



Post-Secondary Quality Education Commission

Meeting Minutes

March 30, 2009

Members Present: Ed Ray (co-chair), Mary Spilde (co-chair), Morgan Anderson, Roger Bassett, Jerry Berger, Frank McNamara, Gretchen Pierce, Richard Schwarz, Larry Wolf

Others Present: Krissa Caldwell, Brian Collins, Connie Green, Bob Kieran, Joe Johnson, Margie Lowe, Ann McLaughlin, James Sager, Susan Weeks, Patrick Kelly (by phone from NCHEMS), and others

Co-chair Ed Ray opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda. After review of the agenda, Ray asked for a motion to approve the January 26, 2009, meeting minutes. The request for approval of the minutes was motioned and seconded. The Commission unanimously approved the meeting minutes for January 26, 2009.

Ed Ray began the meeting by asking Margie Lowe and James Sager to assess the progress of the Commission to date and comment on the goals going forward. Margie Lowe stated the goal of the Commission should focus on the long term and not the near term. James Sager stated the Commission should also focus on evaluating and defining the middle 40%. Ray suggested changing the order of the agenda and begin the meeting with the discussion of the middle 40% and gap identification. The Commission agreed.

Roger Bassett and Margie Lowe gave an overview of the schematic “Assessing the Impact of Improved Performance: Goals in 2025” including the various inputs, throughputs, and changing future enrollment patterns. The Commission discussed the need to include private sector capacity in the model. Bassett and Lowe agreed to discuss capacity indicators with private sector representatives to determine how they calculate available capacity and if it could be included in the model.

Patrick Kelly commented that the model data does not include certificates outside of the public sector. The Commission discussed the success of some students who do not complete the requirements for a certificate but are successful in their careers and how they are currently excluded from the middle 40%. Kelly commented employer recognized programs should be incorporated into the model. He stated the State of Washington conducted a study noted as the “Tipping Point”, which could be a resource for Oregon. In addition, Kentucky’s Five Questions One Mission campaign led to an increase in certificates, but it is not clear if they included employer recognized programs.

The Commission discussed the variables in the schematic including the transfer rate, college-going rate, credentials for certificates, and net in-migration. The Commission agreed to discuss these variables in detail at future meetings.

The Commission discussed the middle 40% with regard to measurement, evaluation, and current status. The Commission expressed a need for the middle 40% to be employer ready, which means the Commission will need to understand educational needs of employers as part of the process to define the middle 40%. Mary Spilde stated the Commission will need a valid baseline so community colleges understand their role in the development of the student pipeline. Morgan Anderson asked if the model could target employer needs to fill gaps in addition to defining the middle 40%. James Sager recommended evaluating career paths to determine the needs for student success in the workforce. The Commission agreed that further discussion is needed regarding the middle 40%.

Ed Ray asked for an update from the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee. Richard Schwarz stated the subcommittee would continue to monitor research regarding faculty and program quality. He stated the subcommittee is working to draft a supplemental report that will be ready for review by the Commission at the next meeting. He commented that some of the challenges for the subcommittee include a lack of research and a common definition for part-time and full-time faculty. The subcommittee will address the shift from full-time to part-time faculty, what is the criteria for the shift, and the effects on students.

Summary of Action Items:

- Margie Lowe and Roger Bassett agreed to distribute the schematic “Assessing the Impact of Improved Performance: Goals in 2025” to the Commission.
- Margie Lowe and Roger Bassett agreed to discuss capacity indicators with private sector representatives to determine how they calculate available capacity and if it could be included in the model.
- Richard Swartz agreed to distribute the Faculty and Program Quality supplemental report to the Commission before the next meeting on April 27.
- Connie Green agreed to distribute the State of Washington “Tipping Point” study to the Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.