutions submitted applications for approval. The institutions are:

- Blue Mountain Community College
- Central Oregon Community College
- Clackamas Community College
- Lane Community College
- Oregon Institute of Technology
- Portland Community College
- Portland State University
- Rogue Community College

RECOMMENDATION
After reviewing the submissions, the Committee recommends approval for the dual credit programs at six of the eight institutions:

- Central Oregon Community College
- Clackamas Community College
- Lane Community College
- Oregon Institute of Technology
- Portland Community College
- Portland State University

The remaining two institutions have been asked for additional material and will be reviewed 2011-12. Institutions in Oregon that offer dual credit and have yet to apply have until April 2013 to submit.
Any student holding an Oregon Transfer Module (OTM) that conforms to the guidelines below will have met the requirements for the Transfer Module at any Oregon community college or institution in the Oregon University System. Upon transfer, the receiving institution may specify additional course work that is required for a major or for degree requirements or to make up the difference between the Transfer Module and the institution’s total General Education requirements.

GUIDELINES
The OTM includes the following course work, which is equivalent to three academic quarters. The coursework must be chosen from the courses approved for the categories below by the institution issuing the credit. In the case of community colleges, these will be courses approved for the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) degree; in the case of universities and 4-year colleges, they will be courses approved for the General Education part of a baccalaureate degree. All courses must be passed with a grade of “C–” or better and must be worth at least three credits (quarter system). Students must have a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 at the time the module is posted.

Foundational Skills
- Writing: Two courses of college-level composition (WR121, WR122, WR123, or WR227). Information Literacy will be included in the Writing component.
- Oral Communication: One course of fundamentals of speech or communication.
- Mathematics: One course of college-level mathematics, for which at least Intermediate Algebra is a prerequisite

Introduction to Disciplines
- Students are encouraged to complete at least one course with the embedded Cultural Literacy component in order to complete AAOT requirements.
- Arts and Letters: Three courses.
- Social Sciences: Three courses.
- Science/Math/Computer Science: Three courses, including at least one biological or physical science with a lab.

ELECTIVES
As required to bring the total credits to 45. Courses must be from the Introduction to Disciplines areas (Arts & Letters, Social Science, or Science/Math/Computer Science).

NOTES
1. Courses that are designed to prepare students for college-level work are not applicable to the transfer module.
2. When choosing courses in science and mathematics, students and advisors should check the specific requirements at receiving schools. Courses that include a laboratory component, or that deal with specific subjects, may be required for majors or degrees.

3. Computer Science courses used in the Math/Science/Computer Science area must meet Oregon Council of Computer Chairs criteria for a science course. See list of courses at (http://cs.bmcc.cc.or.us/occc/).

4. In Arts and Letters, the second year of a foreign language may be included, but not the first year. American Sign Language (ASL) is considered a foreign language. Demonstrated proficiency in an American Indian language can meet all or part of the second language requirement, as certified by the governing body of any federally recognized tribe.

5. All Oregon community colleges and Oregon University System institutions will offer students the opportunity to complete an Oregon Transfer Module and the OTM designation will be posted on the transcript by the issuing institution upon request. Regionally accredited private colleges and universities within the state are also welcome to offer and issue Transfer Modules, which will be accepted at any Oregon public college or university.

6. Oregon Transfer Module credits may not match program requirements in the receiving school. The OTM supplements, but does not supplant existing articulation agreements and does not replace effective advising.

Adopted by Joint Boards of Education (Oregon Board of Education and Oregon Board of Higher Education) February 3, 2005; revised by Joint Boards Articulation Commission to reflect 2010 AAOT requirements, October 2010.
Joint Boards of Education

House Bill 3521 Review

70th Oregon Legislative Assembly—2011 Regular Session

Enrolled

House Bill 3521

Sponsored by Representatives DEMBROW, WHISNANT; Representatives BARKER, DOHERTY, GELSER, HUFFMAN, JENSON, JOHNSON, KOMP, READ, THATCHER, Senators BONAMICI, MONROE

CHAPTER

AN ACT

Relating to courses of study at community colleges; and declaring an emergency.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. (1) As used in this section:

(a) "Associate transfer degree" means an associate degree that is awarded by a community college and that is intended to allow a student to apply the credits earned for the degree towards a baccalaureate degree.
(b) "Community college" means a community college operated under ORS chapter 341.
(c) "State institution of higher education" means a state institution of higher education listed in ORS 352.002.
(d) "Transfer program" means a one-year program that is designed to allow a student to apply the credits earned through the program towards a baccalaureate degree.

(2) The Joint Boards of Education shall develop standards related to the ability of students to apply credits earned through courses of study at community colleges to baccalaureate degrees awarded by state institutions of higher education. The standards shall be known as the "Transfer Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities."

(3) The standards developed under this section may include:

(a) Admission standards to state institutions of higher education for students who have earned an associate transfer degree.
(b) The maximum number of credits that students who have earned an associate transfer degree would need to complete prior to receiving various types of baccalaureate degrees at state institutions of higher education.
(c) The maximum number of credits that students who have completed a transfer program would need to complete prior to receiving various types of baccalaureate degrees at state institutions of higher education.
(d) A process by which a community college would award an associate degree to a student upon completion of necessary credits, regardless of whether the student applied to receive the degree or whether the student earned the credits for the degree at a community college or a state institution of higher education.

(e) Any other issues identified by the Joint Boards of Education that relate to courses of study at community colleges and the ability of a student to transfer credits to a community college or a state institution of higher education, to be admitted to a state institution...
of higher education or to earn a degree at a community college or a state institution of higher education.

(f) Requirements that students must meet in order to benefit from the standards described in paragraphs (a) to (e) of this subsection.

(4) Each community college and state institution of higher education shall submit annual reports to the Joint Boards of Education related to:

(a) The number of students who attend a community college and then a state institution of higher education, or a state institution of higher education and then a community college.

(b) The number of students who attend one community college and then a different community college.

(c) The number of students who transfer from a community college to a state institution of higher education and who have an associate transfer degree or have completed a transfer program.

(d) The average number of credits students have when they transfer from a community college to a state institution of higher education.

(e) The average number of credits students have when they attend one community college and then a different community college.

(f) The average number of credits that a student earning an associate transfer degree completed at a community college.

(g) The average number of credits students who have transferred from a community college to a state institution of higher education must earn prior to receiving a baccalaureate degree compared to the average number of credits students who did not transfer from a community college must earn prior to receiving a baccalaureate degree.

SECTION 2. (1) As used in this section:

(a) “Associate transfer degree” means an associate degree that is awarded by a community college and that is intended to allow a student to apply the credits earned for the degree towards a baccalaureate degree.

(b) “Community college” means a community college operated under ORS chapter 341.

(c) “State institution of higher education” means a state institution of higher education listed in ORS 352.002.

(d) “Transfer program” means a one-year program that is designed to allow a student to apply the credits earned through the program towards a baccalaureate degree.

(2) The Joint Boards of Education shall submit to the interim legislative committees relating to education a report no later than November 1, 2012. The report required by this section shall include:

(a) Information related to the standards developed as provided by section 1 of this 2011 Act, including resources required to implement the standards by no later than the 2014-2015 academic year.

(b) A review of the requirements and standards of the associate transfer degree, and whether those requirements and standards need to be modified as a result of the standards developed as provided by section 1 of this 2011 Act.

(c) The feasibility of and legal issues related to the development of a common data system that allows for the sharing of student information between community colleges and state institutions of higher education.

