CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL
The meeting of the Education Joint Boards Working Group was called to order at 1:09 p.m. by Board of Education President Jill Kirk.

On roll call, the following Board members answered present:

Board of Higher Education
Roger Bassett
Jim Lussier
Tim Young

Board of Education
Ralph Breitenstein
Jill Kirk
Judith Stiegler

Others:
Pat Burk, ODE
Pauline Bernard, ODE
Shirley Clark, OUS
Randy Harnisch, ODE
Richard Jarvis, OUS
Terri Johansen, CCWD
Dave McDonald, OUS
Cam Preus-Braly, CCWD
Christine Tell, OUS
Virginia Thompson, OUS
Susan Weeks, OUS
Bret West, CCWD
Holly Zanville, OUS

Meeting attendees also included other institutional representatives and interested observers.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Director Bassett moved and Director Young seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2002 meeting. Director Kirk requested that the portion of the minutes that discussed “K-12–OUS Standards Outcome Study,” state, “It is of the highest priority that the study be completed as soon as possible.” The motion was approved unanimously.

AGENDA REVIEW
Director Bassett suggested that: an additional item on affordability be added to the agenda that would follow the discussion on quality and that the discussion be no more in depth and no more conclusive than the conversation had been at the last meeting when quality was discussed; the categories of the reports become the topic list or strategic vision; the “Measuring Up” categories should act as a construct for Joint
Boards work; and finally, the agenda item titled “Reports” be labeled, “State of the Partnership.”

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. **Quality**
   a. **Definition of Quality**

Documents prepared for the meeting were reviewed. It was noted that at the December meeting when quality was discussed, there was some tension around whether it could be defined to the full satisfaction and agreement of the various sectors. Among other things, it is important to focus on: how quality is measured, what kind of analysis should be provided and on what dimensions, and a strategy to arrive at an acceptable definition.

One of the requests made at the last meeting was that staff review the literature on quality and, if possible, present it on one page as an overview. In addition, it was requested that a beginning list of approaches to measuring quality be done. Definitions should reach across all three sectors but focus primarily on postsecondary and higher education and should relate to either sector or institutional missions.

Vice Chancellor Clark reviewed traditional and ongoing approaches for measuring quality, noting that most institutions use all of the measures to some extent or another. There are emergent approaches in the area of performance and accountability that take into account outcomes more than inputs. Some of the newer approaches were described as value-added in the sense that they are not merely definitions of quality, but also provide ways to describe students and how much gain they have made over a period of time.

Director Bassett suggested the next step in reviewing the document would be to acknowledge that every element is an important measure for anchoring a definition of quality. He suggested the Work Group select a handful of measures, perhaps five or six, that emphasize Oregon postsecondary education priorities.

A lengthy discussion followed focusing on how productive it might be to look at quality from the standpoint of various stakeholders, applying concrete examples. One such perspective would be a focus on students in the systems. The analysis should also be done in relationship to budget models of the sectors. A caution was raised about not favoring one kind of measure over another or one group of stakeholders over the other. At the end of the discussion, there was agreement that the definitions of quality should be stakeholder based. It was also noted that in the beginning the definitions should not be so narrow as to limit discussion.

It was agreed that staff should prepare a sample of measures of quality for the next meeting. In the interest of keeping it simple and understandable, Board members asked that as these are developed, they be in the least esoteric terms possible.
It was generally agreed that ultimately there needs to be a single integrated set of budget models that are related to quality. The models should take into account the level of resources required to achieve quality and be broken down to see, function by function, the comparable elements of the community college model and the OUS model.

It was pointed out that the analysis could also serve as a “Status of the Partnership” document. It would be a collaborative effort to show where there are commonalities and where there are differences, as well as how they relate to quality and how quality can be translated into resources.

It was decided that quality ought to be defined on a continuum. On the one hand, the model should identify the goals to which the systems aspire and, on the other, the minimum levels below which we cannot go. This is sometimes a difficult balance since there are times when the debate will focus on one extreme or the other.

Director Kirk asked what would happen if we were to blend this perspective on quality with the budget model. She asked that at the next meeting, when there is an understanding from the resource providers’ views of the minimum and maximum levels, that they be run back against the model to find out how close to the minimum the systems are at the present time. She said the group should also determine what happens if one system falls farther behind or moves farther ahead on the quality measures. In addition, the question should be asked, “What happens if K-12 students are more capable in a few years? What are the implications for the community colleges and OUS?”

