



**Oregon State Board of Higher Education
Student Participation and Completion Committee**

June 13, 2008, 1-3:30 P.M.

Location: Oregon Department of Transportation, Conference Room 122, 555
Capital Street, Salem, OR

MEETING NOTES

Attendance

Committee members and staff in attendance: Mark Endsley, Chris Cronin, Alex Sanchez, Nan Poppe, Di Saunders, Hilda Rosselli, Patrick Burk, Tamara Henderson, Ruth Keele, Emilio Hernandez, Stephanie Carnahan, Jon Joiner, Eda Davis-Lowe, Rob Findtner, Bridget Burns, Endi Hartigan. By Phone: Patricia Martinez, Diana Sloane, Gayle Yamasaki, Dave McDonald, Brian Fox, Joanne Sorte, Mark Jackson.

Meeting Notes: Endi Hartigan

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Dalton Miller-Jones reviewed the agenda including an update on the policy option package (POP), and planning for next 10 month. Miller-Jones reported that he and Di Saunders were able to meet with Camille Preus, regarding the community college funding requests.

Update on POP:

Miller-Jones noted that including in the committee meeting documents is the summary document that the Chancellor is taking forward to the Governor regarding the OUS policy option packages. The committee work is represented in POP(policy option package) number three, called "Student Success." The learning outcomes and assessment work is picked up in our package, and the Portland Higher Ed committee has moved some of their material into a separate package. Miller-Jones added that if the legislature awards us this money, with revenue forecasts withstanding, the committee will have a positive impact.

Diane Saunders reported that the summary document provided was presented to the Board and will be discussed at the meeting in June; they will be voting on this in July. Support for students with disabilities will be added. In June, the Board did not vote on these packages; they asked for the Chancellor's office staff to reduce some funds because the total was too much to go forward to the legislature. The student success section, however, is not being "pruned" or reduced; there will be 2.5M added for disabilities funding as the universities do not get assistance right now to have effective support for these students. There will be a finalized version of this summary in the July docket. Right now it looks very good for the work of the committee; most of the language that's in our POP is being incorporated into the full package that we are providing to the Board. That will be part of what the Governor and Oregon Legislature see in the package going forward.

Miller-Jones said we will also be anticipating projections and look at that too. Saunders added that the OUS IR team will have projections soon. Saunders said preliminary numbers show that

degrees awarded are up to 17,650, including some students with double degrees, representing an increase of about 2.5% over last year. These are not yet official numbers but the system is up a bit.

Miller-Jones responded that this is great news, adding that the committee will have to be mindful that if we are successful in this work the infrastructure needs will increase as well. Miller-Jones said he would quote David McDonald who often says if we don't get a lot of this money, we should be trying to do this anyway; it should be part of our ongoing enterprise.

Breaking Barrier report

Miller-Jones said that the final "Breaking Barriers" report on the hearings and forums that we held and the symposium of 2007-08 have been sent around to everyone for final edits and comments. He asked for comments, edits, etc. to be sent to Endi Hartigan immediately as it goes to the printer on Monday.

Discussion: Committee Work Plan, Producing Results

Miller-Jones told the committee that we want to have a scope of work plan in mind for the committee for the next 8-10 months. The committee also needs to begin a conversation about the criteria that would be used to select projects, programs, initiatives that our part of our package. We need to support programs that are going to produce results. We have to change the numbers we have to see people who are oriented and eager to go on to postsecondary education and be sure that all the assets and resources required for that are in place; that means the committee needs to pay attention to performance metrics and indicators. Miller-Jones suggested an open discussion on these matters. He asked Ruth Keele to begin by begin to discuss what we need to know what to look for in these proposals.

Metrics

Ruth Keele said there are several different components to this: one is around the metrics that we need to submit to the legislature for the policy package. If passed, we will need to report those to the state and we will be held accountable to the state at a system level. If we have a re-granting process, to make sure these proposals are on track with our goals, we will want people to ask people who are submitting proposals to submit some type of performance metric. Those don't necessarily need to be submitted to the legislature but will add credibility. There is a good deal of information that we can collect and assess around participation & completion that may not fit well into a tightly defined performance measure. The committee probably wants to keep the measures focused on things that are fairly high level outcomes that can be targeted quantitatively. That doesn't mean we won't also have more qualitative info but it's difficult to embed that into a performance metric. Keele said that one of the things that the system is trying to quantify is learning outcomes; there are ways that people can describe this that that are not measurable, related to quality, attitudes, goal attainment; there are also things that we hear anecdotally which are not necessarily representative of the whole population. The focus we have taken as a whole in this committee is to focus on underserved populations. In terms of broad metrics, we would want participation & success rates for underserved populations to rise in relation to the general average; we want the success rates to match those of the general population.