(d) Any proposals for legislation that are needed to implement the standards described in section 1 of this 2011 Act or that are in response to any of the findings made by the Joint Boards of Education while preparing the report described in this subsection.

(3) In preparation for providing the report described in subsection (2) of this section, the Joint Boards of Education shall provide reports to the interim legislative committees related to education at intervals determined by the committees."
(4) The Oregon University System, the Department of Education and the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development shall provide staff support to the Joint Boards of Education for the purpose of preparing the reports required by this section.

SECTION 3. This 2011 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2011 Act takes effect on its passage.
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AN ACT

Relating to college credits; creating new provisions; amending ORS 340.083 and 341.450; repealing sections 3 and 4, chapter 456, Oregon Laws 2011 (Enrolled House Bill 3106); appropriating money; and declaring an emergency.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. (1) As used in this section, “accelerated college credit programs” includes dual credit programs, two-plus-two programs, advanced placement programs and International Baccalaureate programs.

(2) The Department of Education shall administer a grant program that provides grants for the purposes of:

(a) Providing education or training to teachers who will provide or are providing instruction in accelerated college credit programs;

(b) Assisting students in paying for books, materials and other costs, other than test fees, related to accelerated college credit programs; and

(c) Providing classroom supplies for accelerated college credit programs.

(3) Any school district, community college district or state institution of higher education in this state may individually or jointly apply for a grant under this section.

(4) If a grant is awarded for the purpose of providing education or training to teachers who will provide or are providing instruction in an accelerated college credit program:

(a) The amount of the grant may not exceed one-third of the total cost of the education or training; and

(b) The department may award the grant on the condition that the teacher, school district, community college district and state institution of higher education pay the balance of the cost of the education or training in a proportion agreed to by the teacher, districts and institution.

(5) For the purposes described in subsection (2) of this section, the department may:

(a) Accept contributions of funds and assistance from the United States Government and its agencies or from any other source, public or private, and agree to conditions placed on the funds not inconsistent with the purposes of subsection (2) of this section; and

(b) Enter into agreements with school districts, community college districts and state institutions of higher education related to the funding to provide education or training to
teachers who will provide or are providing instruction in an accelerated college credit program.

(6) All funds received by the department under this section shall be paid into the Accelerated College Credit Account established under section 8 of this 2011 Act to be used for the purposes described in subsection (2) of this section.

SECTION 2. (1) The Joint Boards of Education shall develop statewide standards for dual credit programs to be implemented by public high schools, community colleges, and state institutions of higher education within the Oregon University System. The standards must establish the manner by which:

(a) A student may, upon completion of a course, earn course credit both for high school and for a community college or state institution of higher education within the Oregon University System; and

(b) Teachers of courses that are part of a dual credit program will work together to determine the quality of the program and to ensure the alignment of the content, objectives, and outcomes of individual courses.

(2) Each public high school, community college, and state institution of higher education within the Oregon University System that provides a dual credit program must implement the statewide standards developed under subsection (1) of this section.

(3) Each school district, community college, and state institution of higher education within the Oregon University System that provides a dual credit program shall submit an annual report to the Joint Boards of Education on the academic performance of students enrolled in a dual credit program. The Joint Boards of Education shall establish the required contents of the report, which must provide sufficient information to allow the Joint Boards of Education to determine the quality of the dual credit program.

SECTION 4. (1) As used in this section, “accelerated college credit programs” includes dual credit programs, two-plus-two programs, advanced placement programs, and International Baccalaureate programs.

(2) Each school district shall:

(a) Provide students in grades 9 through 12 with accelerated college credit programs including, but not limited to, accelerated college credit programs related to English, mathematics, and science; or

(b) Ensure that students in grades 9 through 12 have online access to accelerated college credit programs including, but not limited to, accelerated college credit programs related to English, mathematics, and science.

SECTION 5. ORS 341.450 is amended to read:

341.450. Every community college district shall encourage high school students to start early on a college education by implementing two-plus-two programs and other related programs. A dual credit program, a two-plus-two program, or another accelerated college credit program. Each community college district shall make at least one such program available to each interested school district that is within the boundaries of the community college district.

SECTION 6. Section 4 of this 2011 Act and the amendments to ORS 341.450 by section 5 of this 2011 Act:

(1) Become operative July 1, 2014.

(2) First apply to the 2014-2015 school year.

SECTION 7. ORS 340.083 is amended to read:

340.083. (1) A school district may request a waiver from the Department of Education of the requirements of this chapter. The department shall grant the waiver if:

(a) Compliance with the requirements of this chapter would adversely impact the finances of the school district; or

(b) The school district offers dual credit technical preparation programs, such as two-plus-two programs, advanced placement, or International Baccalaureate programs and other accelerated college credit programs.
credit programs) a dual credit program, a two-plus-two program, an advanced placement program, an International Baccalaureate program or any other accelerated college credit program.

(2) The duration of a waiver granted based on subsection (1)(a) of this section shall be no more than two school years.

(3) The duration of a waiver granted under subsection (1)(b) of this section shall be the length of the program that was the basis for the waiver.

(4) There is no limit on the number of times a school district may apply for and be granted a waiver under this section.

SECTION 7a. Section 3, chapter 456, Oregon Laws 2011 (Enrolled House Bill 3106) (amending ORS 340.083), is repealed and ORS 340.083, as amended by section 7 of this 2011 Act, is amended to read:

340.083. (1) A school district may request a waiver from the Department of Education of the requirements of this chapter. The department shall grant the waiver if:

(a) Compliance with the requirements of this chapter would adversely impact the finances of the school district; or

(b) The school district does all of the following:

(A) Offers a dual credit program, a two-plus-two program, an advanced placement program, an International Baccalaureate program or any other accelerated college credit program;

(B) Ensures that at-risk students who participate in the accelerated college credit programs are not required to make any payments for participation in the programs; and

(C) Has a process for participation in the programs that allows:

(i) All at-risk students who are eligible students to participate in the programs;

(ii) At-risk students to earn the number of credit hours established by the State Board of Education by rule under ORS 340.080; or

(iii) For an increasing number of at-risk students who are eligible students to participate in the programs each school year based on demand and appropriateness and as provided by a plan developed by the school district.

(2) The duration of a waiver granted based on subsection (1)(a) (1) of this section shall be no more than two school years.

(3) The duration of a waiver granted under subsection (1)(b) of this section shall be the length of the program that was the basis for the waiver.

(4) There is no limit on the number of times a school district may apply for and be granted a waiver under this section.

SECTION 7b. Section 4, chapter 456, Oregon Laws 2011 (Enrolled House Bill 3106), is repealed.

SECTION 7c. The amendments to ORS 340.083 by section 7a of this 2011 Act become operative on January 1, 2012, and first apply to waivers granted on or after January 1, 2012.

SECTION 8. The Accelerated College Credit Account is established in the State Treasury, separate and distinct from the General Fund. Interest earned by the Accelerated College Credit Account shall be credited to the account. Moneys in the Accelerated College Credit Account are continuously appropriated to the Department of Education for the purposes described in section 1 (2) of this 2011 Act.

SECTION 9. There is appropriated to the Department of Education, for the biennium beginning July 1, 2011, out of the General Fund, the amount of $250,000 for deposit in the Accelerated College Credit Account established under section 8 of this 2011 Act to be used for the purposes described in section 1 (2) of this 2011 Act.

