



Post-Secondary Quality Education Commission

Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2008

Members Present: Ed Ray (co-chair), Mary Spilde (co-chair), Morgan Anderson, Jerry Berger, Frank McNamara, Gretchen Pierce, Richard Schwarz, Monique Teal, Javier Torres

Others Present: Steve Bender, John Britton, Brian Collins, Nancy Heiligman, Andrea Henderson, Joe Johnson, Margie Lowe, Bill McGee, Ann McLaughlin, Lisa Pinheiro, Cam Preus, James Sager, and others

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

Ed Ray asked for a motion to approve the March 24, 2008, meeting minutes. The request for approval of the minutes was motioned and seconded. The Commission unanimously approved the meeting minutes for March 24, 2008.

Ed Ray gave a brief overview of his conversation with the Governor regarding the first year deliverables for the Post-Secondary Quality Education Commission. He asked the Governor what his expectations are from the Commission during the first year. Ray suggested to the Governor that the Commission focus on key elements to success with easy to understand metrics and timeline. Specifically, the Commission could focus on bottleneck areas to successful degree completion including access and the first two years of the student experience. James Sager added that fewer students progress to post-secondary education and Oregon needs to be more aggressive about educating its adult population to address economic needs.

Ed Ray asked the subcommittee chairs to report on the subcommittees' progress. He also asked Margie Lowe and James Sager to report on efforts conducted by other boards and councils addressing education in an effort to eliminate dueling agendas and to create a cohesive plan.

Gretchen Pierce reported that the Quality Education Goals Subcommittee met earlier today to review the goals and methods employed by various states to educate their citizens. She stated one issue that will influence the subcommittee's work is the model development. She added that the state's overall goal is to educate Oregonians 45 years of age and younger by the year 2025. The focus of the subcommittee's conversation and the overall goal is to raise educational attainment to create economic prosperity and opportunity. Pierce stated the other areas for improvement include participation, retention, program capacity, to improve the success of all students including diverse populations, and educating Oregon's adult population. Other areas of discussion included the quality of education and how to make it accessible and affordable for all students. She concluded the subcommittee report by stating that the next step is to develop a hierarchy for the goals, indicators, metrics, etc.

Ed Ray asked if it makes sense to 1) educate Oregonians 45 years of age and younger based on the 40% 40% 20% guidelines 2) to educate Oregonians in their early 20s with technical degrees or certificate in addition to meeting the goals of 40% 40% 20%. Gretchen Pierce stated that is part of the challenge, to define realistic targets. James Sager stated the primary target for education in Oregon is the population 45 years of age and younger by the year 2025.

Frank McNamara asked what the state's interest is in 40% 40% 20%. Sager stated it defines what it will take for Oregon to be globally competitive and to meet the criteria necessary to be competitive Oregon needs to meet the goals of 40% 40% 20%. Richard Schwarz stated Oregon would need to know what a global economy will look like in 2025, so how does it know that the 40% 40% 20% goals meet the needs. Sager stated Oregon will need to shift from a low-wage, low-demand economy to a high-wage, high-demand economy to be competitive. Ray asked if there are data from other states that have defined a plan similar to 40% 40% 20% and have been successful. Sager stated there are states that have been successful but none of the states meet the 40% 40% 20% goals. He continued by stating these goals are necessary for Oregon to catch-up and to be competitive. He agreed to send data to the Commission regarding the need for 40% 40% 20%.

Nancy Heiligman distributed a handout of the straw model developed by the Quality Education Model Subcommittee. She gave a brief overview of the elements of the straw model including the current post-secondary education system, changes to meet goals, and the new post-secondary model. Gretchen Pierce asked if the model would be used as a quality model. Heiligman stated it would be used as a quality model since it allows for estimations. Pierce stated if Oregon's interests are in 40% 40% 20% the Commission could not make the assumption that service to Oregon population should be delivered in a historical way. She stated other means of delivery including distance learning will need to be incorporated to address capacity issues. Ed Ray asked what it would take, using the model as is, to expand the pipeline for 40% 40% 20% without too much expense and with the appropriate adaptations. Pierce stated for-profit institutions such as the University of Phoenix have different models to address educational needs and Oregon needs to include them in the model to be successful. Heiligman commented that the Changes box in the model is intended to address those needs.

Mary Spilde stated that professional and technical degrees are 30-40% of what community colleges do and government priority would suggest that the professional and technical elements of the model be moved to the lower division section. James Sager asked the Commission to look at the post-secondary educational system as a whole and to connect communities to post-secondary educational opportunities. Frank McNamara asked if it is possible to gather lower division data to assess the needs of Oregon communities. Cam Preus stated it is possible but it may not have much meaning given the fact that funding is distributed to communities based on the needs of those communities. She continued by stating some community colleges may use 50% of their funds to support professional and technical programs while others may use only 10%. Ed Ray commented that there is not a RAM model for community colleges and the core course taught at community colleges cost less to administer compared to professional and technical courses. Preus stated that the Chart of Accounts being developed by the Department of Administrative Services will assist the Commission. She was not sure when the Chart of Accounts would be finalized. McNamara stated the data would be vital to the Commission's

work as it was for the K-12 model development. Ray stated the Commission will need to discuss this as a priority to assisting the Commission with its work. Richard Schwarz agreed that data collection needs to be a focus of the Commission. Ray commented it is unclear where to ask for central data collection to continue the next steps for the model development.

Nancy Heiligman commented the next discussion of the model should focus on changes and the Commission should begin designing a message in PowerPoint form to communicate the message. Margie Lowe asked the Commission to look at those students that are close to degree attainment in Oregon and what would it take to help them to completion. Morgan Anderson added that the Commission should also look at how to attract students into the pipeline. Heiligman commented the State Board of Higher Education is conducting a review of student participation. James Sager said the Commission needs to evaluate other reasons students are delaying their post-secondary education such as cultural reasons. Cam Preus commented there are costs associated to educational delay including remedial courses. Ed Ray stated if the Commission focuses on the connection of educational systems, the emphasis should be on student success and not funding.

Richard Schwarz distributed the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee request for data collection. He reviewed the definitions of information for the data request. Schwarz asked if there were studies available for quality indicators based on faculty ratios. Brian Collins indicated there are studies available but many of them support the purpose of the study so they may not be relevant to the Commission's work. The Commission discussed the variation of definition and how funding is calculated based on those definitions. Ed Ray stated it is important for the Commission to focus on staffing needs to support the Commission to address these issues. Margie Lowe and Jerry Berger commented on the need to tie into the quality of programs and research. Ray asked if analyzing student evaluations would be helpful to the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee. He asked Ann McLaughlin to work with OSU's Office of Academic Affairs to determine the accessibility of student evaluations.

Ed Ray briefly reviewed the draft final report outline with the Commission. He commented that structurally it would make sense to have himself, Mary Spilde, Subcommittee Chairs, Nancy Heiligman, Ann McLaughlin, and Brian Collins assist with the initial draft of the final report. Margie Lowe asked that a section of the report and model include independent colleges. Ray and Spilde agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Summary of Action Items:

- James Sager agreed to forward additional information regarding the need for 40% 40% 20% to Commission members.
- Ann McLaughlin will work with OSU's Office of Academic Affairs to determine the accessibility of student evaluations for the Faculty and Program Quality Subcommittee.