Pat Burk said he heard the following in terms of measurement; degrees awarded, credits earned, attitudinal things, disaggregated numbers entering, progress toward degree in a timely

fashion, and the experiential element. If we went back to students and asked what was their experience on campus, that would lend itself periodically to student survey perhaps; those are quantifiable and we could set fairly clear targets.

Miller-Jones said that currently the OUS Institutional Research (IR) office tries to keep track of some of these things already; that office is understaffed with budget cuts. He's worried about the Chancellor's Office (CO) trying to do something when it can be done at the campus level; are we asking for additional funds for IR functions? Saunders responded that if we provided funding to a variety of programs for which we would have a set standard of measurements, a small part of the budget might provide a .3 FTE to help with that, but primarily it is the onus of the programs to collect the data on a standard we would set.

Hilda Rosselli said that a lot of the efforts we are enhancing are already used to tracking data. Also, we have a somewhat deflated number of people who report their ethnicity. Diana Sloane said that you can use a metric like counting services that students use; they are easy to collect, but if our goal is to get more students in and to complete she would not care how many services they use if it does not result in tangible outcomes in participation and completion. If they can be correlated with performance data, there's power in it. Miller-Jones responded by saying if you provide services, you want to track that out to the consequence. Alex Sanchez said part of this depends on being very specific on the outcomes expected, and to grade the proposals based on how well they measure with the outcomes we expect. The one problematic part is students drop out for a variety of reasons, and sometimes that not at control of the institution or the program. Sloane reemphasized that if you want to make difference we still have to do something to keep them in school.

Mark Endsley said that there are so many extraneous factors, and that just raising or lowering tuition could distort the factors. We want a comprehensive picture of what we are trying to gather. We want something like the K-12 efforts at action research which is based on an evidence mode. We're looking for those numerical increases and the correlation of the less quantifiable data. Miller-Jones responded that the work Endsley is doing around the data system will allow us more confidence if not a clear causal relationship. Endsley said that there are a lot more things inclusive of college preparation that the system didn't have access to before. We used to just have SAT and GPA; we learned those factors were not enough; we will soon have more data in terms of course-taking patterns and standardizes tests.

Miller-Jones asked Eda Davis-Lowe what kind of data they collect at The SMILE Program. Lowe said they have a database of over 5,100 students they have served. They can tell where these students are going, not how or where they are exiting, except at OSU; they do keep track of those who matriculated at OSU. Nan Poppe asked if they had run their database against the national clearinghouse.

Di Saunders said that one of the things we can do if we ask for funding is to bring in funds for evaluation too; if you had more resources, could you do more tracking of those students or are the capabilities just not there? Eda Davis-Lowe responded that it is a resource issue because they need someone who can stay in contact with the families; they would like to track those students no matter where they go.

Chris Cronin agrees with Mark's comment that there is a lot of important data we would like to know, and can know but we need to be cognizant that we can't ask campuses to deliver something that is going to ask for a lot of time. We need to balance those things out as we can go overboard with our requests. Keele agreed we all want a lot of into to work with but it is easy

to forget that there is a cost to this and we should manage that tension; when we are talking about subjective factors or survey data, students who are disengaged already are already less likely to participate in surveys. We do run the risk of having survey data at the end which is skewed and misrepresents what is indeed going on with the very populations we are trying to serve.

Miller Jones responded to Chris' concern, asking, isn't this a matter of priorities? This is not just important for our initiative but also in university accreditation process; I know that it is always seen as an additional request we are making when house bill 3565 was passed most schools read it as do everything just add this; instead, we should be rethinking how to deploy existing resources that are more indicative of quality indicators, of the mission, and so on; we got very uneven adoption of the SIM and CAM and that whole effort; we are at a similar effort now. We want campuses to rethink existing practices on how to deploy resources. We need to ask for partnerships; we could very easily ask institutions to tell us how they are going to use this money to refocus and redirect their own institutional resources.