SECTION 10. This 2011 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2011 Act takes effect July 1, 2011.
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AN ACT

Relating to higher education; and declaring an emergency.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. (1) The Task Force on Higher Education Student and Institutional Success is established, consisting of 17 members appointed as follows:
   (a) The Governor shall appoint:
      (A) One member from the State Board of Higher Education.
      (B) One member from the board of a community college district in this state.
      (C) Two members, each of whom is a faculty member of a state institution of higher education listed in ORS 352.002. One shall be a faculty member from the University of Oregon, Oregon State University or Portland State University, and one shall be a faculty member from one of the other state institutions of higher education listed in ORS 352.002.
      (D) One member who is a faculty member of a community college in this state.
      (E) Two members, each of whom is a student at a state institution of higher education listed in ORS 352.002. One shall be a student from the University of Oregon, Oregon State University or Portland State University, and one shall be a student from one of the other state institutions of higher education listed in ORS 352.002.
      (F) One member who is a student at a community college in this state.
      (G) One member who is a president of a state institution of higher education listed in ORS 352.002.
      (H) One member who is a president of a community college in this state.
      (I) Two members, each of whom is a representative of an Oregon-based business. At least one shall represent a small Oregon-based business.
      (J) One member who is a nonfaculty staff member at a state institution of higher education listed in ORS 352.002.
      (b) The President of the Senate shall appoint two members from among members of the Senate.
      (c) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint two members from among members of the House of Representatives.
   (2) The task force shall, for higher education students and institutions in this state:
      (a) Examine best practices and models for accomplishing student and institutional success, as such success is measured by achievement of the mission of higher education set forth in ORS 351.009 and the policy for community colleges set forth in ORS 341.009;
      (b) Consider institutional and statutory barriers to student success and completion of programs;
(c) Examine methods for students to acquire basic skills and career preparation skills;
(d) Review alternative funding options for providing necessary services to students and
promoting best practices for student success and completion; and
(e) Compare alternative funding options instituted in other states for improving student
and institutional success.
(3) To accomplish the tasks set forth in subsection (2) of this section, the task force
shall:
(a) Facilitate discussions with key higher education stakeholders at the institutional and
board levels;
(b) Hold public hearings throughout this state to gain input on its tasks; and
(c) Review work done by previous committees and task forces in this state, as well as
by relevant professional organizations and other states.
(4) A majority of the members of the task force constitutes a quorum for the transaction
of business.
(5) Official action by the task force requires the approval of a majority of the members
of the task force.
(6) The task force shall elect one of its members to serve as chairperson.
(7) If there is a vacancy for any cause, the appointing authority shall make an appoint-
ment to become immediately effective.
(8) The task force shall meet at times and places specified by the call of the chairperson
or of a majority of the members of the task force.
(9) The task force may adopt rules necessary for the operation of the task force.
(10)(a) The task force shall submit an initial report, and may include recommendations
for legislation, to any interim legislative committees related to higher education no later
than December 1, 2011.
(b) The task force shall submit a final report, and may include recommendations for
legislation, to any interim committees related to higher education no later than October 15,
2012.
(c) The task force may submit periodic updates to any interim legislative committees
related to higher education while completing its tasks and preparing its reports.
(11) The Joint Boards of Education, or any successor coordinating commission, shall
provide staff support to the task force.
(12) Members of the task force are not entitled to compensation.
(13) All agencies of state government, as defined in ORS 174.111, are directed to assist
the task force in the performance of its duties and, to the extent permitted by laws relating
to confidentiality, to furnish such information and advice as the members of the task force
consider necessary to perform their duties.

SECTION 2. Section 1 of this 2011 Act is repealed on the date of the convening of the 2013
regular session of the Legislative Assembly as specified in ORS 171.010.

SECTION 3. This 2011 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public
peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2011 Act takes effect
on its passage.
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Task Force on Higher Education Student and Institutional Success

House Bill 3418 passed during the 2011 legislative session establishes a Task Force on Higher Education Student and Institutional Success. The 17-member task force is charged to examine best practices in higher education, and make recommendations to increase success for students in acquiring basic skills, career preparation and program completion with attainment of certification or degrees. The task force must offer an initial report to the Legislature by December 1, 2011. A final report is due October 15, 2012.

The Governor has named the following members to the task force, based on the requirements in the bill:

Jackie Altamirano, student, Mount Hood Community College, president of the Associated Students of MHCC, Gresham
June Chrisman, human relations director, Providence, Portland
Ed Dodson, Chemeketa Community College Board of Directors, retired teacher and administrator, Salem
Ben Ekstein, student, University of Oregon, president of student government, former member of Oregon Student Assistance Commission, Eugene
Jon Eldridge, vice president for student affairs, Southern Oregon University, Ashland
Jim Francesconi, member, State Board of Higher Education since 2007, and attorney with the law firm of Haglund, Kelley, Horngren, Jones, and Wilder LLP, Portland
Betty Fung, student, Oregon Institute of Technology, Klamath Falls
Beth Gerot, co-owner, Woodfuff Nursery and Landscapes, Eugene
Connie Green, president, Tillamook Bay Community College, Tillamook
G.L.A. Harris, associate professor, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Portland State University, Portland
Juliet Long, instructor and department head, Computer Technology, Rogue Community College, Redwood Campus, Grants Pass
Rosemary Powers, professor, Sociology, College of Arts & Sciences, Eastern Oregon University, La Grande
Ed Ray, president, Oregon State University, Corvallis

The President of the Senate and Co-Speakers of the House have appointed two members each:

Sen. Mark Hass (D-Tigard)
Sen. David Nelson (R-Pendleton)
Rep. Michael Dembrow (D-Portland)
Rep. Mark Johnson (R-Hood River)
Minutes

Meeting participants included: OSBE Directors Jerry Berger, Kate Brown, Leslie Shepherd, Nikki Squire, and Duncan Wyse; OSBHE directors Matt Donegan, Hannah Fisher, Allyn Ford, Brian Fox, Jim Francesconi, Paul Kelly, Dalton Miller-Jones, Rosemary Powers, Preston Pulliams, Kirk Schueler, Tony Van Vliet, and David Yaden.

Others participating included: Connie Green (CCWD), Ryan Hagemann (OUS), Greg Hamann (Clatsop CC), Andrea Henderson (OCCA), Joe Holliday (OUS), Doug Kosty (ODE), George Pernsteiner (OUS), Steven Pratt (OBC), Camille Preus (CCWD), James Sager (Governor’s Office), Karen Sprague (OUS), Bob Turner (OUS), and Susan Weeks (OUS).

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OVERVIEW
At 10 a.m., Directors Paul Kelly, Duncan Wyse, and Steven Pratt (OBC) brought the forum to order and greeted the forum participants. They also thanked Dr. Elisabeth Zinser for coordinating the forum on preparing college graduates to succeed and contribute in this new global era, hosted by the Oregon Business Council, the Joint Boards of Education, university presidents, interinstitutional faculty senate officers, and leaders in the community college and K-12 communities. Dr. Carol Geary-Schneider, Association of American Colleges and Universities, gave the keynote address and various panels discussed issues pertaining to innovative practices and opportunities, employers’ views, business-academic collaboration, PK-16 connections, and achieving outcomes and assessing success.

