



Post-Secondary Quality Education Commission

Meeting Minutes

February 27, 2008

Members Present: Ed Ray (co-chairs), Mary Spilde (co-chair), Roger Bassett, Jerry Berger, Frank McNamara, Richard Schwarz, Javier Torres, Tony Van Vliet, Larry Wolf

Others Present: Brian Collins, Dave Conley, Nancy Heiligman, Andrea Henderson, Earl Johnson, Jay Kenton, Margie Lowe, Bill McGee, Ann McLaughlin, George Pernsteiner, Cam Preus, Bob Turner, Susan Weeks, Lisa Zavala-Pinheiro

Co-chair Ed Ray opened the meeting by asking those in attendance to introduce themselves. After introductions, he reviewed the materials distributed to Commission members.

Ed Ray asked for a motion to approve the January 30, 2008, meeting minutes. Larry Wolf motioned for approval and Javier Torres seconded the motion. Ed Ray asked for a motion to approve the February 14, 2008, meeting minutes. Larry Wolf motioned for approval and Tony Van Vliet seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously approved the meeting minutes for January 30 and February 14, 2008.

Co-chair Mary Spilde introduced David T. Conley, Director of the Center for Educational Policy Research, from the University of Oregon to discuss quality education policy work. Dave Conley has years of experience analyzing and developing models to address funding and quality issues at the K-12 level. Conley gave a brief overview of a few policy models he has assisted with over the past few years including the Washington Adequacy Funding Model and the Hawaii Quality Education Model. He stated that determining the inputs and outputs for a model is critical. He also noted that policy models are a type of forecasting, which are often imprecise.

Dave Conley stated that two key components to developing a policy model include the quality of data and the quality of assumptions for the model. In developing the model it is important to define clear goals, develop multiple methods for analysis, understand where the gaps are (current situation compared to ideal situation), and incorporating accountability to achieve the desired results.

Tony Van Vliet asked if there were computer models available for the Commission to review. Dave Conley stated there are some computer models, but they are judgment based. It is important to understand costs and cost benefits. Some goals may have a low cost but have a high benefit, so it is important to prioritize cost benefits.

Ed Ray commented that it would be important for the Commission to define inputs and outputs. Dave Conley agreed and stated that it will be difficult to define a unit of measurement to define the quality of education. The unit of measurement will need to be robust and should capture variances, as well as understanding what is common and what is unique when defining the unit(s) of analysis. George Pernsteiner commented that quality and quantity should be defined in advance, as the State of Oregon decided to reduce education costs by 40% and it resulted in a

loss of graduates by 25%. Conley agreed and noted that the Commission has been charged with the development of a higher education policy model that is uncharted compared to K-12 policy models.

Mary Spilde asked George Pernsteiner to address the second agenda item, Oregon Postsecondary Education – long-range planning, goals, key outcomes measure. Pernsteiner stated that Susan Weeks will present analysis conducted by the Oregon University System (OUS). Weeks briefly reviewed the handouts she distributed to the Commission including OUS's success goals (six years and by 2025); performance measurement; vision, goals, and strategic priorities; key performance measure (freshman participation rate, retention rate, graduation rate, bachelor's degrees, advance degrees, sponsored research expenditures); and *An Investment in Oregonians for Our Future*. Weeks reviewed the four goals outlined by the State Board of Higher Education.

Ed Ray stated that if a higher education system is under-funded one key component that faculty will hold on to is quality. He commented that retaining quality will be important throughout the process. Frank McNamara asked why retention rates are important to a higher education system. Ed Ray responded by stating that retention rates are an output measurement, a way to document outcomes. Richard Schwarz asked if both students starting at a four-year institution and transfer students are tracked in the graduation rate. Susan Weeks stated that both are being tracked, and that OUS is in the process of defining an assessment process for learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are part of a national conversation and Oregon is in the beginning stages of that conversation.

Susan Weeks stated OUS would have to double its current level of degree production to reach its goals for 2025. Ed Ray stated that the state has no credible plan to create the built capacity needed to double Oregon's enrollment by 2025. He stated that it would be useful to have Jay Kenton and others calculate what the built capacity needs will be even making generous assumptions about the use of on-line, community college, and high school facilities to deliver college courses. Cam Preus stated that OUS goals for 2025 do not include community colleges. She indicated that Oregon community colleges are in the process of developing similar goals that can be aggregated with OUS goals.

Tony Van Vliet stated that mission creep is also important to address, as it can overlap within a system and reduce efficiency. George Pernsteiner stated that the State Board of Higher Education reviews mission creep on a case-by-case basis. Some institutions are better equipped to provide a program compared to the institution within that region. Richard Schwarz asked if there was a master list of programs and where those programs are taught. Margie Lowe stated that it is important for the Commission to focus on its specific charge and not to address policy issues managed by other boards or commissions. Ed Ray agreed and stated that the Commission should focus on the processes including inputs and outputs by defining the rules of engagement but not dwelling on them. Roger Bassett stated that for the Commission to accomplish its work it may be important to understand if there are too many programs, if the distribution is correct, and if programs are viable in its location. Cam Preus stated that for community colleges the marketplace defines programs and the locations they are provided, which can be a revolving door of programs.

