CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL
The meeting of the Education Joint Boards Working Group was called to order at 1:08 p.m. by State Board of Higher Education President Jim Lussier.

On roll call, the following Joint Board members answered present:

**Board of Higher Education**
- Roger Bassett
- Tim Young
- Jim Lussier

**Board of Education**
- Jill Kirk

**Other Higher Education Members** – Geri Richmond

**Others:** Richard Jarvis (OUS), Cam Preus-Braly (CCWD), Jim Arnold (OUS), Pat Burk (ODE), Shirley Clark (OUS), Randy Harnisch (ODE), Terri Johanson (CCWD), Wayne Neuburger (ODE), Christine Tell (OUS), Virginia Thompson (OUS), Diane Vines (OUS), Susan Weeks (OUS), Elaine Yandle-Roth (CCWD), and Holly Zanville (OUS)

Meeting attendees also included other institutional representatives and interested observers.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes of the January 13, 2003, meeting were approved by consensus, since there was not a quorum to officially approve.

AGENDA REVIEW
Director Bassett noted that the original agenda had been amended to allow discussion on the Status of the Partnership to occur first.

STATUS OF THE PARTNERSHIP
1. Preliminary Findings – OUS / ODE Study
Christine Tell, Director of PASS, introduced the preliminary findings of the study and report: THE FIRST YEAR: 10th Grade Benchmark Standards and First Year College Performance (2001-02). The freshman class entering Oregon University System (OUS) institutions in fall 2001 was admitted on the basis of meeting traditional college entry requirements. In addition, those who entered OUS institutions and the state’s community colleges in fall 2001 were the first group of Oregon students to have additional information about performance on academic standards at the 10th grade benchmark. This represents part of the requirements of the Oregon Education Act for the 21st Century. This Performance was measured by the Oregon state assessment
system in the four areas of reading/literature, writing, math problem solving, and math knowledge and skills.

Three research questions framed the study:

1. How does the performance of incoming Oregon students on state benchmark assessments compare with their subsequent performance in college level coursework?
2. What is the relationship of state assessments, high school GPA, college GPA, and the SAT to first year college performance? and
3. What is the value of the state’s 10th grade benchmark assessment for predicting college success?

The standards cohorts for this study were 6082 resident freshmen who took one or more of the state assessments. These resident freshmen were a subgroup of the 10,074 currently registered on campus. It was pointed out that students in Oregon’s private high schools are not required to take state assessments and, therefore, are not part of the standards cohort.

The study also included 23,297 of 40,062 first-year students from the state’s community colleges for whom data on one or more of the four state assessment measures were available. The study required working with three data sets and, because there isn’t an integrated system for collecting the data, all data had to be matched individually by last name, date of birth, and other factors. It was suggested that, if the Boards perceive this information to be useful, serious consideration should be given to investing in an integrated data system.

The academic standards test results were provided by the Oregon Department of Education to Institutional Research at OUS for students who graduated from high school in the class of 2001. The preliminary findings are based on descriptive statistics and correlations among variables including Oregon academic standards tests taken in grade 10; results from national college entrance admission tests; end of year high school cumulative GPA; performance in freshmen year of college as measured by overall college GPA; and, continued enrollment in the second year of college. Dr. Tell cautioned that, while some or all of this information was available, it was not consistent.

Students in these cohorts who took the assessment test in 1999, which was required and administered to all students, were not informed that it would later be linked to performance. The preliminary findings address the preparation of students at every level and this appears to be a tool for moving students more positively toward success.

Implications of the preliminary findings were discussed.

1. Promising data were obtained from students who had no idea that their performance on assessment tests were of value in college placement and success.
This finding raises the question of whether or not students would perform better if they were more motivated.

Baseline data have been made available to faculty – but this is only partially in place in four standards areas. More work is required in this area.

Each year, OUS sends an academic performance report to each high school from which students have graduated. For the first time this year, the report will contain college performance data. This will signal to the schools and students that what happens in high school really does matter.

Since there is a legal obligation that by 2014 students will meet these benchmarks, these findings could provide incentive to students and teachers alike of the benefits of the information obtained. There are important implications for counseling students about areas where they need to focus academically to increase the likelihood of success in post-secondary education settings. These findings could encourage more focused attention at the middle school level on critical areas for success in college. For example, students need to be encouraged to take challenging and more rigorous coursework in high school.

An observation was also made that taking just one measurement of predicting success in post-secondary education would be a mistake. There is a correlation among the various data sources and there is a real need to continue to collect these data.

When asked if the data had been analyzed on the basis of gender, the response was that, because of the difficulty in obtaining and analyzing data, this had not been done. Further, a request was made that an attempt be made to track the level of campus involvement and correlate it to success in the first year of college enrollment; however, it was noted that this information is not available in this data set.

Finally, staff made another plea for investment in an integrated data system.