ACTION ITEMS

APPROVAL OF MAY 2009 MINUTES
At 1:45 p.m., Director Duncan Wyse (Chair, OSBE) called the meeting of the Joint Boards to order for the approval of the proposed action items. With no changes to the May 2009 minutes proposed, Director Wyse called for a motion to approve the item. Director Kelly made the motion, Director Pulliams seconded; motion carried. (Docket items may be accessed at http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/dockets under January 7-8, 2010)

STATEWIDE INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE ALIGNMENT POLICY
Director Wyse spoke to the extraordinary work of building the vision of an education continuum that connects all sectors with consistent outcomes for both individual classes and for the educational system; this work has been accomplished under the leadership of the
Unified Education Enterprise Committee, chaired by Director Jerry Berger. Director Berger introduced the members of the UEE Committee (Chair Jerry Berger, Dr. Preston Pulliams, Dr. Dalton Miller-Jones, Tony Van Vliet, Leslie Shepherd, and Nikki Squire) and noted that this Committee was formed in 2005 to address issues outlined in Senate Bill 342 pertaining to seamless transfers among the education sectors. He thanked Chancellor Pernsteiner and Superintendent Susan Castillo for their direction and input to the Committee.

He then called upon Dr. Bob Turner to present the proposed statewide International Baccalaureate (IB) Alignment policy. The International Baccalaureate program is an international program offered in high schools and leads to an IB certificate, equivalent to a one-year course of study culminating in a standard- or high-level examination to receive credit for comparable college credit. The IB program is centered on the IB diploma, which requires a student to:

1. Complete one year-long course in each of six subject groups: the student’s First Language, Second language, Experimental Sciences, Arts, Mathematics and Computer Science, and Individuals and Society;
2. Complete three of the courses at High Level (240 hours) and three at Standard Level (150 hours);
3. Attain a minimum of 24 of a possible 42 points on end-of-course exams; and
4. Complete a three-part core consisting of an extended essay, a theory of knowledge course, and participation in a creativity/action/service project.

Dr. Turner advised that there are four parts submitted for consideration: 1) IB policy for awarding credits; 2) awarding credits for the diploma; 3) number of credits to be awarded to a student who earned an IB diploma (this part of the IB diploma policy is temporary in order to provide an opportunity to gather consistent data that will be used to inform reconsideration of a statewide IB diploma alignment policy); 4) identified variables that were beyond the IB Alignment Working Groups ability to resolve.

Director Berger made the motion to approve the IB policy and Director Van Vliet seconded. Concern was expressed regarding the absence of an IB program in less advantaged districts; Turner noted that each school that desires the opportunity to offer the certificate or diploma must be evaluated by the international IB committee with respect to the resources and the capability and capacity of the instructional staff; the cost of this program precludes many high schools from participating. Following full and frank discussion, the motion was approved.

**OUTCOMES AND CRITERIA FOR TRANSFERABLE GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES IN OREGON**

Director Berger called upon Dr. Karen Sprague (OUS) and Dr. Joe Holliday (OUS) to present the item. Dr. Sprague noted that this work was inspired by the need to identify the fundamental principles that shape General Education in colleges and universities throughout Oregon. The intent was to use the principles in two ways: (1) to create a rational basis for determining the equivalency of courses intended to transfer; and (2) to enhance General Education throughout Oregon by encouraging direct dialog among faculty in each of the disciplines within this rich curriculum. The Joint Boards Articulation Committee (JBAC) recognized that these goals were
ambitious, but were optimistic because of the collegial attention that had already been given to General Education in Oregon. The JBAC believed that what was needed was a collaboratively-developed framework within which to consider specific General Education courses. The framework would consist of two elements: (1) the broad outcomes desired for students who take these courses and (2) the criteria for courses likely to achieve those outcomes.

A number of members commented on the proposed criteria; in response to a query, Dr. Sprague advised that the beginning work relied upon the categories within General Education, defined by the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree (AAOT). Simultaneously, due to the directive of SB 342, the AAOT was also under revision and was the work of the community colleges. During the AAOT work, the need arose for the inclusion of two items, multi-culturalism/cultural competency and information literacy and a definition of those outcomes and course characteristics was also required. With input from various faculty groups, the proposed outcomes and criteria were presented and approved by the OUS Provosts’ Council.

In conclusion, Chair Wyse called for a motion to approve the proposed outcomes and criteria for transferable General Education courses in Oregon. Directors Pulliams and Fox made and seconded the motion, respectively. Motion was adopted.

ASSOCIATE OF ARTS OREGON TRANSFER DEGREE GUIDELINES
Chair Wyse called upon Dr. Sprague to present the item. She noted that the guidelines were approved in 2009 and is being resubmitted for approval of the minor adjustments made subsequent to that approval. The cultural competency and information literacy and the expansion of notes were included. These notes were included as guidance to faculty and advisors to clarify issues asked by students and parents pertaining to the degree guidelines. Chair Wyse called for a motion to approve the amendments to the transfer degree. Directors Miller-Jones and Fox made the motion and seconded, respectively; motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT
With no further business to conduct, Chair Wyse adjourned the official meeting at 2:30 p.m. and the forum proceeded through 5 p.m., culminating with a concluding session by Director Wyse and Dr. Carol Schneider, AAC&U.
Meeting participants included: OSBE Directors Jerry Berger, Brenda Frank, Art Paz, Leslie Shepherd, Nikki Squire, and Duncan Wyse; OSBHE Directors Lynda Ciuffetti, Jill Eiland, Hannah Fisher, Allyn Ford, Brian Fox, James Francesconi, Paul Kelly, Rosemary Powers, Preston Pulliams, Kirk Schueler, and David Yaden.

Others participating included: Larry Cheyne (CCWD), Connie Green (CCWD), Michelle Hooper (ODE), Bob Kieran (OUS), Margie Lowe (Governor’s Office), Cam Preus (CCWD), Bruce Schafer (OUS), and Bob Turner (OUS).

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OVERVIEW OF THE MEETING
At 9:06 a.m., Chair Paul Kelly brought the meeting to order and greeted the members of the Joint Boards of Education.

ACTION ITEMS

APPLIED BACCALAUREATE STUDY
Chair Kelly called upon Dr. Connie Green and Mr. Bruce Schafer to present the item. It was noted that this work was initiated by House Bill 3093 of the 2009 Session of the Oregon Legislature, which directed the Joint Boards of Education to develop a plan for applied baccalaureate degrees in Oregon. These degrees are defined as bachelor’s degrees designed to incorporate applied associate courses and degrees with additional coursework emphasizing higher-order thinking skills and advanced technical knowledge and skills.

The members of the Steering Committee identified three key goals to (1) provide opportunities to Oregonians who originally aspired to two-year degrees but now seek careers that require four-year degrees; (2) provide Oregon employers with employees that have the advanced technical and management skills that increase productivity and competitiveness; and (3) improve the efficiency of the educational delivery system thereby saving the student time and conserving valuable educational resources. The committee also acknowledged that these goals must be served at a time of extremely limited resources.

In its analysis and planning work, the Committee discovered that Oregon has many bachelor’s degree programs that are equivalent to applied baccalaureate degrees but have not been described that way to students. In addition, Southern Oregon University recently introduced an applied baccalaureate degree in management and Eastern Oregon University is considering one in leadership.
The Committee recommended that more analysis and planning work be done in the next biennium to determine (1) where gaps exist between the demand for bachelor’s degrees and the existing supply, (2) what improvements should be made to better serve the needs of students, (3) and what improvements should be made to assure that students receiving these degrees have the knowledge and skills to make them immediately productive in the workforce. Based on this analysis, additional work will be performed to plan new degrees and courses as well as improving existing degree programs. Finally, it was recommended that investments be made in communicating the availability and value of these degrees to existing and prospective students and employers as well as counselors and advisors.

