



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

June 22, 2009, 2-4 p.m.

Location: Portland State University

**DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

**Attendance**

David McDonald, Ruth Keele, Chris Cronin, Mark Endsley, Bob Turner, Jon Joiner, Alex Sanchez, Dalton Miller-Jones, Joe Holliday, Endi Hartigan, Rosemary Powers, Patricia Martinez-Orozco, Algie Gatewood, Diana Saunders, Alex Sanchez, Brian Fox, Hilda Roselli, James Francesconi, Stephanie Carnahan, Jackie Grant, Emilio Hernandez, Eda Davis-Lowe, Lew Frederick, Pat Burk, Jonathan Eldridge, Larry Roper

Meeting notes: Endi Hartigan

**Welcome and Introductions**

Dalton Miller-Jones welcomed the committee, and reviewed the results of the May meeting to convene into three task teams. He introduced the main topic of the day, the planning for the fall symposium.

**Updates/Task Teams**

Director Miller-Jones asked Pat Burk to summarize some federal grant developments which he had reported on at a different meeting.

Pat Burk talked briefly about the state budget. The state budget currently includes withdrawal from the rainy day fund which the Governor will veto. There is new revenue in the budget, including an increased income tax for high-incomes and the corporate minimum increase which may be opposed by voters, and could result in a special session in February of next year.

Burk shared on "Race to the Top," which is part of the federal stimulus package; the state fiscal stabilization fund is part of this. There are categorical grants receiving significant increases; these include Title I (particularly for schools that are in school improvement status) early childhood and special education, and homeless programs. There are also a series of competitive grants; "Race to the Top" is the largest. It includes a "What Works" innovation fund, a pool for teacher incentives, and a pool for longitudinal data systems. "Race to the Top" is appropriated to the secretary to spend. \$350M is going toward national standards, internationally benchmarked, and the remainder will be split in 2 competitions. These are state grants focused on 4 core reforms: rigorous college level and workforce ready standards and assessments, teacher quality issues, longitudinal data systems, and strategies for low performing schools. They are looking for bold statewide strategies contained in these areas. The RFP will be out in Oct, due in Dec, awards in March April 2010. The second round will be applications due in July. Pat Burk said with "Race to the Top" there will be only one application from the state, and the partners involved in that will be looking at how to frame it. The "What Works" innovation fund is a

separate application; these go to local school districts and partnerships with eligible partners. The RFP for this goes out in July. ODE has a website devoted to the stimulus where there is information.

Miller-Jones commented that we all know of multi-sector partners and we should all show up and offer to be part of these initiatives. He suggested we focus on this at our next full meeting. Burk noted that 50% of proceeds must go to school districts; the other half would support the state initiatives. Saunders commented that the "What Works" fund seems related to the Committee's POP.

Miller-Jones acknowledged the GEAR UP report and Stephanie Carnahan's work, and it was requested that all committee members receive a copy of this. He segued to the discussing the committee task teams addressing the three voted priority areas. Larry Roper is setting up a first meeting for task team 1. Task team 2 focusing on best practices also relates closely to the symposium; David McDonald will be leading this and said they will meet soon. Miller-Jones noted that these committee items would involve K-12 but we don't have the capacity to connect there with grants and funds right now so we are looking at what we do have agency with. He encouraged group 1 to continue to think about the endeavor as a K-20 system. Task team 3 on faculty effectiveness has met once and Miller-Jones asked Bob Turner to report on that.

Turner distributed an outline of notes from the task team and reported they had a discussion of potential ways to move forward. They discussed the possibility of using some existing tools like the diversity scorecard, which Turner distributed. This is a device that was discussed in a session for Elisabeth Zinser's Learning Outcomes committee. They also want to make contact with OSA and IFS and involve them heavily in this process; they want to know what's going on at the campuses now and establish point people to use as resources going forward. IFS spent a couple of hours talking about this initiative. They were asked to provide names of contact people, and a list of faculty development grants that touch on these areas, to get an idea of people doing work in this area. Director Powers said we need to address faculty culture with respect and strategies; some of the best reasons students stay in school have to do with faculty, some of the worst reasons they leave also have to do with faculty. We may want to consider changes to the faculty reward system. Dalton Miller-Jones also emphasized that this work needs to be data-driven. Stephanie Carnahan suggested that some of the campus climate students would be effective, and asked if there is a repository for those reports.

Miller-Jones acknowledged Director Francesconi's presence at the meeting and noted that at a previous Board meeting they asked the Board to take the three priority areas to more of a policy level. They suggested that these items could be reported on, and also were looking into presidents' evaluations. Dalton Miller-Jones informally asked President Wiewel what he would think about reporting back on these areas; Wiewel responded that he could report on #2 and 3 more easily than #1. Francesconi clarified that the presidential evaluation piece is now in place.