**2. ReadOregon**

Holly Zanville reported that a sample newsletter had been sent to various schools around Oregon and another joint letter is being prepared to send to other schools in the state. The ReadOregon website was activated on January 5, 2003, and members of the Joint Boards Working Group were encouraged to visit it.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

1. **Coordinated Strategic Planning Framework for K-16 – topics are initial list for discussion**

Roger Bassett called attention to a “bubble” chart entitled, “Coordinated Strategic Planning Framework for K-16” that had been provided for the meeting and indicated that it was one way of looking at the whole list of topics that appear to engage both Boards
in joint decision-making. It was indicated that it was important for each sector to have its priorities included. For example, what are the consequences of days off the school year as a result of budget shortfalls? It was underscored that there is a great deal of urgency on many of these issues because of the tendency of the legislature to act on issues before the Boards have had an opportunity to discuss them and arrive at agreements. “For example, higher education is driven by legislative mandates of no more resources, enroll more students, and limit tuition,” Bassett observed.

2. Issue Topics
   a. Quality

Several documents on quality, prepared by Shirley Clark and Susan Weeks, were reviewed. Included were: “Framework for Discussion of Quality,” “Overview: Quality in Higher Education,” and selected printouts of a PowerPoint presentation, “Crunch Time for Oregon’s Public Universities: Holding the Line on Quality.”

The discussion centered on quality goals, what measures are being used, what is valued by stakeholders, and how to relate quality measures across the education sectors. The notion of a resource continuum was suggested that would take into account the levels of funding and relating them to elements of quality. There was general agreement that a clear and concise definition of quality was needed and that the number of indicators should be kept to a minimum. Additionally, it was agreed that something needs to be added that reflects the urgency of, for example, capping enrollment to preserve quality and, insofar as possible, to use existing data collection mechanisms rather than spend time and resources creating new ones.

Concern was expressed about the tendency to connect, for higher education, the RAM with quality since the level of quality is not always resource driven. For example, time to degree, ability to register for classes in the proper sequence to complete a degree, and size of classrooms and laboratories could be better indicators of quality. It was also suggested that a very useful indicator could be the impact that capping enrollment has on economic recovery/development.

Chancellor Jarvis underscored that a major challenge in measuring quality and the impacts of reduced funding is that change comes slowly and erosion in quality show up over time. It begins to show up in trends such as difficulty in recruiting students, and student dropout prior to degree completion because it takes too long to complete degrees.

It was underscored that the measures of quality need to cross sectors and that community colleges and four-year institutions might take the same indicators and examine them together. Examples might include persistence, time to completion (AA in community colleges, BA in OUS), employer and graduate satisfaction, and research and grant activity. Chancellor Jarvis and Commissioner Cam Preus-Braly agreed to look at these elements across sectors.
b. Access/participation
Mr. Bassett, in introducing the discussion of access/participation, expressed an urgency to have the Boards address the issues in order to be prepared for the legislative meetings that each sector will have in the coming months. The Measuring Up Report has measures that can be used to begin the conversation. It was pointed out that there is a tension between access and affordability and that they are interrelated.

Mr. Lussier pointed out that universal access to education is an unfunded mandate and Oregon is going to have to realize that it is subject to change by the legislature. Ms. Kirk suggested that the Boards attempt to do a 20-year map of what the systems would look like and what would be needed to support each. This approach takes a look at the educational needs of people throughout their lifetime.

c. Affordability and Preparation – Framework for March Meeting
Time did not permit much discussion of affordability but Ms. Weeks was asked to prepare, for the March meeting, some analysis of the differences between access and affordability.

d. Pipeline Issues – Preparation Needed for March Meeting
Preparation is required to move the conversation forward on pipeline issues.

3. Strengthening the Joint Boards

a. Establish a Boards/Staff Leadership Team
Mr. Bassett expressed concern that there is a continuing struggle to balance Board and staff time and that he felt it was important to continue to restate the importance of this group and find ways to better sustain its work. He indicated that for him the objective is to foster increased engagement while limiting the workload. One concept thought to be important is that the Joint Boards Working Group constitutes an executive committee of the Joint Board. There is a need to recruit new members to this task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEO’s</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Castillo</td>
<td>Pat Burk</td>
<td>Jill Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Jarvis</td>
<td>Shirley Clark</td>
<td>Jim Lussier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam Preus-Braly</td>
<td>Randy Harnisch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bret West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is anticipated that the CEO’s of the three sectors will meet on a regular basis and that the priorities of the Joint Boards be a part of their agenda.

The Executive Committee should consist, at a minimum, of the presidents of both Boards and, hopefully, at least one other Board member from each sector. This group
should take the responsibility of keeping the CEO's and staff informed as to their priorities.

Each sector will identify at least two people to work as the Staff Group. This group is responsible for developing meeting agendas, providing guidance on drafting items, preparing and mailing docket materials in advance of the meeting, and making all logistical arrangements.

b. Responsibilities for tasks and logistics
The Board of Higher Education will prepare the minutes of the February meeting and make the arrangements for the March meeting, including the logistics and the agenda. The Department of Education will write the minutes for the March meeting and plan for the April meeting; the Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development will write the minutes of the April meeting and plan for May meeting.

The Board of Higher Education will develop a schedule of dates, deadlines, and responsibilities and try to convene a meeting of the “staff” group prior to the March meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS AND ADJOURNMENT**
The next meeting of the Joint Boards Working Group will be March 10, 2003.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.