Following discussion, Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve the Applied Baccalaureate Study report recommendation that public universities and community colleges continue to work together to offer applied baccalaureate degrees as the need for them is documented. At this time, the Committee did not have a position on whether community colleges should be allowed to offer these degrees. Additional analysis and consideration of this issue will be needed as new degrees are proposed. Dr. Pulliams made the motion to approve the report and Director Berger seconded; motion was adopted.

RURAL ACCESS STUDY
Chair Kelly called upon Dr. Camille Preus and Dr. Bob Turner to present the item. As background, the Governor, legislature, business community, and the education sectors have challenged Oregonians to raise the bar for educational attainment and establishing what has become known as the 40-40-20 goals. The goals include:

- 40 percent of Oregonians earning a four-year degree or more (currently 28.3 percent)
- 40 percent earning a post-high school certificate (currently 26.5 percent)
- 20 percent earning a high school diploma or equivalent (about 12 percent of Oregonians do not have a high school diploma today) and prepared to enter the workforce

In Oregon’s urban counties, the bachelor’s degree attainment rate is 31.3 percent. This is considerably higher than in the state’s rural counties where the rate falls as low as 11 percent. According to 2008 Oregon Employment Projections for the decade of 2006–2016, nearly 74 percent of high-wage job openings in Oregon through 2016 will require competitive applicants to hold at least a bachelor’s degree. And in the fields of agriculture, timber, recreation, and many others, technological changes and global competition require workers to obtain a higher level of education today than they did just 10 years ago. This lower rate of educational attainment can be attributed largely to the many barriers rural Oregonians face. These barriers include, but are not limited to: limited geographical access to Oregon’s public universities, affordability, cultural or social barriers, and insufficient assistance to pursue higher education, including financial aid and academic preparation and support.

In 2007, about 20 percent of public high school diplomas were awarded to rural students, but only 165 of OUS first-time freshmen who enrolled the following fall were from a rural county. This means that students from rural high schools are 24 percent less likely to participate at an OUS institution than are their urban counterparts. For the high school graduating class of 2005,
37 percent of rural high school graduates did not attend any type of college by the winter after graduating high school, compared to 25 percent of urban students.

Three significant obstacles many rural students face include:

**Income:** Per capita income is lower in rural regions of the state, making it harder for parents to afford college for their children. Improved funding for the Oregon Opportunity Grant represents the single largest initiative to increase access to college for low and moderate income Oregonians.

**Distance:** For many rural Oregonians, the closest university can be several hours away and rural students’ lack of exposure to a college setting can be a major barrier to attending college. Distance can also be a barrier for students wishing to attend a community college.

**Familiarity:** A lack of communication between colleges and rural high schools and communities can result in limited or no guidance for application, college selection, and financial aid opportunities. In addition, many rural students are the first in their families to go to college.

Recommendations to achieve two primary goals are set forth for: 1) strengthening the college-going culture in rural areas and 2) improving program completion and credential attainment. The resource team’s recommendations follow:

1) **Actions to strengthen college-going culture in rural areas**
   - Increase investment in proven pre-college outreach programs: Increase ASPIRE sites statewide (with priority in rural areas) from 115 to 210. Invest in GEAR UP to add 10 clusters serving middle and high schools
   - Promote availability of Dual Credit Option through state loan forgiveness initiative as incentive for subject-area M.A.’s agreeing to teach in rural schools
   - Increase pre-college advising skills for middle and high school teachers/counselors by funding summer institutes at colleges and universities
   - Promote student/parent ambassadors for rural middle and high school visitations
   - Increase collaboration among community colleges and universities in rural school outreach (travel funds for college/university visits, training for outreach staff)
   - Increase outreach efforts in rural communities for “adult” learners by increasing access sites and opportunities for gateway/introductory courses

2) **Actions to improve program completion and credential attainment**
   - Develop new regional “open campus” processes and agreements with financial support for the Eastern Oregon Collaborative Colleges Consortium and for the OSU/TVCC/COCC Madras and Prineville campuses for developmental education
   - Apply a “hub-and-spoke” education model through enhanced rural broadband infrastructure and fiscal support for several rural access points (e.g., extension offices, libraries, K-12 schools). Pilot gateway/introductory courses anticipating small classes

With a focus on the need to strengthen college-going in rural areas, one of the first recommendations was to increase investment in pre-college programs. Specifically, the group recommended building upon programs that have achieved success and possess evidence of
efficacy in their respective missions. Thus, the group has recommended increased investment in the ASPIRE and GEAR UP programs.

Following discussion, Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve the recommendations; Directors Powers and Wyse made the motion and seconded, respectively. The motion was carried.

SEMESTER STUDY
Chair Kelly again called upon Drs. Preus and Turner to present the action item. As background, with state investment in public postsecondary education in Oregon consistently decreasing as a percentage of total costs, and economic forecasts for future biennia promising further cuts, Senate Bill 442 sought to locate efficiencies while maintaining educational quality at public postsecondary institutions of higher education. Consideration of moving to a semester academic calendar was included in the bill as one possible move toward greater efficiency as institutions would have only three (including summer term) intensive periods of activity for business functions, academic advising, financial aid processing, grading, and all the myriad activities required with the beginning and ending of the term.

Equally important, discussion in the Senate Education Committee hearings on SB 442 suggested that a semester calendar might be preferable for pedagogical reasons as well. The notion that a 16 or 17-week academic term would provide an opportunity for subjects to be examined in greater depth and breadth is an oft-repeated claim of proponents of a semester calendar.

Currently, many OUS institutions under the quarter system adhere to the four-credit hour standard. A conversion to a semester system would see a transition to a three-credit standard. Working on the premise that the current “seat time” requirements for a degree would be preserved, fewer courses are required in the semester model than in the quarter system. Therefore, faculty and all academic departments would need to redesign courses and the curriculum required to obtain a degree at both the undergraduate and graduate level. This curricular redesign process would necessitate an enormous amount of time and effort by the faculty and this is work that cannot be “outsourced” or handled by other personnel. In addition to course and program redesign at the individual institution level, degree and certificate programs require review and approval at the System-level as well.

Should semester conversion take place, the resource team noted that the state and institutions must make a commitment to not allow the change to delay a student’s progress towards graduation. To make such a guarantee, the following are critical to a successful conversion process:

- The substantial up-front costs and increased personnel necessary for a calendar conversion need to be supported by legislative appropriations and cannot be absorbed within current operating budgets.
- A conversion process should be a minimum of three years and preferably a four-year process from start to finish.
- A majority of the resource team recommend delaying any calendar change of this magnitude until student demand has leveled off and state support is more robust. All
public institutions report struggling to keep up with the current demand in an historically resource-challenged environment.

— The change to semesters should include a fully-staffed conversion office to oversee the entire process. Institutions that have had successful conversions consistently point to the importance of having a full-time executive level administrator, at least one full-time staff assistant, and a highly discretionary conversion budget that rolls over annually for the duration of the conversion (Mayberry, p. 8).

A majority of the resource team believed that a semester conversion in Oregon should be an all or nothing proposition. In brief, all public postsecondary institutions should convert simultaneously, thus maintaining calendar consistency among Oregon’s public institutions of higher education.

