



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

May 12, 2008

Portland State University, Urban and Public Affairs, Room 710

**MEETING NOTES**

**Attendance:**

**Committee members and staff in attendance:** Agnes Hoffman, Bob Turner, Chris Cronin, Vicki Merkel, Tamara Henderson, Jon Joiner, Bridget Burns, Di Saunders, Endi Hartigan, Nan Poppe, Patricia Martinez-Orozco, Joanne Sorte, Diana Sloane, Gayle Yamasaki, Margie Lowe, Emilio Hernandez, Jr., David McDonald, Algie Gatewood, Diana Sloane, Alex Sanchez, Eda Davis-Lowe.

**Others in attendance:** Hannah Fisher, Karen Edmonds

**Meeting notes:** Endi Hartigan.

**Introduction and Updates**

Chair Dalton Miller-Jones overviewed the agenda and noted that this is the chance to review the final set of the POP packages which will move forward to the Board and Chancellor, then move on to the Governor then Oregon Legislature to provide resources. Miller-Jones reported that he and Chancellor's Office staff met with Patrick Burk on the Department of Education policy option packages and will report on that. They will also discuss various policy questions on the committee POP, and consider planning.

Miller-Jones reported that the DOE has a summary of their proposals which will be provided in final form. They engage in a budget-to-results process so that what they are composing to do is connected to outcomes and indicators. They engage in an integrated budget request to the Governor. He discussed with Pat Burk the first 4 priority items among their initiatives. The high school diploma implementation and phase-in is their number one item. The second ranked item is a rebalance and assessment costs to bear as they implement the new assessment system. The third item is in school improvement, and would support a sustainable process for improving student achievement. The top three items address the area of academic preparation which the Committee has looked at very closely; hopefully there will be ways to cross initiatives. Miller-Jones reported that Pat Burk will be available at subsequent meetings and as this becomes finalized, we will send it around to the committee. Miller-Jones added that item three, the school improvement initiative, may include support for implementing mandatory choice, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and some of the community partnerships that work with underachieving groups

Di Saunders reported that we have made a call in to Camille Preus to have a similar meeting on OCCWD proposals so that we can have an idea of overlap between initiatives and can develop a crosswalk. Gayle Yamasaki asked if there is there an opportunity to discuss the OPAS (Oregon Pre-Engineering and Applied Science Initiative) strategy through ETIC. Dalton Miller-Jones said that theirs is a separate funding stream from us though we are aware of what they are doing; we didn't incorporate anything from the OPAS work in the POP. Saunders added that we should include the components that are part of that so that they can be in the crosswalk as well, since there is overlap.

Miller-Jones and Saunders thanked everyone who provided input and comments on the POP. Saunders said that the current iteration contains all but one set of comments incorporated; she will put those into the next iteration. Miller-Jones commended Saunders for doing a very good job integrating some arguments for paying attention to these packages in the representation of the work of this committee. This will be used for talking points as we have our faculty go to the legislature.

### **Key Policy Questions, POP**

Saunders provided an overview of changes and key policy questions. This package is now \$12.8M; this is primarily because we were directed to put back into this package the K-20 integrated data system, IDTS, ATLAS system, and web portal. This has been presented and discussed with the Chancellor who had some comments to consider when we talk about prioritization.

Saunders explained that under 1.1, we had to do some language changing in the titles of the proposals and sub-proposals; ultimately, these may not have names associated with them. Some people thought we had focused too much on dual credit in this section. The EnvisionsCollege section now has the web portal in it again. The 1.4 AlignCollege section now includes the integrated data structure. The proposal to support faculty support of assessment is also included. In the second component, section 2.2 changed with the request from the Chancellor to put in another segment of this which is listed now on page 18 at the end of that package. This would not cost any money but is to show support more first-generation language students through support of the Oregon language roadmap system. Students who have their first language in Spanish, Russian, and Chinese would be able to have the opportunity to get credit for their knowledge; this is being proposed by UO, with a PSU component as well. The goal is to get those bilingual speakers into areas where we need them in the state. Saunders has preliminary text in the POP but will get more clarification on the language of that.