After a short break, Mary Spilde reviewed the meeting agenda. Spilde stated that the discussion on financial status, funding models, long-range projections, data and the review of state and national education policy work are deferred to the next meeting. She asked Cam Preus to give the Commission an overview of Oregon community college long-range planning, goals, and key outcome measures.

Cam Preus gave a brief overview of a handout distributed to the Commission. Preus' overview included community college governance, boards, what drives the work conducted by community colleges, economic growth, goals for 2025, and how community colleges and workforce development programs are providing results. Preus commented that the five questions driving how community colleges and workforce development programs are providing results were derived from the same five questions used by Kentucky. Preus reviewed Oregon's postsecondary affordability for community colleges and stated that tuition has risen 97% in ten years. Oregon's postsecondary education tuition increase has created a greater demand for professional and technical programs.

Several Commission members asked if there has been a shift from high cost programs to low cost programs due to funding. Mary Spilde stated that community colleges are not shifting to low cost programs due to funding. Low cost programs help support high cost programs including dental hygiene, nursing, and other health care professions, which are always in demand. Spilde commented that community college students are paying more tuition and fees due to funding cuts. Tony Van Vliet stated that community college programs are driven by the marketplace, which can force community colleges to expand outside their regions to meet the demand. Cam Preus agreed but stated that it is not the case for all community colleges.

Frank McNamara asked what the comparative cost of lower division courses are between community colleges and four-year institutions. Cam Preus agreed to provide the comparative data to the Commission.

Frank McNamara asked if there has been a shift from full-time faculty to adjunct faculty as a result of funding. Cam Preus stated CCWD does not track faculty types because of the variety of definitions of part-time or adjunct faculty. George Pernsteiner stated that OUS has data to show the shift from full-time faculty to adjunct faculty. Frank McNamara stated this information would be helpful in assessing quality of education. It was also noted by Commission members that this information is an element in the executive order and one of the proposed elements of the first year deliverables. Cam Preus agreed to evaluate the accessibility of data to provide the Commission with a summary of full-time and adjunct faculty.

Frank McNamara asked if there were other boards or commissions that are working on parallel policies that could assist the Commission. Margie Lowe agreed to gather the information and to provide it to the Commission for its review.

After a short break, Ed Ray began the first year deliverables discussion. Roger Bassett stated that a visual presentation of the student pipeline model would be useful to the Commission's work, which could begin at the First Year Recommendations Subcommittee level. He continued by stating that the Commission needs to create a visual presentation of where Oregon is currently

with respect to the quality of education. Mary Spilde recommended beginning with the goals then defining the metrics before beginning the model development. Tony Van Vliet asked if there are groups that support the Governor's Office that could assist on subcommittees. Margie Lowe agreed to gather a list of groups and provide it to the Commission.

Mary Spilde reviewed the list of proposed subcommittees and timeline and asked for feedback from the Commission. Spilde stated that the subcommittees will be comprised of Commission members and community leaders. Jerry Berger stated that he was not clear what the expectations are for Commission members as a member of a subcommittee as they are currently defined. Ed Ray proposed that he and Mary Spilde define the focus of the subcommittees further to create more clarity for the Commission. He stated that his office will communicate with Commission members before the next Commission meeting to identify subcommittee chairs and members.

Jerry Berger asked if there were staff members to support the Commission and subcommittee work. Ed Ray stated that James Sager, Margie Lowe, and Cheryl Yehling from the Governor's Office will assist the Commission, as well as Nancy Heiligman, Ann McLaughlin, and Brian Collins from Oregon State University.

Mary Spilde reminded Commission members that additional communication will take place regarding subcommittees. Spilde thanked the Commission and adjourned the meeting.

Summary of Action Items:

- Cam Preus agreed to evaluate the accessibility of data to provide the Commission with a summary of full-time and adjunct faculty. The Oregon University System tracks faculty data on a regular basis.
- Cam Preus agreed to provide data to the Commission that compares the cost of lower division courses taken at an Oregon community college to lower division courses taken at an Oregon four-year institution.
- Jay Kenton to calculate what the built capacity needs will be even making generous assumptions about the use of on-line, community college, and high school facilities to deliver college courses.
- Margie Lowe agreed to provide the Commission with a list of boards and commissions that are working on parallel policies that could assist the Commission.
- Margie Lowe agreed to provide the Commission with a list of groups that support the Governor's Office that could assist the Commission by serving on subcommittees.