Notably, President Mary Cullinan reports that her institution (Southern Oregon University) is very supportive of converting to a semester calendar and would welcome the opportunity to pilot a semester academic calendar in Oregon with adequate financial support. Such an effort would include working closely with Rogue Community College and other feeder institutions to ensure smooth transitions for students.

Following a full and frank discussion, Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve the report and submit it to the legislature. Directors Powers and Fox made the motion and seconded, respectively; motion carried.

**DUAL CREDIT STANDARDS APPROVAL PROCESS**

Drs. Preus and Turner then presented the dual credit standards approval process for discussion and approval. As background, The Unified Education Enterprise (UEE) recommends that the Joint Boards of Education endorse the state standards proposed by the Dual Credit Task Force and adopt a workplan for implementing these standards. Oregon’s Dual Credit programs create the opportunity for our students to take college-level courses while still in high school. The Dual Credit Task Force found that, in 2005-06, one in seven Oregon juniors and seniors took advantage of this opportunity, saving some $9 million in tuition. Through its pilot analysis of the subsequent academic performance of these students, the Task Force also found that “in most cases, Dual Credit students match or outperform their college-prepared counterparts in both community college and university settings.”

Thus, Dual Credit is currently a viable option for qualified students to begin postsecondary learning early and it can contribute significantly to meeting Oregon’s 40-40-20 goal. As Dual Credit programs grow, it is important to have a consistent set of standards and ways to ensure the standards are met. Guided by those standards over the next five years, the Task Force specifically recommended:

1) **Strengthening faculty connections**

   — Regular, collegial interactions between high school faculty and their counterparts at sponsoring colleges and universities are key to the success of these programs. Such interactions characterize some programs already, but they need to be developed and maintained throughout the state.
— The pool of high school teachers qualified to participate in Dual Credit programs should be expanded.

2) Adapting systematic application and review processes for Dual Credit programs
   — A standardized application process for new programs is needed.
   — Individual programs should take advantage of system-level (CCWD and OUS) studies of the subsequent academic performance of Dual Credit students.
   — A sustainable means for verifying program quality is needed.

3) Enhancing public understanding of Dual Credit programs
   — Dual Credit programs should be continued and effectively publicized. They should be recognized as one of the key paths for academic acceleration.
   — Evidence of best practices and student success should be gathered systematically and shared regularly – both with faculty in the programs and with the public.

Key elements of the dual credit program standards and program application are: program application, program summary, approval standards, program elements, guiding questions, program highlights, supporting documentation/evidence, and assurances and signatures.

Dr. Turner provided an annual timeline for the process. He added that regular program assessment will be conducted at the system-level (CCWD and OUS) and will compare dual credit students and their non-dual credit peers with respect to subsequent academic performance and persistence to goal. Focused system-level research will also be used to examine specific questions or trends that emerge from the full study, with the aim of identifying successful practices.

Discussion focused on providing greater opportunities for students in accelerated learning options to transition to a postsecondary institution. Following this discussion, Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve the dual credit standards approval process. Directors Pulliams and Wyse made the motion and seconded, respectively; motion carried.

2010 DUAL CREDIT STUDY
Chair Kelly called upon Bob Kieran, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research and Planning, OUS, to present a report on the 2010 dual credit study. The OUS Office of Institutional Research, working with the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development, undertook a pilot study in 2008 to evaluate dual credit instruction – courses taught in an Oregon high school, by a high school teacher sanctioned through a college, that carry both high school and college credit. The study found that dual credit instruction does as well as college-situated instruction in readying students for future college work. After the study appeared, the Joint Boards, acting through the UEE, directed that the study be repeated every two years with the aim of establishing a protocol by which to assess the effectiveness of dual credit programs. To that end, the present study addressed two questions: (1) Do high school students who take dual credit courses succeed when they go on to college?, and (2) Does dual credit instruction do as well as college situated instruction in preparing students for subsequent college coursework? The earlier study looked at high school students who took dual credit courses in 2005-06; the present study looked at students who took dual credit courses in 2007-08.
The 2007-08 study focused on two key questions: 1) Are high school students who take dual credit coursework generally successful when they go on to college? and 2) When students take dual credit courses in high school, do those courses prepare them for subsequent college coursework as well as if they had taken the courses in college? In addition, the study included a statistical sketch of the dual credit program at each participating Oregon college and summary data from community colleges’ dual credit programs in career and technical education. The analysis of dual credit performance was based on courses that are intended for academic transfer; the study did not attempt to evaluate dual credit career and technical education (CTE) programs.

Following the presentation and the accompanying discussion, Chair Kelly called for a motion to accept the report. Motion was made, seconded, and carried.

2010 UEE WORK PLAN
Chair Kelly called upon Director Jerry Berger to present the plan. Berger noted that the UEE continues to use the Joint Boards Policy framework to guide the PK-16 efforts. The 2010-11 work plan reflects work that has begun and needs to be completed. There are three areas that are not directly addressed in this plan, but will need attention and direction after the 2011 legislative session: 1) improve the faculty teacher connections within the PK-16 continuum; 2) improve access to education; and 3) improve the communication on the need for education and training.

1) Implement the Oregon diploma
   a) Align the levels of proficiency in four Essential Skills (Reading, Writing, Applying Mathematics, and Speaking) and the means for determining them, with postsecondary expectations.
   STATUS: Three essential skills (reading, writing and math) have been approved by the OSBE to be implemented between 2011 and 2014
   NEXT STEP: Determine how postsecondary institutions can use the assessments of these essential skills to ease transition and to potentially predict subsequent academic success.
   DELIVERABLES:
   OUS/CCWD/ODE:
   • Determine the subsequent academic success of students with a range of OAKS scores in three Essential Skills: reading writing and mathematics. This will require cross-sector sharing of existing longitudinal data on the academic performance (e.g., OAKS scores, SAT scores, and GPA) of individual students. See Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) description in Item 2 below.
   WHO: Tony Alpert (ODE), Bob Kieran (OUS), Marilyn Kolodziejczyk (CCWD)
   WHEN: Fall 2010 and ongoing
   STAFF LEADS: Joe Holliday, Krissa Caldwell, and Doug Kosty

---

1 For results of the study, see: [http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc100928-JB-3B-1.pdf](http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc100928-JB-3B-1.pdf)
OUS:
• OUS Admission Policy that incorporates outstanding strength in Essential Skills with priority admission to all OUS institutions.

WHO: Work with Provosts and Interinstitutional Committee for Admissions and Recruitment.

STAFF LEADS: Bob Turner, Joe Holliday, and Doug Kosty
• OUS Math placement exams: Work with OUS math departments to make their placement exams available to high school students and teachers in a manner that allows the students to determine the OUS math course into which they would place.

WHO: OUS math department heads or their designees
WHEN: Summer 2010 through spring 2011
STAFF LEADS: Bob Turner

CCWD:
• Offer community college placement tests to high school seniors to use for community college class placement and potentially for demonstrating Essential Skills proficiency.
• Consider adding some of the tests of math skills currently used by community colleges into OAKS.

WHO: Work with Presidents, Council of Instructional Administrators, Council of Student Service Administrators, math department chairs, and ODE assessment staff.
STAFF LEADS: Cam Preus, Krissa Caldwell, and Larry Cheyne

b) Coordinate response to the national common core standards and assessments. This will require close collaboration among ODE, CCWD, and OUS regarding the adoption and implementation of any part of these standards and assessments.