Tamara Henderson asked, if a campus wanted to institute a cultural competency training, would 1.6 or 2.1 support that? Di said that if it is in college it would probably be under component 2.1, or it could be part of the convening piece.

Chris Cronin asked if bilingual or multilingual is implied with all information in 1.2. Saunders answered that it was intended to read that way. Merkel noted that the ECMC college guides are available in Spanish as well and they are looking into translating them into Russian. ECMC is also interested in developing middle school guides.

**Di Saunders introduced the first policy question concerning how these monies are going to be reallocated if the POP is funded.** One of the things this group needs to do is to break down into teams to further detail each item and develop RFPs. Saunders noted that sometimes the campuses do not want the Chancellor's Office to be a re-granting agent. Saunders said the Chancellor's Office staff would look at how ETIC handles their OPAS/ETIC grants, because there is some role for a foundation in that. The concern is we don't just want to say here's the money, with no further contact, because we have such a targeted set of issues that we are trying to solve with those monies. We want to make sure they are focused exclusively at the underserved students. Saunders noted that someone has to be the money allocator, and asked the committee their opinion on this concern.

Yamasaki said that having received funds from ETIC (Engineering and Technology Industry Council), OIT has had quite a bit of experience in this; one thought is it does take a good staff steward to work with all the campuses in terms of accountability because ETIC is numbers-driven. They have score card reports and progress reports, numbers that are driving deliverables. As the committee walks through the RFP process, there is going to have to be a lot of work in terms of the numbers for which we are going to be accountable. For the small universities, a 1:1 match is required for funds, for the larger universities, a 2:1 match is required from private sources. They don't look kindly on federal matching or other state fund matching.

Miller-Jones asked if we would need to have a board that reviews proposals, like ETIC. Yamasaki said that the majority of ETIC who are voting members are members of the business community because it is a workforce development initiative. We would need to consider who we would have on that advisory committee, and have rotating terms; with ETIC, the universities have representatives but they are not all voting members. For our purposes, if you had campus representation it would somehow need to be objective. It was suggested that we also look at GEAR UP, another model in terms of competitive processes that are reviewed through the Chancellor's Office (CO).

Saunders said that he CO is happy to coordinate but we would also want external people to do so; she asked what does the Committee feel would be a fair way to provide allocation of this funding? Dave McDonald said that one of the values of having campus input is it takes the bad guy position off the Chancellor's Office's shoulders. Also, peers are generally more up to date on current practices because they are practitioners. It also helps educate to be on a review panel; there is a great chance of education and dissemination of good practices. He doesn't think it's fair to have this as a sole burden of this review on the Chancellor's Office; if it is a system initiative, the campuses should step up. He added that we can't totally eliminate the interested party issue; he would want people who are in the field to make the funding decisions.

Nan Poppe said she thinks it only makes sense to have it come through the CO with a panel of all stakeholders because it would be community colleges and other parties; there are so many objectives that need to be met, it is a jigsaw puzzle. Agnes Hoffman said she agrees with McDonald about the benefits of the peer review but the stakeholder group is larger than the higher education board; it involves K-12 and community colleges as well. If it came through the CO; maybe there could be a panel or assessment board that is appointed. This is not the kind of thing that a total stranger would be able to intelligently assess. Diana Sloane added that if there is an external review board, it would be good to have some of the people on this board who are associated with some large foundations.

Emilio Hernandez said that in today's *Daily Emerald* there was a front page story about the underrepresented grants being reviewed because of the racial preference allegation; has our proposal been reviewed in this light? Saunders said that generally our legal counsel flags any issue, but that we will meet with Ryan Hagemann to make sure there are no issues to resolve up front. Miller-Jones said this is a very important issue and he thinks moving forward that the general rule is that this is not excluding anyone based on the criteria. These are designed to increase participation.

