

**Excellence in Delivery & Productivity Workgroup
October 15, 2004, Chemeketa Community College**

MINUTES

Materials:

Workgroup Meeting Agenda – October 15, 2004
Excellence in Delivery and Productivity Work Plan – Draft

2:15pm - Gretchen Schuette Call to Order

New Workgroup Member Introductions:

Bill Christopher: Rock Creek Campus, President
Joe Johnson: Clackamas CC, President
Jill Kirk: Oregon Business Council.
Adriana Mendoza: EOU, student
member, Board of Higher Education

Karen Phillips: Oregon Small Schools Initiative
Tony Van Vliet: member, Board of Higher Education.
Dave Phillips: Clatsop CC, Chief Academic Officer (retired)
(Not in attendance)

Introductions:

Connie Green: CCWD
Dave McDonald: OUS, Director of Enrollment Svcs
Jonathan Jacobs: OUS, Admin Assistant
Karen Sprague: UO, Molecular Biologist
Vice Provost Undergrad Studies
member, JBAC
Maureen Sevigny: OIT, Professor of Management
IFS Chair for General Ed Transfer Module
Debbie Murdock: PSU, Government Relations
Bob Turner: WOU, President Elect at IFS
Lorraine Davis: UO, VP of Academic Affairs
OUS, Provost's council chair

Gary Dukes: WOU, VP Student Affairs
Paul Steinle: SOU, Associate Provost
Diane Saunders: OUS, Director of Communication
Sam Connell: OHSU, Vice Provost Allied Health
Jem Specter: WOU, Provost
Lisa Zavala: OUS, Sr Assoc Dir Gov Relations
Julie Suchanek: OCCA, Gov Relations
John Miller: EOU, Provost
Earl Potter: SOU, Provost
Geri Richmond: (Not in attendance)

LOGISTICS:

SCHUETTE: Wants to invite the right people to the workgroup meetings. Invitations should go to OUS Presidents, CC presidents, Head of CIA, Head of CSSA,

MCDONALD: Confirmed it would be done

Key Accomplishments of the Work Group, SCHUETTE:

- Skeletal work plan is complete
- Plan represents K-16 collaborative statewide student centered platform of improved post-secondary education with statewide impact
- Traction has been gained in collaborative cross-sector work

Today's Goals, SCHUETTE:

- Current status of all topics.
- Current status of and improvement to processes for each topic
- Clarify how we are projecting costs for near future (current legislative discussion) as well as later phases.
- Focus on integration of initiatives that together will form a strong platform.

Future Meetings:

Next Workgroup Meeting: 11/10/2004, 1-3pm at Chemeketa CC

TOPIC 1: STUDENT DATA TRANSFER PROCESS

How do you better track and inform students.

Discussion led by CONNIE GREEN:

The group working on this item met the first week of October. Included representatives from OUS and OSU (Bob Kiernan, Kurt Peterson, Christine Tell, Liza Mentz, and David McDonald, representatives from the Department of Education (Doug Kost), as well as Connie Green and Marilyn Kolodziejczyk. The next meeting on this topic will be after the pilot, expected in late November or early December.

- **A small pilot** will be executed before legislative session begins. This pilot will demonstrate how to get data back and forth using the unique student identifier. The pilot will not be complete by the Nov 10th meeting.
- **A Data Warehouse** is needed. We need a consistent way to track students and give high schools the feedback they need. The current paper system includes questions: Do high schools use it? Does it get to the right instructor? Is it present when they need it? The data warehouse will allow schools web-based access to this data whenever it is needed.
- **The Post-Secondary Data Warehouse** is expected to be the most difficult. The current OUS database is Oracle based. The current CC database is FoxPro based. Unknown: How difficult is it to add the CC database to the OUS database? Is Oracle the best way to go?
- **An articulation table** can be created. Students should be able to access and compare what they have taken at different campuses (1 class from OIT, 2 from UO, 3 from WOU) and create a postsecondary database with data at one point FOR students. The warehouse will allow students to see what they have taken and how it articulates to ALL universities.