Saunders emphasized we will already be looking at programs that have a history of high success, and we would increase their capacity, or in areas where they don't have any programming, we would help them to begin programs. She added that when she worked in philanthropy, they would not ask organizations to do additional reporting without giving them funding for that. We should save money for technical support for programs that need some assistance setting up outcome-tracking. Mark Jackson said that in the spirit of nonprofit work, we need to keep the process simple; with grant funds, there are different criteria from source to source. Sometimes it asks for too much on the part of organizations.

Sanchez said that in his experience in working with access and retention of underrepresented students it wasn't about formal interventions, it was the informal things that made people think that were part of the organization, the fiestas, etc. When you start talking about measurement, you lose that aspect of it. Sloane said that what matters is if you're getting 90% of your students through and other programs are only getting 60% through college.

Chris Cronin said there was a comment about asking people to change direction in terms of how they do things; she reiterated that this is what this POP is about, asking institutions to think about how they are providing services for underserved people. Dave McDonald said we need to move from the program by program pockets of success to a more global and systemic approach, to be delivered as a university, falling into a trap of delegating it to a specific campus. Joanne Sorte said we had the recommendation that context and quality of the surrounding environment is an important factor; in light of this, we can ask how programs how they are addressing these contextual aspects.

Rosselli would like a placeholder in the POP to say something about the ways to help faculty in their interactions and respect for students; this might be in centers for teaching and learning. What do we mean by inclusive practices of teaching? She is sure the student services are going to be enhanced, but if we don't pay attention to the teaching, that's a problem. Di Saunders said we wanted campuses to be able to do faculty training so there would be the ability to use funding for some of that; we would need guidance on how to structure it. Hilda Rosselli said that one of the centers for teaching and learning has closed because of lack of funding; others don't have enough funds to offer training for faculty. In other states, faculty go through an institute in the summer but that usually takes stipends; it will definitely cost funds. Patricia Martinez said that in 2005 she mentored people from different universities and one was, told "you don't really

want an administrative credential do you?" A lot of these students linked their experiences to racism. Dave McDonald reiterated the need to think about shift systemically to get this done.

Pat Burk said the report last week from the Gates Foundation showed that after an investment of \$25 million in the Small Schools Initiative, those schools have not significantly impacted student performance. This was discussed quite a bit in that process; a changing of the structure in and of itself doesn't change instruction; you have to facilitate the change in instruction. The students still were not connecting, the kids not getting individual attention, etc. Reform and improvement is about changing adults not about changing the kids. It's about changing how we teach. What are the instructional parameters which influence what makes students remain or leave? The issue of early onset of loss of credit is important. We see early intervention in the 1st quarter of the freshman year as being very important; so that kids don't get into defeated learning syndrome. Our institutions are different but the pattern of adult to student interaction as one level of indicator is important.

Dalton Miller-Jones said he thinks it would be good to invite the presidents of the large institutions, with the provosts perhaps, to hear from the committee about these issues and these ideas, with a second session for the presidents of the smaller universities, and another possibly for community colleges as well.

Mark Endsley said he is hearing about 3 immediate dimensions to student intervention: student services, instruction, and evaluation. We could do a pretty descriptive job of implying what it is we are looking for that would get to the point of saying we are looking at institutions that are really engaged. Endsley suggested that in the RFP process an applicant could accumulate more points the more they address all the components; in a competitive process you may lose out to someone who has a more comprehensive approach.

Alex Sanchez said there is a saying that we teach like we were taught. In PhD programs, faculty get nothing about dealing with students, much less on diversity, or even social aspects that retain students because the Ph.D. is all about research. The heaviest weight is given to the research professor. Maybe what we need to do is how we change the structure of the Ph.D. Miller-Jones added that being accountable to student learning and student success will increasingly be how colleges are evaluated. Emilio Hernandez said that just today he was meeting with a student who was having trouble with a professor in regards to her last paper; she didn't write it in his style of acceptance. He said the idea to meet with the presidents and provosts is an important one.

Diana Sloane asked what changes in accreditation would force this issue to awareness. Miller-Jones said we need to have demonstrated mastery. Sloane asks if there is an organization on a state level whereby the faculty senates from all universities convene; perhaps in addition to inviting presidents and provosts, we could bring together the representatives of all the faculty senates for a colloquium over the course of a year and get their help on fashioning the agenda. We would be looking for outcomes long term, and inspiring them to take some leadership with regard to these issues. Joanne Sorte said that each institution has a representative to the Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate (IIFS), it is very appropriate for them to present issues to the groups for discussion at our meetings. We have different kinds of challenges at our different institutions, so the more focused the question can be the better the response from IIFS.

