



Post-Secondary Quality Education Commission

Meeting Minutes

March 24, 2008

Members Present: Ed Ray (co-chair, by phone), Mary Spilde (co-chair), Morgan Anderson, Roger Bassett, Jerry Berger, Ryan Deckert, Frank McNamara, Gretchen Pierce, Richard Schwarz, Monique Teal, Javier Torres, Tony Van Vliet, Larry Wolf

Others Present: Steve Bender, Brian Collins, Nancy Heiligman, Margie Lowe, Bill McGee, Ann McLaughlin, Lisa Pinheiro, Cam Preus, James Sager, Bob Turner, Susan Weeks, and others

Co-chair Mary Spilde opened the meeting by asking those in attendance to introduce themselves. After introductions, she reviewed the meeting agenda.

Mary Spilde asked for a motion to approve the February 27, 2008, meeting minutes. Approval of the minutes were motioned and seconded. The Commission unanimously approved the meeting minutes for February 27, 2008.

Margie Lowe stated that the guest speaker, Darcy Renfro, Policy Adviser for the Governor of Arizona, was not available to present to the Commission. Lowe will arrange for several speakers to present at a future meeting.

Mary Spilde asked the Commission to review the proposed work plan and outline of subcommittee responsibilities. In review of the proposed work plan and subcommittee outline, James Sager asked if legislative goals should also be evaluated as part of the Quality Education Goals Subcommittee responsibility. Morgan Anderson stated that a situational analysis should be included as part of the Quality Education Goals Subcommittee responsibilities.

Frank McNamara commented that each campus has goals and by evaluating their goals the Commission would likely find alignment in specific areas. Ryan Deckert asked if this type of analysis has been conducted by Oregon or other states. Margie Lowe commented that Minnesota conducted a similar type of analysis. Brian Collins state that analysis conducted by other states incorporated accountability.

Mary Spilde asked the committee to review the goals and responsibility for each of the proposed subcommittees. Morgan Anderson asked if a cost analysis should be included. James Sager stated that the Commission should focus on the key goals and measurements for the quality of education. Margie Lowe stated that the legislative committee that defines educational goals for the state could assist the Commission. Gretchen Pierce stated that due to time constraints the Commission should focus on defining post-secondary educational goals. Frank McNamara and Gretchen Pierce asked if the Commission's responsibility is to define post-secondary quality education goals for the Governor's Office. McNamara stated he thought the Commission was responsible for aligning existing goals not defining new goals. Lowe and Sager stated that the Commission's responsibility is to define quality for post-secondary education on behalf of the

Governor. McNamara asked if there are existing statutory goals. Lowe stated that there are currently no statutory goals. Sager commented that the work of the Commission could bring clarity to post-secondary educational goals and measurements at a higher level.

Morgan Anderson asked what is the purpose of the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee. James Sager stated that the goals defined for the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee are specific to the charge outlined in the Governor's Executive Order. Margie Lowe commented that the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee would help the Commission in its evaluation of program quality and student success.

Mary Spilde reminded the Commission that the reason for creating subcommittees is to recruit outside expertise to assist the Commission in defining the quality of post-secondary education. Morgan Anderson asked if it would be more appropriate to have the whole Commission responsible for the goals of the proposed Quality Education Goals Subcommittee. Tony Van Vliet stated that the State Board of Higher Education is ahead of the Commission in addressing some of the goals outlined for the Quality Education Goals Subcommittee. He stated that the Commission could use OUS's K-12 data to assist the work of the subcommittees.

Mary Spilde stated that, given the time constraints, the First Year Recommendation Subcommittee should focus on what is known and what could be dealt with in the allotted time. James Sager stated that the Joint Boards Budget Workgroup could assist the Commission with alignment of post-secondary education priorities. Roger Bassett commented that the Commission could also cite work conducted by the Joint Boards. Spilde encouraged the Commission to collaborate work conducted by subcommittees with other boards and commissions. Nancy Heiligman agreed and said that there are parallel responsibilities between subcommittees as well. Margie Lowe asked if there was a process to track the Commission's deliverables.

Mary Spilde suggested that the Quality Education Goals Subcommittee focus on the development of the goals and the First Year Recommendations Subcommittee focus on the conceptual development of the model. Tony Van Vliet stated that the Commission should first define how it views the development of the goals, from an administrative level down or from the student level up. James Sager stated that the focus should be on student barriers to success. Margie Lowe suggested that the Commission incorporate goals and accountability in various areas including research and service. Ed Ray stated that the work conducted by the Quality Education Goals Subcommittee should focus on what needs to be done to obtain the most effective alignment for the systems. He continued by stating that the First Year Recommendations Subcommittee should focus on program comparison and the elements that define an education model. Ray stated that the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee should focus on analysis conducted by other states with the most success in the areas of growth and competition. He suggested comparing those profiles to Oregon. He concluded by stating that once this work is complete it should be presented to the Legislature for review and feedback for alignment.

Richard Schwarz asked if there are different definitions for faculty levels between the OUS and community college systems. Frank McNamara asked if there are common charts of reporting

this data that could be used to conduct an analysis for the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee. Nancy Heiligman stated there are common data systems, but it is important to have a clear definition for the data before conducting an analysis.

James Sager asked if the subcommittees intended on including estimated costs for recommended changes. He recommended that the Commission focus on developing a proposal of quality and less on estimated costs. Gretchen Pierce asked for clarification of the Commission's charge. She continued by asking if the charge is to help students, administration, or faculty. Sager responded by stating that the focus is educational quality and creating a different way of thinking about education, specifically post-secondary education.

Gretchen Pierce stated that it is important for the Commission to ask campuses what they believe are the problems, and, aside from funding, what are some of the most important factors to resolving those problems. James Sager stated that the focus should be the factors that contribute to quality. Margie Lowe stated that the Commission should focus on designing a system that generates interest in higher education that keeps students in the system through graduation. Ed Ray stated that the first order of approximation should be finding relative comparisons for teaching, research, etc. Mary Spilde recommended removing the cost bullet listed under the goals for the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee. Tony Van Vliet and Ryan Deckert suggested that the Commission view the work from a taxpayer's perspective as well as from a parent's perspective. Morgan Anderson agreed and compared it to developing an economic development model.

Mary Spilde reviewed the subcommittee assignments. She asked that subcommittee members convene their first meeting as soon as possible. Richard Schwarz asked if the subcommittee meeting could be public hearings. Spilde reminded the Commission that all meetings associated with the Commission's work are open to the public. Before the meeting concluded, Jerry Berger asked for faculty ratio data from community colleges and OUS.

Summary of Action Items:

- Margie Lowe agreed to schedule presentations for future Commission meetings.
- Subcommittee chairs agreed to report subcommittee progress at the next Commission meeting.
- Jerry Berger, member of the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee, asked OUS and CCWD for faculty ratio data and the definition of the faculty levels.