It was noted that the Quality Education Model for K-12 is a good model, but the development of it has taken a tremendous amount of work and extensive resources. The end benefits may be important enough to warrant the effort and cost, but this must be taken into consideration. It was suggested that the measures employed in the “Measuring Up Report” be utilized since they reach well into the K-12 system on issues of participation, continuing education, and student preparation for the next phase of their life.

It was suggested that both OUS and the community colleges have professionals that are on the cutting edge of using GIS as social models as well as geographic models. It might be useful to tap into the talent of software models in the social sciences. There are also sources of information in some collaborative studies between ODE and OUS that focus on high school graduates.

In clarifying the task for staff, it was pointed out that what was being requested is more than just taking the Quality Education Model and applying it to higher education. If concepts of proficiency shifted from course work to higher education, it could provide exciting opportunities. The boundaries between the systems would begin to blur with high school students doing college work. This kind of analysis usually has a lot of sales appeal because it can dramatically expand the base of stakeholders as more people see its value.
A question is, “Should we take a student-centric view or some other stakeholder perspective?” For example, if you looked from a student’s vantage point and assume a student has four years worth of funding at the college level, the question becomes, what could he/she accomplish? If the high school education was strong enough, four years of funding could perhaps move college students to a master’s degree. There was general agreement that blurring the linkages between high school, community colleges, and OUS would be desirable. If there are more opportunities in high school for students to become connected to postsecondary opportunities, many might be more likely to continue.

2. Affordability / Measuring Up
Director Bassett addressed the topic of affordability. He reviewed the document, “Framework for Discussion on Affordability” provided as an analytical base against which actions should be tested. He referred to the measures of “Measuring Up Report” that provides a way to think about the progression from the best possible funding scenario to one that would describe where the last dollar would be invested. The topic of affordability should be addressed in the same way as quality, determining what it is and how it would be defined.

A question would be: “How do we define the resources needed to get to the grade we want?” The measures used in development of the policy should follow those of “Measuring Up,” since they take into account the broader public and not just the institutions or sectors. Oregon, compared to other states, has not made the investment in education and this must be acknowledged when examining quality and affordability. A challenge for the various education sectors is to break out of traditional ways of examining issues.

Linking together where course selection occurs becomes both a financial and an instructional model. Many college students choose a particular career path based on their need to repay loans. High loan debt has a clear impact on many students’ career choices. Another dimension of affordability is examining models used in institutions and whether they can be afforded. Several questions were raised: “Are there different models on every campus? Is articulation the same? Is there packaging of degrees across sectors that could be done? Are the models affordable? Can we afford them to operate in the ways we have in the past?”

There was general agreement that some of the measures from “Measuring Up” could be changed and different weighting given to them to fit Oregon. However, as Chancellor Jarvis pointed out, it might be best if Oregon was measured against the national base and additional items considered.

Director Lehmann said it appears that affordability is key to the gaps Oregon had in “Measuring Up” compared to other states. The results seem to indicate that we are disenfranchising our own people who can no longer afford to stay here and acquire postsecondary education. Affordability has a lot to do with access and the question was
raised as to whether it is best to address it separately or if affordability should be part of a larger access model.

Director Bassett expressed the view that the topics should be kept separate. “If we bind them together too early we lose the importance of them as separate items. It becomes difficult to keep track of what is powerfully important about them individually. If, in the future, it is determined that the distinction can’t be defended, the two could be combined. For now,” he proposed, “they should be kept separate.”

There was general consensus to the suggestions.

Director Bassett suggested the “Measuring Up” report be used as part of a framework for the work of the Joint Boards on these topics in addition to a framework used in the OUS categories of policy. He shared a document entitled, “Coordinated Strategic Planning Framework for K-16” and requested a similar framework be developed to represent the strategic priorities of the Joint Boards through the Working Group. The intention is that the measures used in each of the grading categories be a starting point for any measures used to quantify the policies that are developed. It was pointed out that the measures used in “Measuring Up” might not be truly reflective of OUS. It is important, Mr. Basset indicated, that any measures used by the Joint Boards should measure the performance of the broader public vitality, how investing is done, and on what priorities.