Bob Turner said that in the conversations on the teacher prep issue as it has gone forward; they have considered that the voting members of the board ought to represent the consumers of your product.

Chris Cronin asked if the legislature would look on some structures more favorably. Miller-Jones responded that we can't fund scholarships and there is caution with adding administrative FTE. Saunders said that their concern would likely be in the outcomes, perhaps not as much on allocation structure.

Dave McDonald brought up the fact that whether this is a multi-biennial request will impact the structure; if this is a once-then-done initiative, we shouldn't consider it. At some point in time, the money will be diverted. Saunders replied we probably need to talk about how many biennia we feel we would need this funding in order to make a dent, so that we would meet those performance indicators. Saunders said we need to focus on this as a long-term initiative. Miller-Jones added we also need to be smart about transferring ownership about some of these programs because at some point campuses are going to have to make this a priority. We should point out mileposts at which we expect campuses to step up. Cronin added that perhaps part of the outcome will be how they can become self sustaining.

**The second policy question concerned prioritization within the packages, specifically the prioritization of expanded options and dual credit.** Saunders explained that if we aren't careful we may be opening up a pool for the usual demographic. While this strategy addresses the "best and brightest" student issues, it doesn't necessarily serve underserved students. She asked that the committee discuss priorities within 1.1, and also about priorities among the proposals components in general.

Agnes Hoffman said that on 1.5, it was very important to the ICAR (Inter-institutional Committee on Admissions and Recruitment) to reinstate something, however they just learned that the state system has contracted with SAT to give examinations at the sophomore level and those districts will retain the survey info they are seeking. There is a statewide opportunity for all sophomores to take a standardized exam which will provide all the information ICAR needs. Now that we know that if that is the case ICAR probably doesn't need the proposal in 1.5, but probably will need funding to purchase data from those agencies.

Saunders suggested that the language of 1.3 can be inclusive of this possibility, without having a separate piece in 1.5. Agnes Hoffman said she would get the estimated cost of this back to the Chancellor's Office.

McDonald emphasized that the cuts made did have an impact; the loss of some of these services have placed a greater burden on campuses and resulted in lost opportunities to serve students. There was a consequence to taking out the surveys that were done annually, not just from the research standpoint, but also in service to students of rural communities.

Turner said that the context is PK-20 agenda, and noted that this is not the only place where data sharing would be beneficial; it may be worth making overtures to ODE to let the Governor's Office know we are interested in doing this.

Merkel said that when you crosswalk with the Oregon Student Assistance Commission POPs, we will also see related efforts. They are hopeful in reintroducing the College Choices report which they did for years. McDonald summarized that this report provided a school by school county by county break out of where graduating schools went in terms of private, public, community college, etc.; it was broken down for every public high school in the state, and is very revealing about where the gaps are. *Where Have Oregon's Graduates Gone*, produced by OUS, is a sampling of this. Merkel added that she thinks they are going to go back and recuperate the data from the missed years.

Miller-Jones asked if the dual credit focus has less of a priority than academic enrichment programs of other sorts. Sloane said that all of the initiatives were important but if she had to reduce one, dual credit may be higher on the list. Joanne Sorte agreed. Tamara Henderson said that she felt at the last meeting that was the general agreement on this; we brought up our concerns about how much it is reaching our communities. Turner said that from the UEE perspective, dual credit would be strengthened if those courses were allowed to meet national standards. Hannah Fisher said that there is no breakdown along where these classes are offered and in her experience she has seen them offered more often in upper class areas.

Cronin suggested rethinking use of the word dual credit. Sometimes they are talking about a summer institute or bringing kids to campus for an experience; all of those are really effective, and maybe we can be inclusive of but back away from the dual credit language. Saunders said maybe then she would take out specific types of advanced credit programs, because our role with the others, IB, AP, was not identified, and 1.1 could just focus on any pre-college academic enrichment program until we learn more about where are the gaps. There was general agreement to this.