Jackie Grant talked about a campus climate report the campus does for which the questions are very general. McDonald says it is probably the NSSE National Student Survey of Engagement; that data can be broken down by race. That is one place where there is existing, comparable data among institutions, but

because the numbers are small for small schools it is sometimes not reliable. It uses common survey questions. Carnahan said that some of the campuses design their own instruments.

Alex Sanchez commented that there are some land mines in faculty effectiveness; we need to find a way to do this without blaming the faculty. This will be a sensitive issue for faculty since they are also facing the budget situation. We should be aware of language and use something like “engaging faculty as partners.” President Algie Gatewood asked if there is standard methodology for evaluating this; and Larry Roper answered that at OSU they do an effectiveness of teaching survey, but nothing related to cultural competence. Yvette Webber-Davis may be able to further clarify. Endi Hartigan commented that Tom North may know about institutional efforts. Holliday will look into these.

Tamara Henderson said she has point people at OSA to provide a student perspective on this; they may in some cases be people from the multicultural alliance, but student body presidents also want some involvement. Burk said that in the issue of cultural competence the low hanging fruit may be in the graduate schools of education. Cultural competence must be part of administrative licenses, so faculty in this area has already had to wrestle with designing a program for that.

Sanchez said that OSU has “DPT—Difference, Power, and Diversity” as part of the core curriculum; a lot of courses are included in the curriculum; the question is does it carry over into the rest of the curriculum? Gatewood said that some years ago at PCC Cascades we looked at this; we were looking at both the cognitive abilities, and the affective domain. Many students didn’t feel like they belonged on campus. Those who were involved in activities with engagement felt like they belonged more.

Henderson asked if there has been a campus survey that has been done to show differences of perception between faculty and students. Lew Frederick said they did that at PPS; it gave them information; particularly effective related to safety issues. Burk said that in K-12 they did a customer satisfaction survey; parents and students had almost opposite answers on faculty. Kids by and large describe their teachers as helpful; but with regard to issues such as fair discipline, and the representation of students of color in offices, the perceptions were very different.

Patricia Martinez-Orozco cautioned that she doesn’t want it to be too general with cultural competency; we need to make sure that people have the skill, ability, and attitude to teach in that classroom; we need to really hone it down. Miller-Jones said he is less accommodating than some and says this committee is about taking responsibility. Rosemary Powers said we just need to be sure we are engaged; we need to get people who are dealing with this issue to move forward. Brian Fox said that what’s driving some of these things is the tenure process; we should look at what incentivizes people, and what they are they judged on.

Mark Endsley said that data can help elucidate and help with this process, particularly data that provides explanation of students’ experiences. Dalton Miller-Jones agreed it is time for us to put our collective will and intelligence to work.

Turner noted that he has found out what faculty are doing with the assessment cycle; there is a requirement faculty are not that aware of that they state the learning objectives they have, define

assessments, and that assessments need to be in line with institutional mission. Turner said that when he provides some of the data on growing Latinos and adult learner populations, he can ask faculty how they know they are going to actually be teaching these students when they haven't mastered the processes for the current student populations. He added that the culture of academia is changing; we're asking faculty to be an integral part of that change.

Miller-Jones further stated that he has never participated in a system that overworks faculty as much as this one. He said when he entered college there was a weed out system. Now, students are paying more and more, and states are paying less and less. We have to show students they are getting their monies worth. We also want a success-oriented culture.

Emilio Hernandez discussed an *Oregonian* article on Latinos and immigration and the varying views of professors on this noting that there are many anti-immigration sentiments.

### **Fall Symposium**

Dalton Miller-Jones turned the discussion to the symposium planning. He summarized the content of the 2007 symposium and the overwhelmingly positive response to the event. People were desperate to get together; we promised we would try to find the resources to have this again. The last one was free. Last year, ORCAN had a conference in Eugene that was somewhat of a follow up to the committee work.

McDonald agrees with observations about the welcomed response to the symposium event on the first round, but we need to have more of a K-12 audience.

It was suggested that, given Burk's comment about the timeline for "Race to the Top," perhaps the symposium can help frame the state's strategies with that application and put together a highly competitive state grant. Burk said there will certainly be conversations prior, but there is a way to think about the symposium as adding value to that proposal. The problem is everybody has an idea of how to spend all of the money. He said that if there is an Achilles heel of completing high school in Oregon it is math. The DOE board made a decision to move the math proficiency to 2014 but they need to report their steps as they prepare. That is both a K-12 and university issue on methodology.

Director Powers said as a participant in the symposium, she would want to know what the best practices are so people present a variety of things to her. However, she also wants people from her university to be there with her to work on what they would do next. There are a number of projects where teams of people are brought to a place to plan what they are going to want to do. She wants to think about bringing a team from each university to learn about the best practices and then see what's possible. Otherwise we'll just come and share our impatience.