Costs:

SCHUETTE: Projected costs for this element including web-based articulation are \$2.3 million dollars

GREEN: These projected costs are the best estimate for developing and posting the warehouses. The postsecondary warehouse will be the hardest. The first student oriented test of these warehouses will be the statewide web-based articulation table. There are cost concerns: Is there enough money to do articulation and add CC database. We think there is.

Pilot Comments:

DAVIS: The pilot is to make sure the pieces are identified that will make it work prior to buying into a plan that might not meet current needs.

Data Warehouse Comments:

MCDONALD: This is not a "data system." This is connecting data systems into a linked way of sharing student data. There is the potential for Phase 3, 4, 5, as we see the functionality of the project. The pilot is an important first step.

Articulation System Comments:

SPRAGUE: **Question:** How does web-based system work?

MCDONALD: **Answer:** The hope is to take articulation which are currently one campus to one campus across 17 CC and 7 OUS campuses. This warehouse will allow students to see what they have taken and how it articulates to ALL universities and colleges.

SCHUETTE: Allows us to see where articulation problems are and how we can strengthen a particular set of colleges or universities.

SEVIGNY: **Question:** Are we looking at articulation course to course from institution to institution, or major to major? A challenge as an advisor is that a class will apply to one major but not another.

MCDONALD: **Answer:** In best of all worlds it would do both, but course to course will be first. Major is trickier, but may be a later phase.

SCHUETTE: The articulation of the majors would be the most powerful for students long term for them to continue on the path to a major.

SCHUETTE: There are not enough advisors and counselors at the HS and CC to advise every student. Can we have something more accessible to students and families that allow them to see the lay of the land even if they cannot change it.

TOPIC 1: STUDENT DATA TRANSFER PROCESS: (continued)

General Topic Comments:

SEVIGNY: Recent meeting of Oregon business program chairs discussed a statewide degree audit system. Jeannie Cove (UO) and Valerie Wood (Mt. Hood) proposed a statewide degree audit system that takes composite of courses from everywhere and allows the student to see how their history fits into programs being offered at each school. This audit system will be coordinated with the workgroup.

SCHUETTE: State board will take the lead on identifying collaborative work necessary to get done.

SCHUETTE: (in response to cost concerns) The data transfer process is foundational to what we want to do. There is legislative support.

MCDONALD: K12 has a policy option package requesting connectivity to this process. K12, CC, and OUS each have policy packages, but the Governor's staff will use them as one package, one project with three parts.

KIRK: We need an understanding of how increased efficiency will reduce cost. To do that we need to know first what the current cost is. Another approach: Will the new system pay back investment?

GREEN: The cost savings will come from reduced high school processing time, reduced registrar processing time. These will be efficiency savings, and are hard to measure.

TOPIC 2: GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER MODULE

Timeline provided by John Miller:

- Early October - Review by CC and OUS early October (complete)
- Early October – IFS visiting all OUS campuses for discussions (on schedule)
- October 18 – JBAC conference call on status led by Peter Gilkey
- November 15 – Deadline for all JBAC faculty input and data gathering
- November 18 or 19 (tentative) – JBAC Summit.
- December 10 – Articulation Conference / JBAC Review
- Winter Quarter – Faculty adoption per institutional practices

Key Description of Program

- **DAVIS:** Currently in existence is the AAOT, which allows for an easily articulated core from 2-yr campuses to 4-yr campuses.
- **SPRAGUE:** This module will set up an array of general education courses guaranteed to count toward general education wherever the student goes in Oregon.
- **SPRAGUE:** The module is smaller than full GE requirements. Other requirements must be articulated per major. This is because all schools have individual characteristics, and additional general education coursework at the receiving school will display that school's character.

Costs, SCHUETTE: Estimate of cost is \$400,000 for communications, advising materials, and associated costs.

Timeline Comments:

MILLER: Summit will be held after JBAC input deadline, on Nov 19. Invitees: MBF, JBAC, IFS, Provosts, and CIA. Goal will be to look at all information and see what are the major difficulties and common ground on the proposal.