Edmonds said that the committee recognizes the role that dual credit can play but in the last meeting, there was not a clear line in terms of how it serves underrepresented students and whether it does it by accident or design.

Fisher asked for examples of programs that would fit into 1.1. McDonald responded with an example. Western has a partnership with North Salem High School, which is a high risk school, to bring students on campuses for 3 weeks in a summer, all aimed at first generation low-income students. They are looking at programs targeted at groups of students who are underserved and have proven track records. Saunders said that it is both for existing and new programs or initiatives.

Patricia Martinez-Orozco said that the students at OCHA (Oregon Council for Hispanic Achievement) who dropped out or were otherwise disengaged from traditional high school, dual credit was very effective because they saw the link into feeling academically productive. Agnes Hoffman said she would hate to take out the dual credit language because as an example, PSU and PCC have great opportunities to partner with lower privileged schools; maybe we can leave it to the panel as to whether a program is addressing the target populations.

Turner said that he sees 2 pieces, which are not separate for the student but it may be good for our purposes to separate them. The dual credit courses have to meet particular criteria in order to be accepted by postsecondary sector; that is one issue, then there is getting the student hooked and bringing them in.

Saunders said that she can adjust the language so that the funds support programs that may use dual credit as a strategy for a pre-college program, but which are not focusing exclusively on dual credit. Algie Gatewood said he is in agreement; the key part is we leave those opportunities open so that we don't become so prescriptive that we lose our ability to innovate.

Sanchez said that politically, if we start including wording about dual credit we will confuse the issue and perhaps ought to be handled separately.

Turner explained there is the issue of dual credit courses then there is the population that is going into those courses, and suggested the committee address them separately.

Joiner asked how much micro detail needs to be in a POP. Saunders responded it is pretty general. Miller-Jones added that we have to strip down to detail to answer any questions. Saunders added that we should realize too that some of the proposal will be cut. If they see too many things they may not treat our priorities as well. We need to get forward with a very tight prioritization; the first step is to go through the State Board of Higher Education.

Alex Sanchez said that the level of detail that goes to the legislature is through the legislative analysts. For the legislators themselves the information is succinct, like a page long. First we have to get it through the Board and we need to have things explained and rationalized.

Saunders said the Chancellor recommended we might take 1.6 on convening opportunities off, if we need to narrow this down. It is unlikely to be supported and we could get this support from outside sources or possibly within the CO. Turner suggested it may be part of the teacher preparation POP as well. Dalton Miller-Jones summarized that we had a symposium last October; it was an opportunity for cross-sectors hear from different populations, and was a very powerful experience; we were hoping that we could continue that on a regular basis. Miller-Jones said this would also wanted to add capacity to share best practices. Hoffman said we could leave it in knowing it is some low hanging fruit for cuts. Saunders said that what they tend to do is cut the dollar amount in total. Merkel said they will have a POP for the Oregon College Access Network (ORCAN) which includes some of these issues. Saunders said she would include the convening component in the POP but not in its own section, will work it into other sections, perhaps under 1.1 or 2.1.

Patricia Martinez-Orozco asked what in the POP addresses the cultural competency of colleges. Saunders said that would be supported in the retention piece, 2.1. Program evaluation will be required. I think we would want to see some kind of example or perhaps surveys on the issue.

Dalton Miller-Jones said that we are encouraging people who are adopting work geared toward first-generation students which includes working with faculty who want to become more effective in reaching students from diverse backgrounds. At some point we also need to hold to some accountability for achieving diversity.

Hannah Fisher said that the measurement of the problem is very anecdotal. Students are going to get a grade in a class whether or not they had a good experience. Henderson added that people who suffered from the lack of a culturally competent professor are less likely to talk to someone about it. Saunders said that the main things we may need to measure are 1) did we get more students into the retention programs, 2) did we get more students to graduate? We will not get as many to graduation if we don't do a better job at this.