STATUS: Include all sectors in working groups connected with initiatives like: Race to the Top, Complete College America Alliance, SMARTER Balanced Consortium, Common Core Standards, and College and Career Readiness Standards

NEXT STEP: Include all sectors needs in any submitted proposal(s). UEE will ask Joint Boards Articulation Commission (JBAC) to identify representatives to working groups and suggest peer teams for review and support. It is important to ensure that individuals having direct responsibility for student learning in the relevant disciplines, that is K-12 teachers and college and university faculty, play prominent roles in these teams.

DELIVERABLES: The education partners, including classroom instructors and faculty in all sectors, understand and are supportive of the initiatives that increase student success and completion throughout the education continuum.

WHO: JBAC with UEE staff and leads from any of the initiatives.
WHEN: Submissions and conversations are ongoing.
STAFF LEADS: Michelle Hooper, Tony Alpert, Krissa Caldwell, Larry Cheyne, Joe Holliday, and Bob Turner

2) Improve the student data record tracking, alignment, and research to improve student success and remove barriers.
STATUS: Work groups on data sharing (SLDS), alignment of system/admissions tools (IDTS, OSTX, etc.), and student self-advising tools (portal, ATLAS, plan, and profile, etc.) were convened in 2009-10. The data alignment group submitted a successfully funded federal grant proposal to enhance a statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) for students. The other two groups submitted a list of potential action items to UEE Board members in the spring of 2010 for prioritization. The results of the prioritization are summarized in an attached document.

NEXT STEPS: Continue implementation of SLDS grant; focus student self-advising improvement efforts on development and implementation of an AAOT module in ATLAS; continue implementation of OSTX; continue development of a web portal. (Note: another high priority item, Essential Skills/New High School Diploma alignment, is covered in Item 1 above.)

DELIVERABLES: Year 1 SLDS grant objectives (see documentation in attached); fully developed (and implemented on a pilot basis) AAOT module in ATLAS; continued testing of OSTX, with possible implementation this year; continued development of a “shell” for the web portal concept and ongoing discussion of funding needed and fundraising approaches to move to full development and implementation.

WHO: OUS and campus staff: Joe Holliday, Bob Kieran, Lisa Mentz, Connie Atchley, Mark Hammerschmidt; CCWD and campus staff: Krissa Caldwell, Bruce Clemetsen, Donna James; ODE staff: Doug Kosty

WHEN: Fall 2010 through Spring 2011. Regular updates to UEE.

STAFF LEADS: Joe Holliday, Krissa Caldwell, and Doug Kosty

3) Update yearly the Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) score/credit relationships at all 24 community colleges and OUS institutions.

STATUS: Request JBAC to provide recommendations to Provosts and CIA in fall 2010 on AP and IB changes.

NEXT STEP: Revised recommendations to Provosts and CIA joint meeting in November 2010.

DELIVERABLES: COMPLETED: Revised AP and IB approved by UEE January 2011.

WHO: JBAC, Provosts, and CIA.

WHEN: November 2010 and January 2011.

STAFF LEADS: Joe Holliday and Larry Cheyne

4) Ensure the effectiveness of Dual Credit programs through institutional program approval, based on adopted statewide standards that emphasize: strong interactions between the instructors of Dual Credit courses and their college/university counterparts; regular, comprehensive analysis of Dual Credit students’ subsequent academic performance; and communication of effective practices. Develop an accelerate map of high school options in Oregon.

STATUS: Oversight committee reviews institutional program application in regard to standards, measures, and assurances.

NEXT STEP: Existing Oregon Dual Credit Programs will be reviewed over a 3-year period, beginning in August 2010 and continuing through 2013.
DEliverables: All Oregon dual credit programs meet state standards and are approved by August 2013. Maps showing the acceleration options at each Oregon high school in test run by August 2010.
Who: Dual Credit Oversight Committee
When: August 2010 for first round of program approvals and each subsequent August until 2013. Accelerated options map available by September 2010.
Staff Leads: Larry Cheyne, Bob Turner, and Michelle Hooper

5) Identify paths for high school teachers to become qualified to teach community college-level classes for the Dual Credit programs.
Status: A work group from CIA is developing options.
Next Step: Summer 2010 explore the feasibility and timing of implementing the options.
Deliverables: CIA recommends options for approving HS teachers for dual credit teaching by Fall 2010.
Who: CIA and UEE staff.
When: 2010-11 with regular updates to UEE.
Staff Leads: Larry Cheyne

6) Research and reports that address applied baccalaureate, semesters, and rural access for Oregonians for use in the 2011 Legislature.
Status: Reports in draft to be approved by Joint Boards by mid September 2010.
Next Step: UEE approved and forward to Joint Boards by mid September 2010.
Deliverables: Reports submitted by October 1, 2010.
Who: Working groups with leads from UEE.
When: To be completed by November 1, 2010.
Staff Leads: AB—Bruce Schafer and Connie Green; Semesters and rural access—Joe Holiday and Cam Preus

7) Explore the possibility of creating statewide pathways in targeted areas. Supplementing the current pattern of individual campus Pathway Programs has the potential to create offerings that exceed an individual institution’s capacity.
Status: The statewide pathways to advancement team have identified three statewide pathways to be developed in 2009-2011: health informatics, information technology, and basic healthcare.
Next Steps: Progress update for FY 2009-10. Health informatics statewide program currently in development; after careful consideration, information technology not pursued; Basic Healthcare Career Pathway Certificate developed by Rogue Community College. This certificate is available to be packaged for other community colleges to offer. Information on certificates and processes were packaged and adopted to be disseminated September 2010. New funding received through Green LMI Grant to develop five to seven Green Statewide Career Pathway Roadmaps. Project started April 2010 to be completed May 2011. Four occupation/industries have been identified to date: solar, HVAC-R, wind, and construction.
Deliverables: By June 2011, there will be statewide degree programs at community colleges in: health informatics, information technology, and basic healthcare.
Who: Oregon Pathway Alliance
8) Improved career pathways.

STATUS: Career Pathways team is currently developing process and procedure for updating current community college roadmaps in the Career Pathways Web tool with OUS and higher education articulation agreements. Community college roadmaps include links to OUS programs with articulation agreements. Crosswalk of articulation agreements and all roadmaps will be reviewed in FY 2010-11 for accuracy and completeness.

NEXT STEP: Collaborate with Oregon CIS to develop language/information to embed in Career Pathways Roadmaps and Plan of Study Templates (high school to community college articulation agreements) in CIS for student using CIS to access information and pull data for education plans developed in CIS. Collaboration with CIS in FY 2010-10; with programming, testing, and implementation by June 2011. Coordinate effort with CSSA to connect usage with the Education Plan & Profile.

DELIVERABLES: Pathway maps embed and connect to the CIS education plan and the articulation agreements by June 2011.

WHO: Statewide career pathways team with stakeholders.

WHEN: Academic year 2010-11.

STAFF LEAD: Mimi Maduro

9) Improved student success at meeting an individual’s career goal. This includes the development of a plan for student participation and completion that will become the Complete College America Alliance (CCAA).

STATUS: Both community colleges and universities have been focusing on student success and persistence. Both have plans and next steps that address rural access, diversity gaps, and transitions. PSQEC also reflected the high-level practices to increase student persistence and completion.

NEXT STEPS: A team will develop the CCAA plan for Oregon.