Saunders said that last time we looked at both retention and precollege; she asked, do we want to focus on either precollege or retention piece? We can incorporate the team approach no matter which way we go. She also commented that we tried hard to get superintendents there last time; we couldn't get them here because of their schedule. McDonald said it may help to ask Susan Castillo to invite them so it has a more K-12 tone from the onset. Pat Burk said that there are two groups of superintendents. One is

for districts partnering with Harvard focused on equity and instructional core. The second is the Oregon Leadership Network, and includes 29 districts and their superintendents, representing 51% of students in the state. This network is funded through the Wallace foundation.

Miller-Jones agreed we were quite broad last time and that it may be best to hone it down. Holliday suggested we may use multiple days, or even have multiple symposia on the 3 topics. Miller-Jones suggested a single symposium with campus follow-up.

Saunders asked if is there a way to tie in what the Board is looking at and suggested to possibly focus on retention first since that is a Board focus right now, then to move to some of the other issues next. This wouldn't exclude a K-12 perspective because academic preparation is a part of retention. Burk said that the two Boards still have the issue of the linkage of higher education and the diploma, and how credits transfer.

Turner said that at a recent event he attended there were four tracks for participants and there was work time in between. Teams from each institution were meant to spend some time together working on what they would do when they came back.

Turner noted as an FYI that while we are planning this, the learning outcomes and assessment task force are putting together faculty to faculty meetings over the issue of learning outcomes and there may be some overlap. Assessment directors are engaged with this. Turner would get the list of participants in this out.

Martinez-Orozco said she recently participated in an event from Sojourn Theatre in which they had 4 separate rooms devoted to topics related to sustainability. In each room they were filmed and the films were running in a central area so each room was like a formal fishbowl. It was a fun interactive way to bring feedback about; we should think about being innovative with the process.

Miller-Jones interviewed committee members about their desires for the symposium.

Director Fox said that for the symposium focus he wants to drill on the retention and best practices; we can affect those now and have the quickest results.

Miller-Jones said incorporating data will be important. We also should celebrate the impact we have had with the OOG.

Rosemary Powers said she would like to find a way to get presidents involved and to have a team approach. This has to be something that the presidents call for; it has to be both top down and bottom up.

Emilio Hernandez said he would like if we had presidents administrators and superintendents involved. At the diversity summit we had presidents and the Board of Higher Education. This will help us stay on target and keep everybody body moving with the same idea in mind.

Note for Symposium planning meeting: Hernandez added in writing after that the UO office of OIED would be glad to help with this part, and that we may want to combine two summits.

Chris Cronin added it may be good to get our task teams to report on work they are going to do. She likes the idea of an informal sharing of best practices, and promoting inter-institutional dialogue.

Holliday provided a cautionary note about the team approach. He likes it, but it shouldn't be substituted for campus planning. There are ongoing institutional efforts for this type of planning; let's acknowledge this and not expect people to decide in one afternoon what there are more involved initiatives for on a campus level; we need to have a team approach that works for the campuses when they go back.

It was noted that we will need to discuss preconference materials.

Larry Roper said it doesn't matter to him what the breadth is; but he thinks it would be more helpful to hear about best practices if we think about the questions these programs asked to get to what they are doing. Campuses can't replicate a program because of their specific context. They need help with solving their particular context issues. We should provide guidance on how to construct a conversation to determine how to come up with a plan.

Holliday agreed that this type of framing provides momentum when participants return from the symposium.

Burk provided an example from a speech by Superintendent Nancy Golden on the barriers to being an effective superintendent.

Eda Davis-Lowe also likes the idea of providing questions that would help the institution frame things in their context.

Jackie Grant likes the institutional team approach, and providing questions. She thinks we should keep it narrow to retention, backing it up with the data.

Dalton Miller-Jones asked how the issues around Native American issues, such as sovereignty, cultural integrity, can be best represented. Grant said this population's issues share issues with all underrepresented students. Some of those are in the staff and faculty on our campuses; however, she is worried about in hard economic times there being backlash against undocumented people.

Chris Cronin said that we need to make sure we address these things in the context of budget constraints in the current economic climate. We need to keep this focused on things that campuses can do without spending a lot of money.

Algie Gatewood said that retention and diversity are two key concerns we can't leave off the table; doesn't care about format, but it is important we tie all this back to leadership, and to help the leaders to own some of this.

It was decided that the best time for this would be October, or even late November.

Volunteers for the symposium team include: Rob Findtner, Rosemary Powers, Jackie Grant, David McDonald, Larry Roper, Jon Joiner, and Chris Cronin.

Dalton Miller-Jones announced that Mark Endsley is invited to continue to staff the committee even though will no longer be a Chancellor's office staff person.

Returning to the issue of faculty effectiveness task team, Dave McDonald suggested that there be a faculty senate representative from each campus in that effort, not just an IFS representative.

Pat Burk said that the more we can say the institution has a responsibility to generate outcomes, not just the individual, the more likely we are to have change. The degree to which the focus is on the individual, we let ourselves off the hook. Maybe someplace in the symposium we should have a speaker that addresses this idea.

The meeting was adjourned.