**Saunders explained that the third policy question is whether to include elementary student outreach at this time, or to focus efforts on middle and high school.** Saunders said we'll be lucky to get 50% of what we ask for, and while there are some things that we could reach into elementary ages with, such as publications, we need to be explicit that we wouldn't be doing the same level of outreach to elementary school as we are to middle and high schools.

Joanne Sorte said she has an interest in this issue because she works with Head Start populations across our state. She would like to think about some low-key ways that an invitation could be offered to these communities without major expenditures, or the same kind of

outreach. When children are very young, these families need to begin the concept that education is part of the life course for their children.

Gayle Yamasaki suggested that perhaps in planning for the committee they should talk with some K-6 people. Eda Davis-Lowe said that we need to acknowledge the critical role of starting early even if we don't focus our money there. Some new initiatives may want to do this; as I read this, everything started at middle school. Maybe we can make the point that while this initiative is focused on middle and high school, other activities are not ruled out. Martinez-Orozco said that if we look at families holistically they come in packages, and we should approach language as a family unit. Often these families have the aspiration but they don't have the concrete language. Hannah Fisher added it is an untapped resource to use students to go out to schools; that is just about organizing K-12 efforts with student groups. Saunders said a subcommittee member emphasized that we need to reach parents at the place where they are most engaged in their kids' education.

### **EOU presentation on Rural Access Initiative**

Di Saunders welcomed Tim Seydel and Sarah Witte from EOU, noting that we have asked reps from EOU to give us an overview of the rural access initiative which is currently being funded now, and they would be seeking funding for this in the next biennium.

Sarah Witte reported EOU has instituted some recruitment and retention initiatives including work with counselors, parents, and students in the high schools to encourage them to go to college. EOU would aim to continue that program and to augment it slightly with a bridge program. Seydel added that they have found that it is not only the recruitment that is critical, but the retention is key until graduation; many of these students want to return to rural areas. Getting them through the process is critical. EOU is trying to get these students right out of high school into college then ramping up so they are ready to engage right away.

Saunders clarified that EOU would be seeking about \$800 for the next biennium; this would continue the current program and add a bridge component. McDonald asked for a rough approximation of how were served this year and what EOU would serve in the future. Seydel said that today EOU has 300 students from Hermiston on campus; in terms of the direct numbers of students who came onto campus, they have probably visited and worked with about 400 students. They set up the program to build a college going culture so they may have gone to college other places. Witte added that for the number of students benefiting from retention programs, that would be at least 400 students.

Sanchez said he would be convinced by more numbers under performance indicators if he were a legislator. Joanne Sorte asked what is the geographic scope of search, how far they going from La Grande. Seydel answered that they are in primarily the 12 county service region of EOU, but they have also reached students in Coos Bay, Bend, and Salem.

Jon Joiner asked for clarification on whether this was run through the OSBHE last time. Saunders said yes, it went through state board, then legislators, then LFO (Legislative Fiscal Office). Right now it is unclear if will end up as a POP or in the essential budget level.

Dalton Miller-Jones reinforced Sanchez's question on metrics; he said it because of the complex situation of people going to other institutions, it is going to be important to have a profile of the starting point. Saunders said this also need to show that this benefits students directly no matter which college they are going to; the goal is not self-serving but to excite students to go to

college anywhere. Witte responded that EOU has assessment of the success for freshmen retention, for at-risk students versus average students.

Sloane emphasized that the committee's POP is aimed a particular populations; she asked to what extent is the EOU initiative is reaching the same underserved populations or a mixed population? Witte reported that at EOU the difference between retention rates between students served and the students not served is 84% versus 65% overall; it is about 20 points higher when you actually do something. Saunders said that in some ways the rural access initiative is a model because it is joining the pre-college preparation and the retention piece.

Cronin added this is a pretty simple program and probably easily transferable to other areas. Vicki Merkel wants to emphasize that EOU is engaging students in all types of postsecondary education; it is about finding the best fit for the student.

Stephanie Carnahan said that within the budget, EOU lists the GEAR UP matching funds and cautioned that the state is applying for but we don't have the funds yet so to be careful about planning.