TURNER: General Education transfer module has been taking up 98% of discussion in IFS meetings because it is more concrete and hits the faculty in curriculum.

MILLER: Per Peter: Not likely all OUS campuses could adopt JBAC proposal until Jan meeting.

GREEN: We need a provisional board approval before campuses so that we are ready for January legislative piece.

SUCHANEK: Legislation is being drafted.

MCDONALD: We can develop a conceptual draft for legislative session showing what is in place and what will happen.

SEVIGNY: November Summit will provide vital information for conceptual draft.

General Topic Comments:

SCHUETTE: The hope is to address barriers that lessen circumstances where student transfers and has to retake courses, to develop a statewide agreed common core to go with the student or easily transfer with the student.

SPRAGUE: The module does not address the problem of courses improperly selected that do not apply to the major.

SEVIGNY: Students who do not know what to do and have no advising will flounder. The module will assist a counselor in advising when transferring.

CHRISTOPHER: Question: Does the existence of a transfer module with set units *imply to student* that Gen Ed classes outside the module taken at CC won't apply to university? Why would we do that?

SPRAGUE: Answer: Technically you can take general education courses at a CC that apply to CC but not OUS when transfer. You must check articulation to know all the courses that will transfer and take all your general education at the CC level, but PSU general education requirements differ slightly from OIT requirements.

SCHUETTE: CC Concern: to what extent do the healthy curriculum differences between universities play out as a barrier? Which differences could and should be addressed?

MILLER: Data shows only about 30% of CC students transfer with complete AAOT.

CHRISTOPHER: What is the lifespan of this as campuses change their courses that make this invalid? What notification to students must be given? Needs to be a set of time restraints.

POTTER: We need to go past the agreement to the way we work together. Need to be consultative between campuses as changes occur.

SCHUETTE: Adapting to course changes needs further addressing in phase 2. A legacy review process.

TOPIC 2: GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER MODULE (continued)

Module's Relation to Majors:

CHRISTOPHER: Several majors have major coursework in the first two years, with gen ed taken over all four years. We need to work closer programmatically between campuses. Develop common core agreements in business, sciences, premed, pre-dental, chem., math, biology. The general education transfer module is limiting.

GREEN: Communication is critical. The intent is not to say, 'when you finish this general ed core you can leave.' The hope is to say that you can take these to any institutions and they will transfer, but you can and need to continue to take other courses throughout all 4 years (in CC or OUS) that will apply to the school/major you would like to take.

TURNER: We should think of coursework as fitting in one of four boxes: major, minor, general ed, and electives. Gen Ed is covered by transfer module. The major and minor have their own structure and coursework.

Communication Comments:

JOHNSON: We need to provide a report to the outside world that shows the number of students this applies to. This would be helpful for legislature.

SCHUETTE: Agreed. There is much legislative interest in this topic. How can we characterize what we have accomplished and what we have yet to accomplish in a way that is easy to understand and support.

SAUNDERS: Will the general public understand the name "General Education Transfer Module"? Do we want to move to an acronym that public will understand?

SPRAGUE: Ohio, Colorado, North Carolina call theirs General Ed Transfer Module.

SCHUETTE: Lets think about it and bring back ideas.

Competency Comments:

SCHUETTE: Work on stronger general ed common core that relates to student competency. Look at where we are and create something in timely fashion that helps students early on while we continue longer work on student competencies, which is critical.

SPRAGUE: We need a simple way to measure student competencies. How do you measure whether students have learned how to think? Look at other states (North Carolina and Michigan).

TURNER: Idea for cost effective way to determine competencies: Have a course (e.g. biology) which would act as gatekeeper course with elements built in to determine if student had necessary skills in statistics, writing skills, etc to proceed. If the student does not have the skills regardless of where he came from he must go back and take those classes.

SPRAGUE: Pilot programs in other states believe they can measure competencies by building them into courses in this way.