Rosselli said that in accreditation guidelines, diversity is not there. She added that the power of data to faculty is important. Sometimes we keep info and don't share it in a way that makes a

difference for faculty. New faculty orientations are another strategy that provosts can influence. Donna Beegle is phenomenal and lived the life right here in Oregon. When we brought her in I heard faculty talking for the first time about how to do things differently. Faculty is interested in improving teaching and learning; the POP is a parallel effort to this.

Jon Joiner said that the OSBHE stamp of approval would help this committee in front of presidents and provosts in terms of reducing the fragmentation. Miller-Jones said this is a good point and he will be sure that if this committee decides they want to have sessions to invite the presidents we will be sure that the Board endorses that meeting.

Reports from Committee members

Community College proposals

Miller-Jones asked for Nan Poppe to talk briefly about Oregon Department of Community College and Workforce Development (OCCWD) initiatives for the community colleges. Poppe said that the community college (CC) proposal that relates most to this committee is a career pathways initiative. We have about 450,000 Oregonians that are way past high school and yet have no credential; when they try to access postsecondary education they don't have the academic skills. They end up in basic skills programs. The career pathway program is building pathways to high demand high wage populations. OCCWD is also in charge of workforce development; the federal government has disinvested in a lot of programs including the summer jobs program; they are asking for summer jobs for low income kids. They have an academic component wrapped into so that it could be like a mini bridge program. Saunders said there is an OCCA link where you can get more information on this. Poppe added this serves all students but with particular emphasis on students who are not college ready or who are not English speakers. In addition to the students who are working to transfer to a 4-year degree, the community colleges have been working on developing career technical pathways so they are chunking 2 year degrees up into things that lead to jobs. The academic focus will probably be focused on success skills in reading, math and writing.

Oregon Student Association

Tamara Henderson reported on an Oregon Student Association item having to do with tuition equity regards to state tuition for undocumented students. A state bill addressing this will be reintroduced and the OSA goal is to pass it. OSA needs to collect support statements, and need to have more support than higher education and the Latino community. They are in the research phase for approaching businesses on the changing population in Oregon. One of the next important thing is to lobby in a much larger coalition. The obvious people are at the table right now and they need to do more to be strategic; they need to bring as many people to the table as an access to education issue not an immigration issue. In response to a question on just what the bill does, Henderson said the bill says that a student must have attend an Oregon high school for 3 years, and be working toward their residency requirements, then they can gain in state-tuition rates at Oregon universities. This is a state bill. Henderson said that another component of the OSA work is the federal Dream Act which, if passed, would make a significant difference in proving that these students could contribute and be able to contribute in Oregon.

Mark Endsley said that as a whole, we have discrepant policies on residency for admissions; those discrepancies are a real problem for a lot of students. This may be a whole separate issue to bring up the whole notion of residency is worth considering. Henderson said they have not considered linking those things together.

Oregon Student Assistance Commission

Vicki Merkel pointed out that everyone received the OSAC white paper on students of foster families, and she talked about an OSAC policy proposal to support these students. These students have unique sets of barriers to higher education that have some complexities. OSAC administers the federal program education and voucher program for students in the foster system. When they started, OSAC had a complex system and inadvertently brought in barriers related to deadlines, activities charts, etc.; they lost students because they made it too complex. OSAC worked with the department of human services and realized it would work to give money as a grant to students. These students now fill out a very simple application. However, the program does not have enough federal dollars to serve the students who are applying so we'll now have to reduce the amount of funds for each student. The DHS and OSAC had conversations about what will it take to help these students. They discovered there are clear ways to provide support: including providing a go-to person modeled on the Ford Foundation family counselor. This would have a former foster youth acting as a program coordinator. OSAC learned that you should not put a sign on a college door that says former foster youth; but have someone who is a neutral entity like OSAC whom students can contact. Also, some youth are put into a homeless state over the winter break; they don't know the dorms close. They don't have health care sometimes. DHS is kind of a strict parent; if they miss the window to apply for support it's difficult for these students. We have developed a plan for mentoring students.

Merkel emphasized that there is a need for more financial aid, and more visibility needed for this population, as less than 2% of foster youth complete a bachelor's degree. The OSAC paper addresses the detailed barriers that these students face. OSAC will be putting forward a POP on this issue and would appreciate any questions or support.