### **Other discussion items**

Hannah Fisher noted that students with disabilities are included within cultural competency; and many students see those issues as imperative.

Miller-Jones asked that the committee start about thinking about how to organize work over next 6 months noting that there are things that are not in here that are critically important; like the disabilities piece. Please think and reflect between today and the next time we meet about how this committee is going to organize our work.

Tamara Henderson said that meeting with community groups that are organizing within their own underrepresented communities will be important.

Poppe suggested that in the POP when any institution would apply for these funds they would need to do it in partnership with other institutions.

Saunders said that some of our convening money could apply grant funds toward pulling together grant recipients on best practices. Any grantee would be part of a team so that we can spread the best practices, collaborate, etc. Cronin suggested that the committee provide some oversight and connection in the future.

Sanchez said that this offers the potential for the institutions to move much more closely together; if students are being recruited and motivated to go, we should know they are showing up there and know they are staying for a period of time. They usually drop out in the first two or three weeks; we need to know that information. The receiving institution should know that students are recruited through this program.

Joanne Sorte said there are projections about the numbers of grads we will be expecting in the future; do we have a sense of percentage of students we are bringing in and the numbers of students that we are all going to be vying for?

Miller-Jones said that we're not at the position of everyone competing with a limited number of students; in order to reach the 40/40/20 goals of the Oregon Shines report, though stretched goals, this means expanding capacity.

Saunders said we have forecasts of how many students are expected to enroll in OUS in the next 10 years or so; if the question is do we have the students to fill these slots, she thinks the answer is yes. Miller-Jones said he thinks we have the numbers but we don't have the numbers of academically prepared. McDonald said if we find ourselves in a situation where we are competing with the same small group of students then we have failed.

Alex Sanchez said the other part of the equation is we've heard from K-12 and hopefully their efforts will improve this. Miller-Jones said that most forecasts say that if you raise the bar on what it means to be academically qualified and don't change a whole lot else, there will be a problem. Margie Lowe responded that she doesn't see the DOE expecting a major change overnight, and they do cite different research that shows if you set the bar higher students achieve higher; there are mixed reviews and probably have to do with how to approach implementation.

#### **Report on ORCAN (Oregon College Access Network) Conference**

Merkel said we plan on having ORCAN's first statewide conference in late October, to bring together many people who work in the field; they will be presenting a gap analysis survey to determine where gaps are in services. They hope to look for funding to allow administrators and counselors to attend so that they can hire substitutes. Miller-Jones said the committee is really appreciate they are doing this and will work as closely as they can with ORCAN on it.

#### **Report on Teacher Ed Initiative**

Bob Turner provided an update on teacher preparation initiatives, noting that they were informed by 2 meetings with and PK-12 educators and administrators. There is strong desire for increased partnerships with college of education faculty and a strong sentiment in favor or support of new teachers. They put together a 4-part policy option package. There was a strong desire for continued conversations and a desire for increased partnership was expressed by half of the 16 groups which is more than double the next highest number. On induction programs, there is going to be a report coming out the educational science on induction; this covers 14 states. The report involves about 4,000 students and should give us a handle on what kind of programs work. There is a fair amount of literature that says strong induction programs increase the retention of new teachers. We hope to put together a set of pilot programs for fall 2008, 09. There is a relation between this and the establishment of a funding structure. Turner sees this as a means of enticing OUS faculty to interact with PK-12 faculty, with a funding structure analogous to ETIC. It is important that the funding structure be set and the agenda be set by the consumers, which would be K-12 ODE. The education deans came up with modeling a funding structure on ETIC. Part 4 of the proposal would be a data exchange. The proposal has come to 3.3M total.

Joiner asked if they looked at the Portland Teacher's Program as a model. Turner said he has talked with Deborah Cochran and will be in contact with her more.

#### **Adjournment**

Miller-Jones thanked the participants. A meeting date was tentatively set for June 13. The meeting was adjourned.