TOPIC 3: ARTICULATION OF MAJORS AND DUAL ENROLLMENT

Articulation of Majors Key Points:

- **GREEN:** The goal is to make sure there are articulation agreements for popular programs. For example, there are lots of students transferring into education from Chemeketa to WOU, but there is no articulation agreement. We need to find patterns and make sure articulation agreements follow these patterns.
- **MCDONALD:** Community Colleges are giving us their current articulation agreements. OUS has the number of students transferring to campus by major. We will overlay this information to see where gaps are, and where needs remain to be met.

Dual Enrollment Key Points:

- **GREEN:** EOU and OSU have produced a draft template on dual enrollment. We need to look at how to implement it. This will be discussed at the November meeting of the Provosts/CIA.

TIMELINE:

February 2004 – Matrix of all Community College Articulation Agreements completed

October 18 – Updates to Agreements due from Community Colleges

Costs, SCHUETTE: Estimated costs and time. We believe costs to be between \$400-600,000 for materials and training.

General Topic Comments:

JOHNSON: Articulation is easily described to Legislators. We can say we have “x” agreements in place, expanding to “y”, we have “x” dual enrollments, moving toward “y” number. We can provide a report of the number of students benefiting from this agreement.

GREEN: Articulation is helping students more than dual-enrollment.

SCHUETTE: There is not a lot of need to do a dual-enrollment agreement if there is no articulation agreement.

SCHUETTE: We need to approach dual enrollment together and globally. We were beefing dual-enrollment agreements at PSU, then OSU, one campus at a time, which takes too many resources. We need to add language about sorting out how we work together on it on continuing basis.

MURDOCK: In recent years, students at PSU seem very happy with transfer process. We need to look at where the program already works.

CHRISTOPHER: Question: Are we talking about program articulation agreements or course articulation agreements? Will my three courses taken at Chemeketa in Biology transfer to Western as the same three classes working towards my major?

GREEN: Answer: We are doing the program by major first. Currently if you are going to SOU you must take one set of courses, and for WOU another set of courses. Each school has their own data and system. The information is not at one place. We are starting with the majors (step 1) and working from there.

SCHUETTE: As we work on the majors, some of the course problems disappear.

MCDONALD: Course by course comparison will be part of Student Data Transfer Process phase 2.

TOPIC 4: ONLINE DELIVERY & CAPACITY COURSES

Timeline by Connie:

- October 18 – CIA numbers due on Community College articulation, gaps, and capacity.
- October 21 – Jon Mosely to have information on OUS bottleneck courses.
- Provosts/CIA Meeting – Talk about how information should be presented in November.
- November 4 – Present information

Online Delivery & Capacity Key Points

- **SCHUETTE:** We need more courses to ensure more Oregonians get education. The goal with online courses is to identify where students are hung up and can't make progress because they can't take the course. Make sure we are using well what we have from a student-centered perspective. What is the next capacity that would make the biggest difference for students? Look for gaps. Make recommendations. Ask for resources when necessary for greater capacity.
- **SCHUETTE:** Next steps: does the process make sense? Are we going to get some traction? We put early deadlines for proposal on purpose. We want to identify and add capacity, and we need to know what it will take. We need a proposal that might reach some resources.

Costs, SCHUETTE: Initial cost estimates \$1.6 to \$1.7 million dollars (for both online and capacity). What would this go for, who would be involved. We need this to be concrete for legislature.

Capacity Courses Comments:

MURDOCK: Question: Are we looking at alternative times of delivery for bottleneck courses? 3AM, etc.

GREEN: Answer: Solutions to bottleneck courses will be discussed in next meeting.

MURDOCK: Students are willing to be mobile. A student at UO takes one class at PSU since there is an opening.

MCDONALD: In a past meeting, Liz Goulard and John Minehan were talking about capacity. In one instance WOU had faculty capacity, Chemeketa had technology capacity. It would be a great way to use resources that are not fully maxed out in ways to address areas that we have need in.

CHRISTOPHER: There are several models for sharing facilities and faculty to make it easier.

SCHUETTE: Need to make bottleneck courses visible to neighboring campuses.

JOHNSON: In Washington, there was huge increase in capacity, but they found they jammed at upper division level. We need to take a global view to make sure this doesn't occur if we increase capacity.