CCWD Commissioner Cam Preus-Braly and Assistant Commissioner Terri Johansen reflected on the complex nature of national studies. For example, research for the National Literacy Survey was incredibly expensive and the data sampling small. It was agreed that there is difficulty in getting funding to do the kinds of studies that are needed. On the other hand, it is extremely important to have accurate, complete, and updated information.

Director Bassett moved and Director Young seconded a motion to utilize the “Measuring Up Report” as a template for the larger work of the Joint Boards. The motion was approved unanimously.

**STATUS OF THE PARTNERSHIPS**

1. **K12 – OUS Standards Outcome Study**

Dr. Christine Tell, director of implementation for PASS, explained that the integrated data transfer system would provide data in three areas. It will track K-12 to four-year institutions, transfers to four-year institutions, and link all sectors. There is a student education plan and profile that is required for high school graduation, and this requires a data element that reports on the standards students have met, along with the high school transcript.

Dr. Tell reported on a December 14, 2002, meeting attended by 35 representatives from OUS registrars and admissions offices as well as community college representatives.
They reviewed and approved the integrated transfer system and addressed the next steps. Fundamental to conducting this and future studies was the recommendation that there be agreement on what the next data transfer items should be.

Regarding the K-12/OUS standards outcome study, Dr. Tell noted that OUS reports back to high schools across the state now by matching “traditional” indicators with college success. The study is to determine the relationship between three categories of indicators to ascertain where or if there are strong relationships between GPAs, SAT scores, and college success and if there are other kinds of relationships. A future study will determine whether there are particular groups of indicators that discriminate better. It was noted that community college student data are included in the K-12/OUS study. The final data will be run in February, with the results scheduled to be completed on February 28. Dr. Tell explained that the questions asked by the community colleges are parallel to OUS, but the indicators are different.

Director Kirk underscored again how extremely important the study is. She noted that a lot can happen in the next six weeks and this information could be a very powerful tool for advocates of education in Oregon.

Director Stiegler agreed that this is vital information, noting that there are competing forces at work, particularly in the K-12 sector with the “No Child Left Behind” program, and there will be efforts to examine standards-based education.

Director Kirk asked that the information be made available to the heads of the three systems and the Board of Education as soon as it is completed. Chancellor Jarvis agreed that this report could have a big impact and that it was important to have a plan for press releases when the information is ready to be made public.

Director Kirk said it would be ideal to have an embargoed copy out to a small group a day or two before the planned release date and requested that ODE Executive Officer Randy Harnisch help coordinate that effort. Dr. Tell noted that the planned release will include talking points and suggested that, at the next meeting, there be a discussion on how to present the information.

2. Oregon Research Report

Associate Vice Chancellor Holly Zanville reported that a great deal of work is coming out of two partnerships: the Oregon Quality Assurance in Teaching (O-QAT) Grant and the Oregon State Action for Educational Leadership (SAELP). She referred to the O-QAT website that is designed to keep its partners informed. The site includes information about teacher licensing, reading, literacy, and a number of studies and research. One relevant study (included in the agenda packet as an example) looks at what has happened to individuals who received an Oregon Administrator License between 1999-2001: how many are working, what’s happened to them, what were their early experiences as administrators.
The other recently completed study is a “one-year-after” study that looked at the experiences of student teachers from 2000-2001. Dr. Zanville stated that there were several important implications in both studies. There has been improvement in diversity by gender, but not by ethnicity. Many implications have emerged regarding the more formal course work that appears to be most beneficial to needy practicing administrators and teachers. The study found a significant difference between how important a variety of skills and knowledge are to the jobs that educators report versus the type of course work provided in their university program. Relating to a quality practicum experience, many administrators reported that their practicum did not relate to the activities of an administrator. Regarding the first year on the job, indicators show there is a need for a supportive and strong mentorship program. However, Oregon schools do not typically offer mentorship programs.

Numerous areas for improvement are identified in these and other recent research. Dr. Zanville noted that various groups are now working with the information resulting from these studies to consider next steps.

**Meeting Summary**

Director Bassett suggested that the topic of “pipelines” be brought back on the agenda of the Working Group.

After examining several alternative meeting schedules, there was consensus that the Joint Boards Working Group would meet the second Monday of each month from 1-4 p.m., alternating locations between Salem and Portland.

Director Kirk adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.