Saunders said this is an eye-opener and the 2% is pretty appalling. Sanchez added that when he read this, tears came to his eyes. Miller-Jones commented on the courage of these children. He said this is aligned to the committee work and he would like to support this. Miller-Jones asked if there was any objection to endorsing this and there was not. Merkel added that there is a book called "3 little words" on foster students and it is very informative.

Department of Education

Patrick Burk distributed a document detailing the Department of Education's (DOE's) ten most urgent policy proposals. He noted that the one that links the most directly is the highest priority for the agency which is the high school diploma work. It was pared back a bit, but the DOE's highest priority is implementation of the diploma.

They are doing a more complete financial picture of what some of the costs overall might be. By increasing credit loads, and by middle school reform, all of the cost numbers are going to be dramatically higher. Miller-Jones asked where does the DOE proposal align with the committee work, and Burk answered that first it is with the diploma, but also with the sustainable process for improving student achievement. The expectation is that districts are using their data to target student achievement, and to build out more regional capacity. They now have a school improvement planning specialist around the continuous improvement plan. There will be expenditures for student data. The first 5 proposal are essential to our core mission. Data integration is at the heart of how we work and we are now in the 3rd biennium of implementation of this. The KIDS project is designed to link to the higher education integrated system and the ATLAS system with community colleges; this will integrate data flow across the system which

will give us the capacity to do some things like follow kids after they leave high school. The others are fairly self explanatory. They are requesting support for an Indian education specialist. There is an executive order signed by former Governor Kitzhaber that established a government to government process recognizing the sovereign governments. Each state agency is obligated to establish processes for negotiating with tribal representatives. ODE does not have an Indian education specialist on its staff to do that work. Finally, we have had an increase in students with autism, and must address that.

Miller-Jones said he does not see here an effort to deal with students with various sexual orientations; he went to a very moving session at Jeff the gay straight student alliance; it is a powerful set of issue for high school students. He asked whether that has received on the Department of Education's attention. Burk said that the State Board of Education changed the administrative rule and changed sexual orientation to the categories protected under the administrative rule. What that means is it is a protective category status and will give students and parents a number of rights in terms of challenging matters. Miller-Jones asked if the state provides anything on awareness of this issue. Burk replied it is in the standards for sexual education programs in the state.

Burk noted that in the original proposal #3 allotted 22M dollars to schools, and 5 FTE in our agency. In conversation with the Governor's office that number is now at 5M and the FTE is now at 1M.

Mark Jackson asks how student achievement is measured. Burk said the biggest measures of increases in student achievement involve cutting drop- out rates and high school completion rates. The Board of Education will soon be adopting the revised policy statement on the assessment criteria for the essential skills of the new diploma requirement; there is urgency in doing this so that we can communicate effectively to kids. Jackson asked, what is the DOE going to do with helping these students be successful in these new assessments? Burk said that the Board made a decision not to implement a high stakes single exit exam because of these concerns. Oregon is interested in evidence of proficiency but that could come from other sources. Students could use classroom work samples; they could also use other forms of assessment so we are currently now paying for a PSAT exams for every 10th grader in the state next year. If students reach a score they would be able to use that as evidence of proficiency. They want to keep a connection to the classroom so that the impetus is on quality instruction rather than focusing teaching to the test. Burk said there is expectation in the continuous improvement planning process that districts identify level of support (tutoring, etc) to address needs of students who are not on track.

ORCAN Conference

Miller-Jones asked Stephanie Carnahan to talk about the ORCAN (Oregon College Access Network) conference. A piece of the ORCAN conference is to see if we can revisit that symposium. Hernandez asked if part of that panel would include foster children.

Carnahan said she doesn't want people to have the expectation that this will look like last year's symposium; they are focusing much more on partnerships and networking for access programs and practitioners. There will be opportunities to connect and networking. The morning will be spent presenting on the state of access and support programs around the state, and on a gap analysis of access programs. This conference will be in late October or early November.

Next Steps

Miller-Jones asked the committee's opinion on meetings in summer months, noting that this committee has worked hard and under a great deal of pressure. He suggested meeting in July, skipping August, then reconvening in September. We will try to have working task teams to propose for the July meeting to carry forward the agenda. Many members expressed scheduling constraints in July.

Miller-Jones thanked everyone for their participation and the meeting was adjourned.