Online Courses Comments:

SCHUETTE: Southwestern CC received a grant for distance learning. We need to clarify best next steps to fund.

Looking to John Miller and Liz Goulard – and should look for Grant opportunities for distance education.

MURDOCK: Question: Common Courses: Can a person take online courses at one campus that count at another?

GREEN: Answer: If PSU can make common courses work for surrounding community colleges, it would be a great pilot for the state. Need to track it and confirm it works.

DAVIS: As we move forward with online courses we need more support services.

SCHUETTE: If we do things in a collaborative fashion the ensuing support would make more capacity possible.

TOPIC 5: ACCELERATION FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Key Points:

1. **MCDONALD:** What does it mean to be college ready? When we figure it out, we need to articulate it to the high schools, students, and parents.
 - **GREEN:** Next Step: Create draft of college-ready and test it with larger group. We have the philosophy with it but need the right words for it.
2. **MCDONALD:** Align proficiencies in the system. Through PASS, OUS has a strong alignment with K12. CC not as systematic as OUS. OUS needs to take the next step to align with CC.
 - **GREEN:** Next Step: Dave work with State Board of Education policy director. Progress will take a couple of years.
3. **MCDONALD:** Recommendations for pilots for high school acceleration to college. Current piecemeal offerings (one school has AP, another has IB, another has Dual-Enrollment, some have nothing) are offered to too few students, and not enough areas. We need to do it systemically, possibly using Washington's "Running Start" as a model.
 - **GREEN:** Next Step Review recommendations for pilots – Need to get group together and figure out what Oregon pilot will look like.

Costs, SCHUETTE: \$135-\$500,000 for nature of mapping, launching pilot, sharing information.

Pilot Comments:

POTTER: Currently preparing for Provost action. Met with Steve Bouyoski at Jackson Education Service District to discuss regional perspective. Has inventoried OUS resources to HS, noticing that OUS often work without the knowledge each other is there. Wants to take perspective from HS point of view. Need to talk with school leaders to assess readiness for systemic implementation. Reason he is talking to school leaders is so he can ask the right questions when he meets with Connie.

CHRISTOPHER: Opportunities such as AP classes, Dual Enrollment, etc need to coexist because they reach different kinds of students. Well-adjusted students who enjoy HS don't join Running Start. Those who do not like HS and would normally drop out enjoy AP classes and opportunity to take college type courses.

CHRISTOPHER: We need to dispel the notion that if Running Start is implemented other programs will disappear.

GREEN: We are not trying to take away anything; we are trying to add something systemic to the mix. The money is there. It is not about new money, it is about taking money you have and using it for this. There is no policy stopping this from happening. It is an operations issue. There needs to be a will to change the program locally.

JOHNSON: Suggestion: Single out three pilot areas (one urban, one rural) to get arms around this. Do not launch statewide. Pilot districts report back, show costs, show performance.

SCHUETTE: The pilot should demonstrate potential for statewide impacts, ability to create access statewide even if not fully adopted at first.

SAUNDERS: Grants are possible for this type of effort.

SCHUETTE: There were several CCs wanting to participate in pilot once we get it in place.

JOHNSON: Greatest challenge will be concern that programs are elitist. Working with college-ready is easiest, but what about the dropouts?

General Topic Comments:

SCHUETTE: A small group at the acceleration summit signed invitation to join with larger group on this topic to think about current barriers to more systemic statewide approach to college coursework for HS students. Includes Elaine Yandle-Roth CCWD, Linda Jessell from Gretchen Barlow, David Douglas sup. Barbara Rommel, Hermiston superintendent Jerry Wilson (Advisor to state board of ed), Wallawa superintendent, OEA rep, Chuck Bennit COSA, Cheryl Falk CIA.

Current Acceleration Comments:

PHILLIPS: Currently large high schools are being divided into smaller schools. As schools go smaller, the current models and AP opportunities are challenging. Need statewide system.