DELIVERABLES: An approved plan by Joint Boards that meet the CCAA requirements. Those requirements are that each state must:

a) Set Completion Goals (set annual state and campus-specific degree and credential completion goals through 2020);

b) Develop Action Plans and Move Key Policy Levers that include:
   • Ensure all students are ready to start and succeed in freshman credit courses.
   • Redesign remediation efforts to substantially improve success.
   • Increase the number of students completing on-time.
   • Develop new, shorter, and faster pathways to degrees and credentials of value in the labor market.
   • Utilize available financial resources to provide incentives to students and colleges for progress and completion.

c) Collect and Report Common Measures of Progress that include:
   • Using common metrics for measuring and reporting progress.
• Publicly reporting year one benchmark data and annual progress on college completion, progression, transfer, job placement and earnings, and cost and affordability measures.
• Disaggregating data by level and type of degree/credential, age, race, and income.

WHO: UEE staff with a CCAA team.
WHEN: Completed by December 2010. Implementation and quarterly reports will be ongoing.
STAFF LEAD: Cam Preus, Margie Lowe, George Pernsteiner, and UEE staff.

10) Coordinate sustainability curriculum capacity and outcomes in the education enterprise.
STATUS: Currently, sustainability curriculums exist throughout the education enterprise. The connections and understanding of outcomes is limited but CCWD, under the Green Labor Market Information Improvement Grant, which includes the statewide career pathways project, and the development of the Green Training Performance System, which will actually identify the courses and OUS through the AASHE STARS process are conducting independent inventories of sustainability curriculum and working to identify potential alignment between the sectors.
NEXT STEP: Complete independent curriculum inventories and reconvene to discuss connections and alignment. Identify next steps.
DELIVERABLES: Identify a work plan for 2010 through 2013.
WHO: OUS and CCWD
WHEN: Fall 2010 through Fall 2011
STAFF LEAD: Charles Triplett and Shalee Hodgson

Director Berger made the motion to approve the 2010-11 UEE work plan as proposed; Director Fisher seconded. Motion carried.

INFORMATION ITEMS

ACCELERATED LEARNING MAP
Dr. Connie Green was called upon to present the item. She reiterated that educators and policy-makers alike are calling for increased educational opportunities that prepare students for the rigors of postsecondary education. Accelerated learning opportunities foster smoother and more successful transition from high school to college while allowing students to earn dual credit. Accelerated learning opportunities can also increase communication, collaboration, and curricular alignment between secondary and postsecondary systems; prepare students for academic challenges of college through a rigorous high school curriculum; dispel “senioritis” by offering interesting, challenging, and college credit-bearing courses; provide students with the practical skills needed to succeed in college; and provide students with interesting curricular options.

To assist students in accessing information pertaining to the Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Dual Credit/Expanded Options, an accelerated learning map is being developed that will link each Oregon county with information the programs offered and the
secondary districts and postsecondary institutions participating. This map will be located on the Department of Education website.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PARTNERSHIPS REPORT

Dr. Larry Cheyne provided a report on the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (located at www.ode.state.or.us/superintendent/priorities/state-strategies-for-overseeing-dual-enrollment-10.pdf). Cheyne advised that the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) is a professional organization for high schools and colleges that advances seamless education through secondary and postsecondary collaborations. Established in 1999 in response to the dramatic increase in concurrent enrollment courses throughout the country, NACEP fosters student success and achievement by supporting standards of excellence that promote program and professional development, accreditation, research, and advocacy.

The NACEP September 2010 report “Promoting Quality: State Strategies for Overseeing Dual Enrollment Programs” concluded that states considering implementing new strategies for overseeing the quality of dual enrollment programs have a variety of tools at their disposal. Local policy environments and institutional arrangements affect the design of a state oversight system. Policy-makers should identify quality assurance mechanisms that encourage colleges and universities to adopt best practices without establishing burdensome regulatory measures. There are many routes to the desired outcome of a high quality seamless education system for students, where high school teachers and college faculty collaborate to align curriculum across the secondary-postsecondary divide.

COMPLETE COLLEGE AMERICA ALLIANCE

Margie Lowe, Governor’s Office, provided an overview of the Complete College America Alliance. This Alliance includes each states' commitment to college completion:

1. Set completion goals: To join the Complete College America Alliance of States, a state—in partnership with its colleges and universities—pledges to make college completion a top priority and commits to the following:
   a. Establish annual state and campus-specific degree and credential completion goals through 2020.

2. Develop action plans and move key policy levers: Develop and implement aggressive state and campus-level action plans for meeting the state’s college completion goals, including strategies to:
   a. Ensure all students are ready to start and succeed in freshman credit courses.
   b. Redesign remediation efforts to substantially improve success.
   c. Increase the number of students completing on-time.
   d. Develop new, shorter, and faster pathways to degrees and credentials of value in the labor market.
   e. Utilize available financial resources to provide incentives to students and colleges for progress and completion.
3. Collect and report common measures of progress: Use consistent data and progression measures to create a culture that values completion. This includes:
   - Using common metrics for measuring and reporting progress.
   - Publicly reporting year one benchmark data and annual progress on college completion, progression, transfer, job placement and earnings, and cost and affordability measures.
   - Disaggregating data by level and type of degree/credential, age, race, and income.

Lowe emphasized that for far too many students, the path through college ends with no degree and often too much debt. Oregon is making great progress in providing access to more students but must have more success from all students. Fall 2009 enrollment listed total public college enrollment at 183,332; 106,512 full-time, 76,820 part-time; 76,091 in 4-year colleges and 107,241 in 2-year colleges. For states to compete, students must earn more degrees and certificates and all credentials should provide clear pathways to success. Oregon graduation rates are very low, especially for students who are poor, part-time, African American, Hispanic, or older. It was noted in conclusion that, given changing demographics, the United States will not have enough skilled Americans to compete unless many more students from all backgrounds and walks of life graduate.

**HIGHER EDUCATION WORK GROUP**

Ms. Lowe then informed the Joint Boards concerning the Higher Education Work Group, which was tasked by the legislature with proposing reforms to ensure access to and affordability of quality postsecondary education; consider long-term funding models, including the management of tuition increases; and consideration of a governance model that optimizes Systemwide efficiencies to produce an educated workforce. Senator Mark Hass (D-Beaverton) and Representative Tobias Read (D-Beaverton) will co-chair the work group; other members include Senators Chris Edwards (D-Eugene), Frank Morse (R-Albany), and Dave Nelson (R-Pendleton) and Representatives Sara Gelser (D-Corvallis), Michael Dembrow (D-Portland), Betty Komp (D-Woodburn), Greg Smith (R-Heppner), and Sherrie Sprenger (R-Scio).

The Joint Boards was then provided a report that, during the July and August 2010 meetings of the Work Group, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) presented their study, “Oregon Higher Education Anew: Autonomy and Accountability to Serve the State and Its Citizens,” that recommended a structure and finance policy. The report established the preeminent principle as the state focusing on goals (defining and establishing benchmarks, determining gaps between performance and goals, developing strategies to close gaps, and tying finance and accountability back to goals). Simply stated, Oregon has an obligation to define what should be accomplished, create a financing framework that ensures adequate educational capacity and the utilization of that capacity to achieve state goals, to determine an accountability framework that measures whether goals are being attained, and to delegate to institutions the determination of how goals are to be achieved.

The finance policy should be structured to yield adequate funding for institutions and affordability from the perspective of both students and the states and the higher education system must be an “efficient” system—producing the outcomes specified in the goals at the
lowest cost consistent with the ability to maintain quality. Members participated in a lively discussion.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to conduct, Chair Kelly adjourned the meeting at 11:17 a.m.