TOPIC 5: ACCELERATION FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS (continued)

Washington Running Start Comments:

JOHNSON: Washington Superintendent has a model in place using both Running Start and AP. The two programs complement one another, with a tremendous # of students participating.

TURNER: **Question:** How did WA program dollars work?

JOHNSON: **Answer:** Dollars flow with students. 7% retained for HS, 93% to college. WA superintendent felt it is purpose of HS to move person on to higher education. 7% is plenty of money to provide necessary advising.

MCDONALD: Bellevue Washington's superintendent is very progressive. Believes every student should be taking AP type class. He has HIGH expectations, and students are meeting them!

CHRISTOPHER: Hundreds of students in WA that were home schooled came back into formal education system to enroll in college through Running Start. Districts lost no dollars because students were not enrolled there in first place. Siphoned off students were helpful by taking pressure off areas of high enrollment.

Legislature Comments

JOHNSON: Legislature repeatedly asks, 'will we institute a student bill of rights?'

CHRISTOPHER: Student Bill of Rights. Has come up in two past iterations. Unlike WA Running Start program that takes college ready, the last iteration said remedial students would get access to classes for college credit. We need to set the standards so it is very clear *who this program is geared for*. Need a focus, or legislature will decide what focus ought to be.

TOPIC 6: RETENTION

Identified Best Practices for Retention (JEM SPECTAR):

Following is per meeting with CSSA at Linn-Benton CC

- **Advising** – good advising connects a student to the institution
- **Learning Communities** – Communities needed at all campuses
- **Early Warning Systems** – Track students with difficulties to catch students before they drop out
- **Supplemental Instruction** – Offer tutoring or additional instruction in selected areas of common difficulty (math, sciences, writing)
- **Campus Climate/Environment** – institutions need to embrace retention as an institutional goal.
- **Academic Intervention/Career Guidance** – Show students the connection between 1st year of college and future career.
- **Peer Mentorship**– Students learn very well from peers.
- **Rigorous Curriculum at HS Level** – HS Students are not sufficiently prepared. Need to focus on difficult areas and prepare students at HS level. It would be proactive to fix the program at this level before it becomes a college problem.
- **Capital Construction** - Student centers, library, etc. Students can interact and feel connected to their communities if they have comfortable places to hang out with their peers.

Costs (SCHUETTE): \$500-\$550,000 range for retention efforts. This is for initial stages. We need to clarify what we can do with our current resources, identify key next steps and costs, demonstrate our collaborative ability across three sectors, and get greater support from legislature. Only then, having shown impact, could we ask for the big bucks.

General Topic Comments:

SCHUETTE: We need to focus efforts on first generation, low-income, minority students and transfer students. Yvette Webber-Davis provided paper of recommendations for MBF. Think about how strategies relate to all students.

CHRISTOPHER: Faculty need to view retention as part of their responsibility and not just a job for student svcs. Retention should be explicit, accountable, and rewardable activity for faculty.

PHILLIPS: It is about relationships, rigor, aligning the system so we have high standards for student and staff.

SCHUETTE: There may be different strategies for older students who are working while in school.

SEVIGNY: Financial situation impacts retention also. Students drop out because they can't afford to return.

TURNER: It is difficult to be a successful student if you are working 40-hours a week at an outside job.

High School Requirement Comments:

CHRISTOPHER: Is it time to modify HS Grad requirements? HS students can stop taking math as a sophomore and still graduate. This affects their ability to move on to college.

MCDONALD: Had a conversation with ODE. Now may be the best and only time to make significant changes to HS graduation requirements.

GREEN: K-14 board has ability, will, passion. Initiative to ensure college-life ready. They are ready to move on this topic.

Pilot Comments:

SPECTER: A pilot could have dramatic effect.

SCHUETTE: We need to define what we mean by a pilot and what funds will be required. Pilot needs to ultimately have a statewide impact.

Funding Comments:

GREEN: Funding for some efforts come from federal dollars, not general fund. If money disappears, access for students would disappear.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Some of these initiatives might be right for statewide FIPSE application, or possibly a Title III application.

SCHUETTE: collaborative support can be provided if needed for grant writing support.